

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 27 July 1983

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

ANIMALS: DOG ACT

Review: Petition

MR MACKINNON (Murdoch) [2.17 p.m.]: I have a petition which bears 154 signatures, and which reads as follows—

To The Honorable Members in Parliament Assembled:

I, the undersigned, wish to draw your attention to the fact that the recommendations put to the minister by the Dog Act Review Committee, May 1983, are a serious menace to my civil rights and accordingly hereby request that you reject, in its entirety, the reported recommendations of this committee and as your humble petitioner shall ever pray.

I certify that this petition conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

(See petition No. 6.)

BILLS (4): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Acts Amendment (Constitution and Electoral) Bill.
2. Electoral Amendment Bill.
3. Constitution Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Tonkin (Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform), and read a first time.

4. Liquor Licensing (Moratorium) Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House), and read a first time.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Days and Hours: Motion

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [2.24 p.m.]: I move—

That for the balance of the present Session the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays and Wednesdays at 2.15 p.m. and

on Thursdays at 10.45 a.m. and shall sit until 6.00 p.m., if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.15 p.m. onwards.

This is only part of a general package of measures we intend to introduce in an endeavour to manage the affairs of Parliament in a more orderly and rational manner.

In the past, it has been the tradition for the Parliament to begin sitting late in the afternoon and only recently have we had parliamentary sittings in the mornings. Previous Governments hoped that, at 1.00 or 2.00 a.m., people would be tired and exhaustion would result in the legislation being passed.

I can understand a Premier not wanting to adjourn the House at approximately 11.00 p.m. if he knows that next day members of the Opposition will return refreshed and will charge forth again on the legislation. However, if a Premier or Leader of the House knows that, if he adjourns the House at 11.00 p.m., the Opposition will have only a couple more hours next day within which to debate the measure, he will take such action without worrying unduly, because he will know that, in due course, the debate will be completed.

The tradition in this place has been legislation by exhaustion and that is most unsatisfactory. One reason that tradition has been allowed to prevail is that the conservatives, who have been in power most of the time, and who have rigged the electoral laws in such a way that they have never lost power in at least one House of this Parliament, have been able to go through the charade—

Withdrawal of Remark

MR LAURANCE: I take exception to the statement made by the Leader of the House that the electoral laws are rigged.

MR I. F. TAYLOR: We all know they are rigged! What are you talking about? Why don't you sit down?

MR LAURANCE: A few moments ago the Leader of the House introduced a number of measures which related to the electoral laws of this State. At this early stage, you, Sir, have a duty to the House not to allow such an unparliamentary term as "rigged" to be used—

MR PARKER: You don't like the truth, do you?

MR LAURANCE: —in respect of our electoral laws, once those laws have been passed by this Parliament. Therefore, I ask that the word be withdrawn.

MR TONKIN: On that point, Sir, it appears we are in danger in this Parliament of allowing people to speak their minds!

An Opposition member: So you are going to bring in the guillotine!

Mr TONKIN: I accept that certain language is unparliamentary and it would not be in the best interests of this place and, far more importantly, it would not be in the best interests of the people, for such language to be used. However, if one cannot use a moderate word like "rigged", we will reach the very silly stage where members will not be game to open their mouths at all.

If that is what the Opposition intends to do to prevent debate, members on this side of the House will object to every second sentence uttered by members opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have been asked to rule whether the term "rigged", in the context used by the Leader of the House, is unparliamentary. I do not believe it is unparliamentary and I rule accordingly.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr TONKIN: Conservative Governments have been able to present the illusion that this is a democratic House where freedom of speech obtains, knowing that in fact that is not the case.

Mr Clarko: What does that have to do with the withdrawal of remark? You are debating the question.

Mr TONKIN: I suggest the member for Karrinyup wake up and he would then realise the point of order has been disposed of and we are now debating the motion.

Mr Clarko: How would you know?

Mr TONKIN: At least I know the position, even if the member for Karrinyup does not.

Under the situation which has obtained, it has been possible to allow the Opposition to speak all night knowing that, by various means, the Government has the numbers to pass the legislation in the early hours of the morning.

This Government believes we should have adequate debate on legislation and it does not believe that less time than allowed previously should be spent on such debate. However, it is far more orderly and acceptable to members of Parliament if they know at the commencement of debate on a Bill that, after five or six hours, depending on the type of Bill and whether it is contentious—

Mr MacKinnon: What if you wanted to make a speech similar to the one you made previously which lasted for six and a half hours? You would run out of time.

Mr TONKIN: It would not have been necessary for me to make such a speech if such a dis-

graceful situation in the Kimberley had not existed.

Mr MacKinnon: We might think the same situation applies. How can we debate it adequately in six hours?

Mr TONKIN: The point of the matter is—

Mr MacKinnon: The point is that you are two faced.

Mr TONKIN: —a certain time will be allocated for debate and members will be aware of that.

The second alternative is to sit all night to get the legislative programme through, and the third is to use the gag. The gag has been more used by the conservatives than has been the guillotine, but the unfairness of the gag is that members do not know whether it will be applied, because it is applied suddenly. This does not allow an Opposition to plan its speakers or to know how long it will have. The guillotine is far fairer than the gag.

Mr Thompson: That was not your reaction when you were on this side of the House.

Mr TONKIN: While we were on that side of the House we were not responsible for the running of Parliament or this House; but we are responsible now. What we are saying is that if members opposite liked to run a process of legislation by exhaustion because they wanted to parade themselves in front of the people as democrats because they had something to hide, that is their concern; our concern is that we believe in real democracy and in the freedom of debate. That does not mean that debate will be allowed to go on all night.

Mr Rushton: It is not your House.

Mr I. F. Taylor: We have the numbers, and you don't.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MacKinnon interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! When I rise to my feet and call for order I expect silence from every member. The House will come to order!

Mr TONKIN: We will introduce, we hope, some sanity and some orderliness into the management of the business of this place. I expect that if we are unreasonable, the Opposition will tell us loudly and clearly, not only in the House, but also outside it.

Mr Clarko: You will not let us.

Mr TONKIN: If we are being unreasonable, the people will see this and we will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr Clarko: Nonsense!

Mr TONKIN: The member says it is nonsense, but if we are seen to be acting unfairly and unreasonably, the people will deal with us accordingly. We are quite happy to be dealt with by the people. I would expect members opposite to know that we will not make special rules to enable the wrath of the people to be blunted.

Mr Clarko: You are making special rules now.

Mr TONKIN: Although this motion deals only with our starting at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesdays, it is just part of a whole package. The reason we have started late in the afternoons goes back to the days when members of Parliament were amateurs; they were not full-time members, but had their own work to go to. At five o'clock in the afternoon or whatever time, they would then go to Parliament. Of course, that is no longer the situation and it has not been for many decades. Day-time sittings as far as possible, with some night-time sittings as well, represent a far more sensible approach.

As I said, to get our legislative programme through the Parliament we have only three alternatives: One is legislation by exhaustion—to keep on until people are tired; the second is to apply the gag, a sudden procedure which does not allow the Opposition to plan a list of speakers; and the third is the guillotine. There is a fourth alternative, and that is not to get the legislative programme through and to allow the Parliament to meander along in the months ahead in a very leisurely fashion. We are opting for a sensible approach, and I am quite prepared to discuss it with the Opposition.

Mr Clarko: Very noble.

Mr TONKIN: That does not mean to say that we will necessarily be able to agree on everything. I have discussed this idea with the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy. Obviously there are points of difference between ourselves and the Opposition, but it is not our desire to stifle debate in this House. It is our desire to have a more orderly arrangement so that the Opposition will know at the outset that it has a certain number of hours to debate a particular Bill. I would expect members opposite to come to me and say, "Look, this is not reasonable; you have given us only a certain amount of time, but it is a big Bill and we will need more time to debate it." We would look at such a request, but once the decision was made I would expect members opposite to say that, as they have so many hours, this will be their list of speakers.

Another spinoff from this arrangement involves the question of tedious repetition.

Mr MacKinnon: You are an expert.

Mr TONKIN: As members know, we have a Standing Order which prevents tedious repetition, by a member, not only of his own argument, but also of an argument put by another member. I have seen speakers try to apply this procedure in this House and the House has gone into uproar. The Standing Orders really do not effectively prevent tedious repetition. I believe we can put the point to the House and to the people that, if we have a certain number of hours for a debate, all the arguments will be put forward. It may be true they will not be put forward *ad nauseam*, but sufficiently for the consideration of the people. That is the reason I have moved this motion.

Mr GORDON HILL: I formally second the motion.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.35 p.m.]: The Leader of the House really did speak at considerable length about subjects not covered by the motion before the House, and with due respect to you, Mr Speaker, I am surprised you let him go so freely. I did not take a point of order although clearly—and he talked about tedious repetition—the whole of his remarks will have to be repeated next week. Because he ranged so widely, it is necessary that I, on behalf of the Opposition, should respond to some of the points he made; it is only fair that I should do so.

The Opposition does not wish to take unnecessary exception to the procedural changes suggested by the Government for the operation of the House. The Opposition's real concern is to preserve the effectiveness of the parliamentary process and the undoubted duty and right of the Opposition to express an alternative point of view. There is also a concern on our part to protect the right of individual members of this House to speak in debates in this House and not to be denied that right merely to suit the convenience of the Government.

What is being proposed in relation to the guillotine procedure will be strenuously resisted by the Opposition. I give the Government notice now that if that is the way it wants to proceed with the conduct of business in this House and this Parliament, it will pay the price for doing so; it will pay the price as a Government in a complete lack of co-operation from this side of the House, because we sat here for years on end as a Government and did not seek to deny the Opposition as it then was—the present Government—the opportunity to make its points, however stupid, long-winded, tedious, or repetitious. The moment this Government comes to power it seeks to deny the Opposition the right to make its points on the Government's legislative programme.

The member for Kalgoorlie, with some smugness which he still displays, indicated that the Government has the numbers. That no doubt is a lovely position for the Government to be in.

Mr I. F. Taylor: It certainly is.

Mr HASSELL: But I remind the member for Kalgoorlie that in another place we have the numbers, and if members opposite want—

Mr I. F. Taylor: So much for your democracy!

The SPEAKER: Order:

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! You may not have been in the Chamber when I stressed the point a little while ago that when I am on my feet and call for order, every member must obey.

Mr Thompson: Where is the smirk on the face of the member for Kalgoorlie now?

Mr HASSELL: If the Government wants to run the business of this House—not the votes of this House; we know it can win the voting because it has the numbers; that is not in issue—on the basis that the member for Kalgoorlie suggested, it may be that our colleagues in another place will ensure very thoroughly that the public has an opportunity to scrutinise legislation at length.

I just warn Government members that if that is their approach to our right to debate, they will not have our co-operation in putting their programme through this House. I make it clear that the Opposition has not come here to do its job after five months without the Parliament's sitting on the basis that the Government will put through its legislative programme without debate. We will not accept the imposition of artificial constraints on debate. At the same time I must emphasise again that we will not be unco-operative in dealing with the business of the House.

As is well known, it has been the long-standing practice of all political parties in this Parliament to conduct their party meetings at 2.00 p.m. preceding the sitting of the House at 4.30 p.m. on Tuesdays. To change that practice will cause inconvenience to many members, particularly country members. I know the Government does not have all that many country members—

Mr Parker: We represent more country areas than you do.

Mr HASSELL: The Opposition is concerned about the provision of reasonable convenience to members. Obligations upon members of Parliament are increasing, not diminishing. There are party committees and Government committees, and it is proposed by this Government that there be a substantial increase in the number of parliamentary committees. The time needed to under-

take this committee work is considerable. In practical terms the work often needs to be carried out during business hours, especially when witnesses and others are involved. That work cannot be done when the House is sitting. Members are obliged also to attend to electorate work. In particular, country members rely on Mondays and Fridays to do that work. Usually they travel to Perth on Tuesday mornings and return to their homes on Thursday evenings. In many cases they work right through weekends to facilitate the needs of their electorates.

Party meetings are an essential part of the parliamentary process, and the proposed changes in sitting times will inevitably require party meetings to take place on Tuesday mornings. Country members will be required to travel to Perth on Mondays, thus inconveniencing them and reducing the time they have available to work in their electorates. Our objection to the proposed change to the dinner suspension is substantially related to habit. In particular, it has been the practice of many members to watch the ABC television news broadcast between 7.00 and 7.30 p.m., and if the Parliament resumes at 7.15 p.m. that viewing will not be possible. It is not a great point, but I have put it simply because it represents the inconvenience to which I have referred.

I understand that you, Mr Speaker, propose that the House should suspend sittings on a Thursday at 1.00 p.m. instead of the customary 12.45 p.m. Although that proposal is not part of the motion before us, the change would be a matter of preference to which our members are opposed.

The real issue, as raised by the Leader of the House, is the Government's use of its numbers, which it undoubtedly will use, to impose on this House a system to control the business of this House, a system which is not necessary in this Parliament and which was not applied by our coalition in all the years we were in Government. This system will be resisted strenuously by the Opposition. If this is the attitude to be taken by this Government to the business of this House, as was indicated by the Leader of the House and his colleague behind him, the member for Kalgoorlie, it will be on the Government's head, because we will not go along with it.

Amendments to Motion

Directing my remarks strictly to the motion, I indicate that we are not in accord with the proposals, and I move an amendment—

Line 4—Insert after the word "Tuesdays" the passage "at 4.30 p.m."

If that amendment is accepted, I will move the following further amendments—

Line 6—Delete the passage “6.00 p.m.” and substitute the passage “6.15 p.m.”,

Line 7—Delete the passage “7.15 p.m.” and substitute the passage “7.30 p.m.”

The intent of the amendment is that the motion to be adopted by the House would be as follows—

That for the balance of the present Session the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays at 4.30 p.m. and Wednesdays at 2.15 p.m. and on Thursdays at 10.45 a.m. and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

In conclusion, I ask the Leader of the House whether in terms of the motion he moved to which I have moved an amendment, he seeks to change the Thursday time of adjournment from 4.30 p.m.

Mr Tonkin: We have not made a firm determination on that, but we had thought it would be 6.00 p.m. I am happy to discuss that with you.

MR OLD (Katanning-Roe) [2.46 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment. The pertinent matters have been well covered by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. We are not here to fight about who has the greatest number of country members. It is quite a debatable point. As far as members who live a fair way from the city are concerned, it could be said without fear of contradiction that we on this side of the House would have the greatest number, and we would be the most disadvantaged in the event of the House sitting on Tuesdays at 2.15 p.m. It has been traditional for party meetings to be held on Tuesday afternoons, and I have no doubt that if the force of numbers on the other side defeats this amendment and accepts the motion, we will still be able to have our party meetings, but that will not be without considerable inconvenience to many country members. I recall that during our period in Government on the very few occasions we applied the guillotine there were squeals from the other side of the House to the effect that we had completely upset the proper running of the Parliament.

Mr Clarko: The cutting of the pig's throat.

MR OLD: That is correct. Those occasions were indeed rare. The guillotine was applied only as a matter of last resort. As for legislation by exhaustion, that was a matter of choice by the then Opposition. If members of the then Opposition wished to sit here all night, we did not intend to argue with them—it was their privilege. However, I am very much opposed to the House's sitting at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesdays. We should continue to sit

as we have done at 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday after our party meetings, 2.15 p.m. on Wednesday, and 10.45 a.m. on Thursday. It is essential that we meet early on Thursdays to ensure we rise by 4.30 p.m. It became an accepted practice during the last session after consultation with the then Opposition. It was an amicable arrangement, which allowed country members to get back to their electorates on Thursdays if they so desired; and importantly it allowed many country members with electorates in the short to medium range distance from Perth to attend functions in their electorates on a Thursday evening.

It is just as important for a country member to be able to attend to not only the business side of his electorate, but also the social side of his electorate, and I do not believe they should be disadvantaged in comparison with their city cousins.

I ask the House to support this amendment because I believe we will be able to get through the business of the House. I am quite flexible as far as hours go, but I am convinced that the hours programmed by the Leader of the House will be totally unacceptable to the majority of country members.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [2.51 p.m.]: I also want to support the amendment. We have been asked to adopt a number of changes embodied in motions before the House and our amendment seeks to return to the previous more reasonable arrangement for sitting hours, one that has been negotiated in recent times between both sides of the House.

I was annoyed to hear the Leader of the House say this was only one of a package of measures. He has already introduced substantial changes that he wants to see incorporated in the laws of this State and now he is bringing forward a number of changes in the operations of the House. This motion illustrates some of them. Obviously more are yet to come. We are not opposed to these sorts of changes, but the changes that have been adopted in recent years—they have been substantial—have always been agreed upon by all members of the House. When the present Leader of the Opposition was arranging the affairs of the House, he had a great deal of success in being able to obtain the co-operation of the then Opposition in dealing with changes that would be of benefit to members.

Now we see the Government coming here this time trying to impose its will on members by arbitrarily changing the sitting hours without going into the proper forms of consideration of these matters and giving members on both sides of the House an opportunity to negotiate. For that

reason the motion should be amended in the manner sought by us.

It is understandable that the Leader of the House will try to make changes and, as I indicated earlier, we are not opposed to those changes and are prepared to talk about them; he knows that the proper form for proceeding in this way is to obtain agreement between the parties before coming to the Parliament and trying to make changes, but he will press ahead because that is his way.

He indicated earlier that he was trying to be rational. Those of us who can remember him in Opposition will recall that he was very far from being a rational member of this House; in fact, he was the most irrational member.

Mr Blaikie: He had the worst record of any member.

Mr LAURANCE: I understand he will come forward with a number of issues and will try to ram them through this Parliament because he is full of missionary zeal for the changes—both parliamentary and electoral—he wants to make. Many of his colleagues are moving along with him. He has missionary zeal which may be one of his strengths, but for the Government it will be one of its greatest weaknesses because despite the blackmail that the Premier came here with last night in his statement to the Parliament, saying that we had better co-operate or else—it was put in very clear terms—at least he tried to be subtle about it. However, he was as subtle as a sledgehammer in saying that if we do not, and if we bring the contempt of the people of Western Australia on us by not agreeing to everything he wants and by not acknowledging the mandate that he claims he has from the people, the Government will give the electors the opportunity to express their view on such issues.

I am pleased that this matter is in writing because while it is a subtle form of blackmail, it is one which we will be able to fight against because time and time again when he tries to put his proposals into practice in those areas, he will be asked to take them to the people.

Mr Gordon Hill: Are you saying you will reject things time and time again?

Mr LAURANCE: No, I am not saying that. The Premier says the Government has this "magnificent" mandate to change the hours and operation of Parliament, and we must go along with him "or else" we will be taken immediately to the people. We will take the Government up on that challenge, do not worry about it. This Minister with the missionary zeal wants radical changes in this State and he will pursue this to the nth de-

gree, without caring what the people of this State want. The Minister reads into the vote at the recent State election a mandate for the changes; in fact, the Premier says that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is the first of three amendments by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and will add after the word "Tuesday" the passage "at 4.30 p.m."

Mr LAURANCE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your guidance and direction in that regard. I have been merely pointing out that this is only one of a package of measures. In fact, the Minister when introducing the motion indicated that—to use his words—this is one of a "package of measures".

Mr Tonkin: Relating to the management of this House.

Mr LAURANCE: At the commencement of my remarks I was responding to the Minister's comment that this was the first of a package of measures. Mr Speaker, I seek your indulgence to expand that point for a moment before returning to the point that this motion is only one of the changes the Minister has foreshadowed. In his speech last night the Premier indicated that the public had demonstrated fairly unmistakably that they wanted a Labor Government that would implement its programmes.

Mr Gordon Hill: Hear, hear!

Mr LAURANCE: That is stretching the point of this mandate far too wide. It does not for instance provide the right to the Leader of the House to come along, without proper consultations, and try to change the hours of Parliament, a matter which concerns every member of the Government and Opposition. It should be done with the consensus of members, I am sure everyone will agree.

Mr MacKinnon: Perhaps we should have a summit.

Mr Blaikie: Consultation and co-operation!

Mr LAURANCE: We will not make much more progress when the Government has made the admission that the parliamentary and electoral changes that we have been told about this afternoon are as a result of the public almost begging for the Government to go ahead and do this because of the mandate referred to earlier. I warn the Government that this mandate was for two things: To keep fees and charges down in this State, and to increase employment. In regard to both those matters the Government has already failed the people of Western Australia. If it ever had a mandate, it has lost it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have given the member for Gascoyne a fair rein. As I pointed out, the question before the Chair is the first part of the amendment dealing with the Tuesday sitting time being 4.30 p.m. or 2.15 p.m.

Mr LAURANCE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your guidance and wisdom. I made the point I wanted to make and I will now move on to the main point of the amendment before us. If the Government pursues this and other changes, it will do so at its own peril. That was the point I really wanted to make.

To members who travel great distances to attend this Parliament—there are several of us here who live in remote parts of the State—the sitting hours mean a great deal. Country members have a tremendous requirement on them to follow up electoral and constituent matters while they are in Perth and the times at which they can travel backwards and forwards between their electorates and Parliament are very closely prescribed, particularly in the north of the State, by airline schedules. Consequently it is possible for northern members to arrive only on a Monday evening and this affects what they can do on a Tuesday. If they have the morning free, they can hold meetings and so on and can follow up matters on behalf of their constituents. The timing of sessions is very important to country members, as the member for Katanning-Roe has already pointed out. I just wanted to make that point on behalf of members who come from the far reaches of the State. They also must take into account their electorate commitments, committee work and meetings. If we change the sitting hours it will affect members' effectiveness, or to some degree will have an effect on what sort of operation they can run and the services they can give to their electorates. It is possible that the hours could be changed, but the Government is not being fair because these matters should be discussed between the parties.

In regard to Thursdays, country members in some ways go the other way; they will be advantaged by sitting early on Thursday mornings, but part of the arrangement was that we should rise at 4.30 p.m. Country members could either drive home or catch a plane late in the afternoon. Members such as the member for Greenough could catch a late afternoon flight.

Mr Parker: We never had a sessional order to have the House rise at 4.30 p.m. It was done by agreement.

Mr Old: We have not given that undertaking.

Mr LAURANCE: It could be changed by agreement and I believe proper consultation has not taken place.

Country members lost out on the Thursday morning because they could not meet with departmental officers on behalf of their electors. Also, because the sitting could go through until 6 o'clock on a Thursday, country members could not drive to their electorates for a meeting or function that evening. In some cases members, like myself, could not catch a late afternoon flight on a Thursday and had to wait until Friday morning. The situation will not change so much for me, but this amendment seeks a return to the hours which were agreed upon by both parties recently. Those times should apply until another agreement has been reached between both sides of the House.

Mr Davies: You are conservative!

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [3.03 p.m.]: I assure the member that we have consulted with the Opposition to a much greater extent than it consulted with us on the question of electoral law. Not once did members opposite come to us and say, "What about this? Is it a fair electoral law?" When they were the Government, they consulted with us on the subject of sitting hours, which hardly could be called the great stuff of which Parliament is made. However, on a matter of basic fundamental laws, never once did the now Opposition, or Sir Charles Court, or any other Premier, come to us and say, "Let us work together to see what is a fair thing".

I have consulted with the Opposition. It is just unfortunate we cannot agree. When I moved the motion, I forgot to mention that we have introduced a series of weeks in which no sittings will occur and we have done this deliberately—to aid country members.

Mr Blaikie: It is done to protect your own Ministers. Be honest for once.

Mr TONKIN: This move will be of great advantage to country members. The change is far more important than two and one-quarter hours extra on a Tuesday because a country member will be able to be in his electorate for the whole of the weeks the Parliament is in recess.

We have bent over backwards to help. I do not believe members will have to return to Perth on a Monday. Our party meetings are set down for 11.00 a.m. on a Tuesday. We are familiar with the situation of country members and their particular problems. I do not think their problems are helped by our sitting all night, and if we can move to a proper time of the day, when most people work, that would be to the advantage of all members of this House. I ask the House to reject the amendment.

MR THOMPSON (Kalamunda) [3.04 p.m.]: I appeal to the Leader of the House to withdraw this motion which we are attempting to amend because I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to the ramifications of a change to the hours of sitting. It is not so very long ago that Parliament met at 4.30 p.m. on a Tuesday and Wednesday and 2.15 p.m. on a Thursday. After consultation between members of the Government and members of the Opposition—without involving the Speaker or the Clerks of the House—a decision was made to amend the hours so that Parliament would meet at 4.30 p.m. on a Tuesday, at 2.15 p.m. on a Wednesday, and at 10.45 a.m. on a Thursday.

That change to the sitting hours made a dramatic impact on a number of the facilities of this House; it compressed the amount of time available for committees to meet. As the Speaker, I used to Chair three such committees: the Library Committee, the Joint House Committee, and the Printing Committee. As a result of the change of hours, I could not obtain a time when it was convenient for members of those committees to meet.

Mr Davies: Now you have every third week.

Mr THOMPSON: The reason, as stated by the Leader of the House, for the implementation of a recess every third week is to enable country members a little more time in their electorates.

I do not want to make a barney out of this matter, but I wish to appeal to the reasonableness of the Leader of the House and point out to him that a number of problems will be created by the change of sitting hours which will have a dramatic impact on the working of this place.

After the change of sitting hours last time, as Speaker I had to invite members to dinner if I wished to hold a meeting of the Printing Committee, the Library Committee, or the Joint House Committee.

Mr Davies: Who paid?

Mr Brian Burke: To get a meeting of the Library Committee, you didn't ask us to dinner; you sacked the Librarian. You know all about that one.

Mr THOMPSON: I am sure all the ramifications of this change have not been considered, but I ask the Leader of the House, "What consultation has there been?" I know he has had consultation with my deputy leader.

Mr Tonkin: And the leader.

Mr THOMPSON: What consultation has the leader of the House had with the Speaker and the Clerks of the House? None. That situation oc-

curred last time: No-one consulted the Speaker, the Clerks, or the officers of the House and as a result it was impossible to obtain meeting rooms in this place for committees.

The Government says the aim of this motion is to streamline the operations of Parliament. I believe this move would be unworkable and I suggest to the Premier and his very reasonable-thinking Leader of the House that they should withdraw the motion and have a chat with the Speaker, the Clerks, and other people who are responsible for providing services in this place. Discussions with the Chief Hansard Reporter will be necessary also because we do not know what pressure will be placed on *Hansard* as a result of this change.

Mr Davies: I am sure they will be pleased with the 11 o'clock cutoff.

Mr THOMPSON: It appears the Government intends to introduce a readily available guillotine. A time-honoured system has been used to amend our Standing Orders and it is the only practical, logical, and fair way to amend Standing Orders; that is, through the Standing Orders Committee—which this Government elected as one of its first actions in office.

A Standing Orders Committee considers any proposal put forward by the Government or Opposition because by that means the considered opinion of the Speaker, his Clerks, and others is obtained and then a recommendation of the Standing Committee is given to the Parliament, with the knowledge available through that process.

If the Government simply introduces a motion to amend the Standing Orders, I believe it will be totally unworkable and unacceptable.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [3.09 p.m.]: As one who has been in favour of amending the sitting times of Parliament since I have been a member and as one who has been associated with the only breakthrough in a change of commencement times, to an early start on a Wednesday and Thursday, I say it is time we gave proper thought to this matter. The basic reason given for the proposed amendment is that the change in sitting hours would interfere with party meetings. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition were really in earnest about this, perhaps he would have suggested that we leave the commencement hour at 4.30 p.m. on Tuesdays and make the commencement of Wednesday's sittings at 10.45 a.m. This would allow for extra sitting time. However, the member did not make that proposal, but instead suggested something which will not alter the sitting hours.

The hours proposed by the member are useless. If a member wishes to watch television, he can watch it in the bar and he surely will not be missed from the House.

The remainder of the member's speech dealt with extraneous matters including the introduction of the guillotine which, no doubt, will be the subject of a torrid debate in this House when such a motion is introduced.

I agree with the member for Kalamunda's statement that the last committee made decisions without consulting those people who would be affected by the various changes. I see no reason that the proposed motion will interfere with members or the parliamentary staff. The proposal that did interfere with those persons concerned was the introduction of Thursday morning sittings. After a late Wednesday night sitting it was almost impossible for the staff to handle the situation on Thursday mornings.

Mr Speaker, you will recall that on one occasion we had to adjourn at the commencement of our Thursday morning sitting because the *Hansard* staff had been working all night in another place and it was physically impossible for them to handle the situation. On previous occasions when there has been a staff problem, we have overcome it by employing more staff. Surely, a staff problem should not stop us from adopting sitting hours in this Parliament.

Some of the sitting hours in the past have been anything but sane, as the mover of the motion indicated earlier. The motion before the House will be an improvement.

I must agree that, if it had not been for the now Leader of the Opposition, the sitting hours would not have been improved. Before he was elected to the committee and when the former Deputy Premier (Sir Desmond O'Neil) was sitting on the committee, we were not getting anywhere. We had many meetings and made many suggestions, but did not get anywhere at all. Finally, we made a breakthrough despite the fact that we made the mistake of not consulting those people involved with the alterations to the sitting times. Nevertheless, we changed the *pro forma* which has been in existence since Adam was a boy. It was important that we changed the commencement times to suit requirements different from those that caused the hours to be set at the turn of the century.

Mr O'Connor: What we did between us improved the situation tremendously.

Mr JAMIESON: It helped a great deal and there is no reason for our not considering further improvements. Should there be a problem with our meeting early on Tuesdays, perhaps members

of the Government and the Opposition might discuss the situation and decide to meet earlier on Wednesdays. As a matter of fact I did suggest that Parliament meet at 9.30 a.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, but that was ruled out because of the problems of *Hansard*, and the Government Printing Office which provides the necessary papers required by the Parliament in order that it can function properly.

Mr Clarko: Would you not agree that the way we previously rearranged the sitting hours, by a committee which included you, my leader, me, and the present Cabinet Secretary, was a better way to make any new arrangements about sitting hours rather than by bringing forward a motion like this.

Mr JAMIESON: The member indicated that there had been some consultation, but I was not privy to it. The changes we are seeking are not heinous and we need not war over them. If alterations are necessary to departments within the Parliament in order to achieve what is proposed in the motion, these should be made. We should not unnecessarily balk at shadows—we should overcome them.

The motion is far more sound than the proposed amendment. No reason has been given for the proposed amendment except in the area of party meetings and I am sure that can be overcome.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [3.16 p.m.]: The amendment proposed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in relation to sessional hours is what has been practised by this House in the last two sessions and we in the National Party have found them far more suitable than the times that operated in the past. As far as the amendment is concerned—I can only repeat what I have already said to the Leader of the House—we find that the sessional times which apply at the moment are to our liking, but we would not raise any great objection to the motion before the House, particularly on the basis that it would provide earlier nights. Unfortunately, the motion that was moved and the subsequent amendment, do not give any indication of the time that the House will rise each night. It does give us an extra 2¼ hours' sitting time on Tuesday afternoons.

In the two years in which the current sessional times have been practised, we have had about a dozen occasions on which the sittings went over midnight. Current hours have given me and my colleague, the member for Stirling, the opportunity to travel to Perth on Tuesday mornings to deal with electoral business. The time of rising on Thursdays, while it was not covered in any mo-

tion, did give us the opportunity to return to our electorates the same evening.

For that reason we are quite satisfied with the sessional times and we prefer to retain them rather than to opt for an extra 2½ hours' sitting time on Tuesday afternoons. This is something we should not argue about forever. However, I indicate to the Leader of the House that we support the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment put and negated.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR COWAN (Merredin) [3.19 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, in other speeches that have been made in dealing with this motion, you have allowed members to speak not only to the motion, but also to some of the consequences which might arise from it. Those, of course, include the matter of the guillotine.

In my experience in this place there have been two motions for the guillotine. One of them related to the fuel and energy Bill. My colleague will deal with that and some of the comments that have been made by members on the other side of the House in relation to the guillotine motion and he will reflect our sentiments. The other was the Electoral Districts Amendment Bill which related specifically to the Kimberley by-election. The guillotine motion was passed, but it was never really applied because the debate ended something like 10 minutes before the time limit set for the guillotine motion to take effect. Perhaps, Mr Speaker, you will allow me to take this matter of a guillotine motion further. I am aware you are giving me a great deal of licence, but everyone has referred to it so I think you have no option in terms of fairness. What worries me more than anything else is that the Leader of the House must be aware that any discussions he has on times of debate will mostly be with the Opposition. We expect him to consult us and we expect to be given or allotted some time in which to express our point of view. The Leader of the House will be aware that our point of view does not always coincide with that of his own party or of the coalition parties. We would expect to be granted, whenever we request it, an opportunity to put our case in relation to whatever subject is to be debated on the basis of a guillotine motion or time limit. That is quite important. There is no question of a precedent being created by the introduction of the guillotine.

It has been available and has been used rarely. But if the Government is going to make it a practice, and quite a common practice, it is most im-

portant that, when we arrive at the time for the Bill to be passed through all stages, parties such as ours and individual members are considered when the Leader of the House consults the Leader of the Opposition, his deputy, or the Whip and says, "That party can have X number of hours." If a member is not allotted time within his political party's allocation, surely this Parliament will not be performing one of the tasks for which it is elected. Individuals must be given an opportunity to speak on a subject in which they are quite interested if they state their desire to do so.

The Leader of the House would have to bear that in mind. We oppose the motion before the Chair.

MR RUSHTON (Dale) [3.21 p.m.]: I want to make one or two points—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There may be some confusion, but there are still two amendments which have been foreshadowed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Does the member for Dale wish to speak on those amendments?

Mr RUSHTON: I want to speak to the motion.

Amendments to Motion

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.22 p.m.]: It is not the desire of the Opposition to delay the House unnecessarily or to divide the House unnecessarily, but I want to formally move the balance of the amendments of which notice was given. I move an amendment—

Line 6—Delete the passage "6.00 p.m." and substitute the passage "6.15 p.m."

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Leader of the House) [3.23 p.m.]: We reject this amendment because obviously we would not have moved a motion if we did not believe in it. I say to the Leader of the National Party that we would not envisage naming each member who was to speak during a guillotine motion.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The House could get seriously delayed here. There is another matter to be dealt with and the Minister already has spoken to the motion. I shall put the question.

Amendment put and negated.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move an amendment—

Line 7—Delete the passage "7.15 p.m." and substitute the passage "7.30 p.m."

Amendment put and negated.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [3.26 p.m.]: I want to indicate my opposition to the changed sitting times and the suggestion implicit with them that in future we will be subject to the guillotine. I

endorse the remarks made by the member for Merredin. Under a guillotine motion, parties such as ours quite frequently can be denied an opportunity to speak unless you, Mr Speaker, are very astute in giving the call. With the limited amount of time available and with members wanting to speak, there might be a filibuster and the first speaker for the Opposition, having unlimited time, could take up all the time available. Members of small parties will not have the opportunity to put their point of view. The Government would be denying freedom of speech.

It is as well we have *Hansard* to take down our remarks so that they are there forever more to be held against us. I want to refer the Leader of the House to *Hansard* No. 2 of 1974, on Thursday, 12 September. In speaking against a guillotine motion during the Fuel, Energy and Power Resources Amendment Bill, Mr A. R. Tonkin had this to say—I will give one or two quotes to indicate how times or circumstances have changed. On page 1459, Mr Tonkin said—

We have before the House a guillotine motion which will deny us the right properly to debate a Bill of a serious nature which will give to the Government powers in an emergency.

Further on he said—

There is a great deal of accumulated wisdom and hundreds of years of experience on both sides in this Chamber; but the Government by this motion intends to prevent us from drawing on that wisdom and experience and debating at length this Bill of great gravity.

Mr Tonkin goes on to talk about democracy as follows—

I believe in parliamentary democracy. Members of this House are the people assembled. We do not accurately reflect the wishes of the people in some of the Statutes but—

Mr Tonkin: Underline that bit!

Mr STEPHENS: I am being fair; I am quoting it all. It goes on—

—nevertheless, as far as is possible in Western Australia, we are the people assembled and we come here to discharge our duties. Yet we find that a Government, anxious to push through a measure, will not allow us the opportunity for full and proper debate.

On page 1460, Mr Tonkin continues as follows—

If democracy is to flourish—and it is not flourishing in Western Australia at the mo-

ment, and certainly it did not flourish in this place this afternoon—it is essential that we allow and encourage people to take part in public debate. If we steamroll legislation through this place with a guillotine motion we do not allow the people to gather their wits about them, to discuss the matter with their neighbours, to write to their members of Parliament, and to call meetings in order to discuss a Bill which, in this case, has very grave parallels in history.

This is another example of the Executive riding roughshod over the Parliament. Members of Parliament have become rubber stamps.

I agree wholeheartedly with those sentiments and for that reason I believe the sessional hours should stay as they are and that any suggestion of a guillotine should be treated very cautiously. In the 12 years I have been in this Chamber, the guillotine has been applied on two occasions. On one of those occasions opposition was expressed by the Leader of the House who is now talking about bringing in a guillotine, not as a special measure or for special occasions, but to apply virtually to all legislation going through this House. If anything will kill parliamentary democracy, it will be the proposal put forward by the Government.

I ask the Government to reconsider the matter. Let us sit for longer hours; we are paid for 365 days a year and we should be prepared to sit longer hours. No-one should curb the right to free speech in the House. I would go along with the suggestion to reduce each speaker's time from 45 minutes to 30 minutes—that is perhaps a reasonable suggestion. If one cannot get one's point over in 30 minutes, one will not succeed in 45 minutes. However, do not let us use the guillotine. I oppose the motion.

MR RUSHTON (Dale) [3.30 p.m.]: I would like to make a few comments to this motion. Firstly, it appears that the Government wishes to condition Opposition members to take it easy. That is not the Opposition's intention. The Leader of the House made the point that the Government would like to control the performance of the Opposition. Of course that is not on. We might as well shut down Parliament and not come here if that were to happen. That would mean we were in a state of revolution.

I will not reiterate the points made already. We are firmly of the belief that if the Premier were to take the stance that he would negotiate times on the different measures passing through here, the House would get through a great deal more work than if the guillotine were used. This motion will

be a test of the Premier's sincerity—yesterday we heard him talk about consultation and co-operation.

There does not appear to be much wrong with the motion as it stands—the problem lies in the implications it contains. In his letter to the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the House said that the aim is to reduce the amount of time members need to spend in the House. Just who is the Leader of the House fooling? It is Government members who wish to sit shorter hours. In fact, Government members have not yet learned their lesson—there are so few of them in their seats at the moment that one would think they were in Opposition still. When in Opposition, Government members were out in the electorate rather than present in the House. They must realise that it is up to them to keep the House—it is not up to us.

I would now like to refer to the proposed programme of sitting weeks. We are told that the idea of the non-sitting weeks is to give respite to members—it is really an inducement to stay away from Parliament. Basically the Government would rather not be in Parliament—Government members would rather get on with their business. However, they must pay more respect to Parliament and give us the opportunity to test them out as we should do.

The next point is the proposed adjournment time of 11.00 p.m. The inducement here is that members can go home to bed. Opposition members are not so worried about this point because the Parliament is our main performing forum. Government members have the advantage of being in Government, but Parliament is the focal point from which Opposition members can work.

It would be a far more acceptable situation if the sitting times were negotiated rather than our having them forced upon us. In *The West Australian* this morning the point was made by the Leader of the House that in relation to the legislation which proposes to cut the salary of Public Service officers, there should be no more than six 30-minute speeches to the second reading debate. This is a vital issue and not one on which the debate should be limited to such an extent.

The member for Stirling put forward a valid point of view, particularly when he referred to the comments of the Leader of the House when his party was in Opposition. The Leader of the House is being quite hypocritical. It was the Government, when in Opposition, which introduced the system of a shadow Ministry. The major focus was on the Leader of the Opposition, and other members of the Opposition made very little con-

tribution to the debates. As well as the then Leader of the Opposition, there were perhaps two or three other Opposition speakers, but most of the time Opposition members were out of the Chamber. This is the way in which the Government would like us to continue. However, we believe that we must protect a member's right to speak on any issue. This is the one bastion of democracy that is left to us, and we need to protect it. With the present structuring of the Burke Government, with the KGB-type infiltration of the Public Service by its own party-political people—

THE SPEAKER: Order! I know that the Leader of the House talked about the use of the guillotine and some other matters in respect of this motion, so I allowed some licence to members who have spoken to the motion. However, I suggest that the member for Dale should return to the motion and that he should not carry on in that particular vein.

MR RUSHTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was just mentioning the intention of the Leader of the House and the way in which it was expressed in the media and in correspondence to the Opposition. Now is the time to raise an objection; it is too late once a motion of this type is passed. Once we have the use of the guillotine, the House will be controlled in an autocratic way. While speaking to the motion, I just mentioned that the Australian Labor Party is infiltrating the Public Service with its party-political supporters.

I would like to make the point that there is no member of this House I would like less to have control of the House than the Leader of the House. If one gives him an inch, he takes a mile. I would not like him to have the authority to tell us what we should be doing.

I conclude by saying that obviously we have an opportunity for the Premier to demonstrate the sincerity he expressed when he said that he is here to co-operate. He made a great point about that last night and now he has an opportunity to demonstrate his sincerity to the Parliament and to the people of Western Australia.

Mr Gordon Hill: What about your co-operating, too?

Question put and passed.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 26 July.

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Leader of the Opposition) [3.38 p.m.]: Although this legislation has been discussed for some weeks now, the Bill

was presented to us only last night. There has been very little time for anyone to peruse it properly and to approach interested people to obtain their comments.

The Government has indicated that it wants this legislation to pass all stages by tomorrow night. I can understand some of the Government's reasons for this desire, but I hope it will not be a pattern for the future. If the Government uses its numbers to push through such legislation as this without giving us proper time to consider it and proper time to debate it, it will be a sorry day for this Parliament.

We agree with a number of aspects of the Bill; and I will comment on some of those as we go along. The Bill has caused a great deal of concern to many people in the community. Yesterday I received a petition from 32 000 people on this issue—I received another petition today from 5 000 people, on another issue—indicating that many people think the Government does not have a mandate to take action on it. Apart from the petition signed by 32 000 people, I have received about 1 500 letters from people who have also expressed concern about the substantial increase in the tobacco tax proposed in this Bill, and the effect it will have on them.

I received a telephone call from a woman who is an invalid in bed, and has been so for about three years. She cannot leave her room. All that she enjoys is watching television and having a cigarette. Her husband is a pensioner, and she indicated that he said whatever happened she would still have her cigarettes. I doubt whether the Premier would enjoy imposing that burden on a person in a position such as that. It may be that some people are in a worse position than the one I have mentioned.

We are seeing tremendous opposition from the community about this Bill. I have grave doubts, particularly about the amount involved. Frankly, this is an area in which the Government has failed dismally in recent times. It just does not understand finances. It varies its figures from day to day, indicating clearly that it does not know what it is doing.

Mr Bertram: Rubbish!

Mr O'CONNOR: I have the information to qualify this.

Mr Bertram: I hope you produce it.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Mt. Hawthorn might like to tell me how much this tax will bring in.

Mr Brian Burke: That is the whole problem. You do not seem to understand that no-one can

accurately estimate the decrease in consumption resulting from this change.

Mr O'CONNOR: I agree with that point; but when the Government is 50 per cent or 100 per cent out, it could not refer to that as accuracy, could it? Some of the estimates of the decrease in consumption have been as high as 25 per cent. That means that the Government's estimate is way off beam.

Mr Brian Burke: What do you think it would be?

Mr O'CONNOR: The assessments have shown it will be about 10 per cent.

Mr Brian Burke: Whose assessments?

Mr O'CONNOR: I have documents to which I will refer later. The maximum decrease would be about 10 per cent.

Mr Brian Burke: I have never heard that quoted by anyone except you today.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have received telephone calls from a number of people who are concerned about this. They have asked us, as the Opposition, to oppose this legislation strongly.

One wonders how much the Government will receive from this measure. The various figures that have been quoted by the Government for the additional taxation to be achieved by increasing the figure from 12.5 per cent to 35 per cent range from the Government's initial estimate of \$15 million, through \$16 million and \$19 million, to \$21 million, and then back to \$15 million.

When the Government varies its figures from \$15 million to \$21 million, that indicates a substantial difference. One would have thought the estimate taken out initially would be reasonably accurate.

When the Bill was introduced, the Premier said that up to \$3 million of the extra \$15 million may be spent on a massive education programme. He indicated clearly that the additional income would be \$15 million. However, on 1 July 1983, the following comment appeared in *The West Australian*—

The Government says it will raise an extra \$16 million a year from the increased tax . . .

I accept the difference between those two figures, because it could be assessed at \$15 million, \$15.5 million, or \$16 million. I cannot see a great deal of variation with that. Then we come to 14 June, when the following appeared in the *Daily News*—

. . . told the *Daily News* today that its latest estimate was that the tax would raise about \$19 million . . .

That is a substantial difference. On that occasion, the article continued—

Mr McCarrey—

He is the Under Treasurer. I continue—

—conceded that the tax measure could return up to \$40 million to the government—compared with the \$15.5 million expected . . .

The difference there is substantial.

That is a matter which the Government should consider properly. It should obtain a closer assessment of the position. We then go on to a further article—

Mr Brian Burke: Who was the last person you quoted? Which Minister?

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr McCarrey, the Under Treasurer.

Then we come to the Deputy Premier, who had this to say—

In addition, the tax on cigarettes will raise \$21 million, the fuel franchise . . .

On that occasion, the Deputy Premier stated that the additional amount will be \$21 million. Again, a substantial variation from the figure initially given.

In *The West Australian* of Wednesday, 27 July, the Premier said—

The Government expects to raise \$32 million a year from the new tobacco-licence fee, an increase in revenue of about \$15m.

The first extract I quoted was from a couple of weeks ago; one was on 1 July; one was on 14 June; and the latest ones were in July. In one of those, the Deputy Premier indicated an increase of up to \$21 million.

The fact is that if there is no drop in smoking, the amount to be achieved by the Government would be \$46 million—not an increase of \$15 million over the \$16 500 000 last year, but an increase of almost \$30 million. That means that the increase received by the Government will be not \$15 million, not \$17 million, not \$19 million, and not \$21 million, but about \$30 million. In those circumstances, the Government should reconsider this matter. It should see if it can reduce the tax to an amount that would give it the \$15 million it indicated initially. On that basis, it would have no problem in reducing the rate of taxation from 35 per cent to 25 per cent.

One of the problems in this legislation is that it could lead to large-scale avoidance. Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution permits free trade between the States. People could avail themselves of mail orders to bring tobacco into

Western Australia in large quantities, thereby avoiding the taxation. If there is a substantial difference between the price of cigarettes in this State and in the Eastern States, obviously this sort of thing will occur.

The tax on tobacco in Western Australia will be 35 per cent if the legislation is passed. Queensland has no State taxation on tobacco. Anyone could buy a truckload of cigarettes in Queensland and bring them across the borders, thereby improving the price on those cigarettes by about 50c a packet. One can pack many cigarettes in a truck; and that would give a substantial return to the person doing that.

This sort of legislation will cause some people to try to bring truckloads of cigarettes into Western Australia and to sell them to retailers, wholesalers, or consumers at a greater rate than we have ever seen before. We will see an increase in mail order sales; and this will have the effect of benefiting some people and disadvantaging the rest.

A 35 per cent increase is substantial. It is more than it should be; and the Government should reconsider this matter.

The petition against the Government's increase indicates that, prior to any parliamentary discussion or approval, the Government's move has added 30c to the price of an average packet of cigarettes, not 25c per packet, as the Premier indicated.

Not only is the price to be increased by the Government by 25c, but also a further slice is to be taken by the retailers, as a result of which the price of a packet of cigarettes in this State will increase by approximately 30c.

A total of 32 000 people signed the petition and many others wrote to me. They pointed out that such an increase would impose additional punitive and detrimental taxes on the lower and middle income earners. They indicated also that it would result in the loss of jobs and in increases in the Consumer Price Index. It would also impinge upon people's lifestyles and introduce criminal acts of bootlegging and contradict the Government's policy of containing excessive price increases.

In connection with the first of those issues, there is no doubt that such an increase would impose a punitive effect on the middle income section of the community as well as on pensioners and the unemployed; that is, those people who can least afford to pay such an increase. Those people will be the ones most affected by such an increase and I believe they will reject this legislation more

strongly than will any other section of the community.

Turning now to the fact that the legislation will result in the loss of a number of jobs, I indicate that it is clear the legislation does not present a solution for those who work for cigarette companies or advertising agencies, because I am sure that, once this Bill is passed, the Government will seek to ban all tobacco advertising.

Based on previous public relations experience, the Government has decided not to introduce the two tobacco-related Bills at once, but rather to ensure one Bill is passed before proceeding with the other. In that way, the tobacco companies and sporting bodies involved in such measures will not bring their combined forces to bear in opposition to the Government. I do not doubt that a great deal of action will be taken by people involved in sporting bodies in relation to this matter.

I should like the Premier to give us further information on a statement he made in *The West Australian* of 30 October 1982, which reads as follows—

Labor will provide money for sporting and cultural organisations that cannot get other sponsorship if the promotion of tobacco products in WA is stopped.

Labor would provide financial help at least equivalent to that lost—either by grants or sponsorship through authorities such as the SGIO and R and I.

On 12 April 1982, the Premier is reported as saying—

Labor will consider supporting a Sports Foundation funded from taxes on an illegal casino.

Mr Brian Burke: What legislation was the quote of 30 October 1982 in connection with?

Mr O'CONNOR: That quotation refers to sporting and other cultural organisations which cannot obtain alternative sponsorship if the promotion of tobacco products in Western Australia is stopped.

Mr Brian Burke: The legislation to which that refers is different from the Bill we are debating now.

Mr O'CONNOR: I mentioned earlier that this legislation will have the effect of stopping some promotion of tobacco in Western Australia. I think the Premier would agree with that. This Bill will have that effect, because tobacco companies will receive less money than previously from this State and, therefore, will give less money to Western Australia.

Mr Brian Burke: There are many arguments which say that, when your market contracts, more money is spent.

Mr O'CONNOR: I should like the Premier to tell us—he might care to do so by way of interjection—how he proposes to fill the gap in revenue of a sporting organisation which loses the support of cigarette companies.

Mr MacKinnon: Deathly silence!

Mr O'CONNOR: The Premier is not prepared to give us the answer.

Mr Brian Burke: I will be perfectly happy to let you know the position when we discuss that piece of legislation. From the way you are carrying on, it appears you think this legislation is designed to stop the promotion of tobacco advertising. However, this is a Bill which relates to tax.

Mr O'CONNOR: I indicated earlier that, while this legislation was before us now, I had no doubt that the Government intended to introduce a ban on tobacco advertising in due course and I do not intend to comment on that.

Mr Brian Burke: I am not going to confirm your lack of doubt.

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not require this information for my own purposes; I want to obtain it for the benefit of the sporting community so that it does not have any doubt. The sporting community should know the position and should not be left up in the air until such time as the Government introduces further legislation in this regard.

It appears the Premier is not prepared to answer the question.

I turn now to the taxation aspect of the legislation. Some people may not realise that the Federal Government taxes cigarettes at the rate of 62c a packet. The additional State taxation sought will not only apply to the actual product, but also will be a tax on the Federal tax. It can be seen that a duplication of tax occurs.

It is proposed the State taxation be 35 per cent and that taxation will not be levied only on the product, but will apply also to the 62c in the dollar which is the Federal tax. Therefore, the amount of State and Federal tax on a packet of cigarettes worth originally \$1.50, will be \$1.01 and the cost of production and transport, and retailers' mark-up will be 49.9c. It can be seen where most of the money will go.

I do not like double taxation and perhaps the Premier would consider a proposition which did not involve a tax on the Federal tax. Is the Premier aware of that situation?

Mr Brian Burke: Yes. I suppose you are aware of the precedent such action would set.

Mr O'CONNOR: If the Premier accepts that he will receive a greater sum of money from this measure than initially thought, he should accept also that other ways exist by which the tax may be applied.

Mr Brian Burke: But you could apply the same argument to liquor and things like that.

Mr O'CONNOR: That may be the case, but the Government has not done so. Is the Premier suggesting he will take similar action in respect of liquor and increase liquor tax by 30 per cent?

Mr Brian Burke: No, I am not indicating that.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Premier does not intend to take the same sort of action in respect of the liquor companies as he seeks to take in regard to the tobacco companies?

Mr Brian Burke: You are suggesting not charging tax on that part of revenue which constitutes a Commonwealth tax. That is an unheard of precedent.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am saying the proposed tax is extremely high and the Government will receive more than it expected initially. Therefore, the proposed increase could be reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent and the Government would still obtain the amount it initially thought it would receive.

A Morgan poll was conducted recently.

Mr Pearce: You have been watching the Morgan polls, have you?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, and I shall continue to watch them.

Mr Pearce: Your colleagues have been watching them as well.

Mr O'CONNOR: Members opposite should continue to watch the polls. I shall quote from a document titled "Roy Morgan Research Centre Survey on WA State Politics and Attitude to New Tax on Cigarettes, conducted June 18/19". The survey is taken from a random sample of 581 men and women aged 18 and over from telephone-owning households in Perth. I shall read three or four of the questions. If anyone wants a copy of the document, I shall be happy to supply it. One of the questions reads as follows—

Do you think the Government should or should not use taxes to change people's smoking habits?

The response was—

	per cent
Should	31
Should not	61
Undecided	5.2

If the Government claims it has a mandate on that matter, perhaps it should conduct a poll of its own in relation to it, because it appears from the responses to that question that, in fact, the Government does not have such a mandate.

A further question reads—

Do you agree or disagree that the cigarette tax increase will increase the CPI?

The answers were—

	per cent
Agree	52
Do not agree	33

Another question reads—

Will an increase in the CPI increase wage demands by the unions?

The result of that question was—

	per cent
Agree	57.8
Disagree	27.4

A further question reads—

Will the proposed cigarette tax increase unfairly penalise pensioners, low income earners, and the unemployed?

The result of that question was—

	per cent
Agree that it will	62.8
Disagree	30.8

Another question was—

Will the increased cigarette tax lead to illegal importing of cigarettes?

The responses read as follows—

	per cent
Agree	62.4
Disagree	22.9

It can be seen in that area alone that the Government does not appear to have a mandate.

One thing that does worry me substantially is the loss of jobs, not only in tobacco companies, but also in the outdoor advertising companies. No doubt the Government has received letters from these people as I have. This Bill will be detrimental to one of the areas for which the Government does have a mandate in this State; that is, in the area of providing employment for our young people. The loss of sponsorship could cost this State considerably and could certainly cost the jobs of our people.

As members know, I am a non-smoker, although I do not mind people smoking. However,

I have been in offices of recent times where there has been a smoker or where one has just left, and I must say that they do make a mess with cigarette butts and ash over the floors. This does not make for a healthy office. Ash lying about is not palatable to any individual. Nevertheless, if a person smokes on his own and does not leave a mess to be faced by the rest of the community, that is not so bad.

The Government has indicated it will be legislating to provide penalties for the sale of tobacco to juveniles, and certainly I believe this is a good idea. Juveniles should be precluded from purchasing cigarettes, so there will be no opposition from us on that point.

The Treasurer mentioned also the establishment of "quit centres". Perhaps the Treasurer will be the first person to apply to enter one of these centres, with the idea of trying to set an example for the rest of the community. It will be interesting to see whether he is the first person to enter a "quit centre".

Mr Hassell: It would be a change of behaviour if he set a good example.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have mentioned the variations in the amount that the Treasurer has stated the Government will receive from the increased tobacco tax. We carried out an assessment in my office of what would be raised by the tax without any increase or decline in the smoking of cigarettes. On the basis of a similar amount being consumed, the amount would be \$46 million.

Mr I. F. Taylor: That would be way out, knowing your mathematics.

Mr O'CONNOR: If ever a Government has made a mess of mathematics, it is the member's Government, and he should know that well; he cannot point the finger at us. Members opposite should wait until the Address-in-Reply debate; they will want to leave the Chamber.

Mr Barnett: If you are speaking at the time, I will leave.

Mr O'CONNOR: It will be the same when we discuss rises in charges and changes by Treasury over the last five months. It is unbelievable that a Government could make such a hash of Treasury finances in such a short time. The way this Government has acted may be a result of the assistance it has received from the member for Kalgoorlie. Perhaps he is the one who does not understand. When we find that the Government is supplying figures which are 100 per cent or 50 per cent out, it is time the Government got someone who knows something about Treasury finances. If

the Government wants someone who knows, I am prepared to offer my assistance.

A 25 per cent increase in the tobacco tax would provide the Government with additional revenue of about \$15 million. Members opposite who laughed a little earlier should be able to work out the figures quite easily. They should know that last year the tobacco tax raised \$16.5 million.

On the basis of the increase being 35 per cent, the tax would yield about \$46 million. Does any member opposite disagree? Obviously not. Allowing for a drop-off of 10 per cent, the amount would be a bit below \$40 million. But this is much more than the Government said it would receive.

Mr Brian Burke: What about a drop-off of 25 per cent?

Mr O'CONNOR: That would give a total of \$34 million, allowing for no decline in the market.

Mr Brian Burke: That would be a tax revenue.

Mr O'CONNOR: With no decline in consumption.

Mr Brian Burke: What did the tax raise last year?

Mr O'CONNOR: The figure last year was \$16.5 million; that was the figure quoted at 12.5 per cent. With a 25 per cent tax with no decline in the market, the amount raised would be about \$34 million. With a 10 per cent decline and a 25 per cent tax, the figure would be \$30.6 million. The amount would vary, but this could be worked out according to what the Government wanted.

I would like to quote a rather strange statement by the Treasurer, bearing in mind he might assist some people who are paying out more than they can afford for cigarettes. I have a quote here from *The West Australian*, although unfortunately the date is not shown, but the Treasurer may read this later. It states, "I am worried as to how the Government will use the \$15 million it hopes the tax will raise." Fancy being worried about how the Government will use it! It goes on, "Only \$3 million will go on a planned education campaign to discourage youngsters from smoking. Presumably the other \$12 million will help the State's Budget."

Mr Brian Burke: I didn't say that; that is you. You are quoting yourself.

Mr O'CONNOR: Does this photograph look like me?

Mr Brian Burke: The picture might not be you, but I didn't say that.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will read it—

Premier Brian Burke can afford the proposed tobacco tax, but it would hurt pensioners, the poor and those on low incomes.

I will provide a copy of the article to the Premier.

Mr Brian Burke: I saw it. But you are quoting yourself.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have not quoted myself.

Mr Brian Burke: It would be very unwise to, but I think you have.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Federal excise and State tax on cigarettes, with a 12.5 per cent State tax, on a packet of cigarettes costing \$1.50, is 62c Federal tax and 41.5c State tax. Currently a packet costing \$1.50 has 66.1 per cent State and Federal taxes imposed on it.

This legislation takes away freedom of choice from the individual and it is obviously a rip-off for Consolidated Revenue. The Treasurer ought to put a lot more of this expected revenue towards health education plans. I hope he will consider doing so. If a tax is being increased because of the harm cigarette smoking does to individuals—and I would be the first to agree that it does harm—more of it, and probably one-third, should go towards health education to assist those affected by tobacco smoking. I know the Treasurer himself has trouble giving away cigarette smoking. He has attempted to do so, but has failed.

What worries me is that I have had calls from people suggesting we ought to tax and ban advertising of such things as sugar, alcohol, and cosmetics. It would be a sorry thing for this State if that occurred.

The Treasurer commented on spending for this campaign. I wonder whether he has assessed what the optimum amount would be. He has indicated he will spend \$2 million a year.

Mr Brian Burke: You are constantly doing this. We didn't say \$2 million a year, but rather we said a minimum of \$2 million a year.

Mr O'CONNOR: This morning's newspaper indicated the Government would spend \$6 million over three years.

Mr Brian Burke: A minimum of \$2 million a year.

Mr O'CONNOR: Does that mean it will be substantially more?

Mr Brian Burke: It just means a minimum of \$2 million a year.

Mr O'CONNOR: Has the Treasurer had an assessment made of the optimum amount in order to get the most benefit from the money spent?

It has been found that no advertising of certain commodities encourages people to use those commodities. One example was the prohibition of marihuana in the United States—people were encouraged to try it out.

Mr Brian Burke: Apart from the fact that marihuana is an illegal substance—there is something about that—this campaign is being put together by experts in the Health Department, and one of the reasons we have committed ourselves to a minimum of \$2 million is that we want to carefully assess the results of the campaign.

Mr O'CONNOR: I did want to ask the Premier whether the Government would monitor the effectiveness of this campaign so that the effect it may have on young people in particular, for whom we should have the most concern, could be gauged. We should try to ensure that young people do not take up the habit of smoking cigarettes.

During the Committee stage we will move an amendment in view of the fact that the proposed increase will bring in much more revenue than initially estimated. Even yesterday the Deputy Premier stated that the proposed increase will bring in \$6 million more than initially estimated. We will seek that the proposed increase of 35 per cent be only 25 per cent. The Government will still obtain the amount it requires. It does not have the stringent financial problems it has indicated it has, and the \$15 million that would be obtained from a 25 per cent increase will be adequate.

Along with our proposed amendment, we will seek assurances from the Government that a minimum of one-third of the revenue received, approximately \$5 million, will go into the areas of health and education for the people of this State. Apart from the issues I have raised, the Opposition will support the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Laurance.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SECOND DAY

Motion

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Leader of the Opposition) [4.13 p.m.]: I offer my congratulations to you, Mr Speaker, upon your appointment to your high position in this House. Judging from the way you have handled this position to this stage, I have no complaints. You have fitted in very well, and I am quite sure you will continue to be unbiased and to give all members the sorts of opportunities you have until now. I have probably known you longer than has anyone else in this House. In fact, we played football together as star ruckmen—if I remember rightly.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Who led the ruck?

Mr O'CONNOR: I think I did. We have always got on together extremely well, and I am sure that situation will continue during the next 2½ years.

I congratulate members on both sides of the House on their election to their seats. New members will find that in many ways the job is not as easy as many people believe. Even the Premier would have found today that he was concerned about some of the people he had known on a different basis. Many demands are placed upon a member of Parliament, and as time goes on many new members will find the handling of those problems easier than they do now. I am quite sure new members will enjoy their time in this House.

During the five months since the election, we on this side of the House have set out objectives, and one of our main objectives is to ensure that this Government is kept on the mark. We will endeavour to keep it frank and honest, but that will be a difficult job. From what I have witnessed so far, I believe that job will be the toughest. During the next 2½ years the Opposition will try to ensure the Government acts for all the people of this State, not just for certain sections. We will try to ensure also that this Government defends the rights of this State. We will push as strongly as we can for the maintenance of this State's rights and will support the Government fully while it endeavours to maintain those rights. I assure members on both sides of the House that the Opposition will involve itself deeply in areas where it believes State rights are being taken from us. We will pursue just as strongly the defence of individual rights against sectional interests and legislation that seeks to decrease those individual rights. In fact, it might not be too long before we have to take action in this regard.

We will ensure as far as we can the maintenance of law and order in this State. We will ensure proper laws are made so that individuals can move around in the way to which they have become accustomed in the past.

I intend to attack the Government's lack of performance in a number of areas in which it claimed it would take action. Yesterday I saw a petition signed by 32 000 people, which referred to the action this Government is taking on cigarette sales. The petition is one of the biggest I have seen since I have been a member of this House, which is an indication that many people are unhappy with the action this Government is taking.

A group of 4 000 people came to this House to voice their displeasure with this Government.

Although it has claimed mandates for certain action it has taken, it might find that those mandates will not exist very long if it continues to act in the way it has.

Mr Parker: Did you agree with their claim for a pay rise?

Mr O'CONNOR: These matters should be handled in the proper manner, not in the way this Government has handled them. In the Eastern States recently a commissioner of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission criticised a company for suggesting that its employees should accept a 10 per cent pay cut, yet here this Government has taken similar action without going to our arbitration system. This Government acted incorrectly by not going to the proper authority.

Mr Parker: The rally was about the refusal of the Government to allow their claim to go to arbitration. Do you believe their claim should go to arbitration contrary to the wages freeze legislation?

Mr O'CONNOR: This matter was handled incorrectly by this Government; it should have left the situation as it was. If it had allowed the wage freeze to continue as it was, that would have been fair enough.

Mr Brian Burke: Take those employees at Chamberlains—they didn't get the option of a 10 per cent wage cut, they were retrenched.

Mr O'CONNOR: Does the Premier suggest that any firm has the right to cut its employees' wages by 10 per cent?

Mr Brian Burke: No, but I am saying that in the Public Service you have permanency, which you don't have in private enterprise.

Mr Clarko: If your argument is true, why didn't you cut the wages by 50 per cent?

Mr O'CONNOR: At this stage I will not continue with that matter. Contrary to this Government's glowing promises, it has shown during the short period of five months it has been in office that it is the hallmark of incompetence—no doubt exists about that—that it is the trademark of deception, and that it is the benchmark of mediocrity. Members opposite cannot deny those things, and they cannot deny that we are in a State where living standards have been marked down, prices and wages have been marked up, and the State as a whole is marking time. In the short period of five months, all this has occurred.

This Government has only one claim to success, and that is its media manipulation. It has done that very well, which was illustrated clearly in

deficit deception, Treasury crisis deception, and the cover-up of increased charges.

I will deal with each of these individually. I believe that the Burke Government has scaled the heights of deception on the so-called Budget deficit and I can only reflect on well-respected statements that it has made over a period of time to indicate just where the Government stands. From the date of the election to the massive increases in charges in this State, the Government has manoeuvred to paint a picture that a grave financial crisis exists in this State, which has not been the case. One can refer to it only as the great deception. It is totally unprincipled. The Government's cover-up of massive increases is nothing short of deceitful. Its cover-up of Government extravagance is costly to the community and mainly affects the poor.

The Government has claimed that it has a mandate to do most things. I again repeat what the Minister for Housing claimed on the air on Monday when he said the Government had a mandate in connection with Aboriginal land rights. I want to see him go to the community on that issue. He would give no undertaking that the Government would not transfer 50 per cent of Western Australia to the Aborigines. I notice the Minister has not commented, but that is exactly what he said.

Mr Brian Burke: He would not give an undertaking that the Government would not transfer 99 per cent to Aborigines because he would be committed to it.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am glad to hear the Premier say that; it is quite an interesting issue. Quite frankly, I would give an undertaking now, if I were in Government and were the Premier, that I would resign before I would give 99 per cent of our land to the Aborigines.

Mr Tonkin: You are very safe!

Mr Brian Burke: Do you not understand the very mild sophistication of what I am saying? We are simply not giving a guarantee as to quantity.

Mr Hassell: I'll say you are not!

Mr O'CONNOR: I am glad the Premier has confirmed that for us because that is also a point I want to bring up fairly strongly.

Mr Clarko: We can bring it up in the next election.

Mr Hassell: That is a good issue to take up with the people.

Mr O'CONNOR: I want to deal with the deficit deception, the short-term money market, and charges during the wages freeze. I have documents that show that financially this Government

has absolutely no idea of where it is headed. It has manipulated the media in such a way that the media has not understood what it is doing in connection with the finances of this State. In fact, I wonder whether they have manipulated; quite obviously the Government does not know what it is doing.

I will go through these documents and quote briefly some of the extracts from them to show that we have a Government which does not have a clue about where it is going. When I went out of office, it stated that the deficit was \$21 million. A few weeks later it did another assessment and stated that the deficit was \$24 million. On 6 April 1983, it stated—

State Cabinet will hold preliminary talks today on measures to reduce the prospective \$30 million Budget deficit.

It is creeping up all the time in an effort to confuse the people that this State's finances are in a perilous condition. The Government is using a cover-up or a public relations operation and one that I believe should be above a Government's activities.

In *The West Australian* of 11 May it is stated—

Wide ranging charges after June.

The latest Treasury estimates put the 82-83 Budget deficit at \$32 million with a grim outlook for existing services and activities.

The Premier may like a copy of the document I am now holding. It is *The Mt Lawley Rotary News*. The Premier may recall that he spoke at one of that club's functions. The document reads as follows—

Although somewhat upset by the Premier's late schedule, which was communicated by 'phone to the Club only minutes before due to start, nevertheless, still went smoothly in spite of the back to front format. And Premier Brian Burke still ate a full lunch.

The Premier spoke at a Rotary function on Tuesday, 21 June. Because I could not believe what he said, I went back to the Rotary Club and spoke to people there to confirm what the Premier said. He said—

Cabinet are presently holding a series of meetings to bring about a precise and accurate picture of income and expenditures in order that a responsible budget be presented to the public in September for 1983/84. The Labor Government has inherited a State spending deficit of some \$175 million on gaining office.

Mr Clarko: Shame!

Mr O'CONNOR: I could hardly believe that a Premier would go to an area such as that and make such erroneous statements before a group of responsible people.

In regard to the Budget, the deficit started off at \$21 million and rose to \$24 million, \$30.4 million, \$32.3 million, \$34 million, \$175 million and last week the Premier said that the deficit was \$14.2 million.

Mr Brian Burke: Can you give me your reference for the \$34 million? You said \$32 million and then \$34 million.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will give that to the Premier. The variations in the Budget are substantial. The Government claims a \$14.2 million deficit now. If that were correct, the situation would not be too bad because \$14.2 million is approximately .05 per cent of a Budget of \$2 400 million. This is again a false statement. We only have to remember what the Premier said recently and to recall his answers to my questions last night wherein he admitted that, on the short-term money market, \$37 million remained for the Government in the year 1982/83. Obviously, he has taken approximately \$20 million or \$30 million out and has given it to various agencies. I ask the Premier to confirm that.

Mr Brian Burke: About \$20 million.

Mr O'CONNOR: So there would be about \$64 million taken from that?

Mr Brian Burke: About \$57 million, I think.

Mr O'CONNOR: So approximately \$20 million has been handed out to agencies and a further \$37 million remains from the previous financial year. This amount not only is enough to offset the \$14.2 million deficit, but also will allow the Government to carry \$23 million forward to the new 1983-84 financial year. This money could go into capital works and wherever it is needed. The Premier has admitted that the deficit stands at \$14.2 million. He has also admitted that, after handing \$20 million out to the agencies, he has \$37 million remaining from last year's Budget which he is now transferring into next year's Budget. If that is a deficit, I wonder what we can say about his previous statement.

Mr Clarko: Silence reigns!

Mr O'CONNOR: We have looked at some of the Premier's statements in connection with money on the short-term money market. Liberal Governments, including my own Government, have used this in the past to balance a Budget and transfer the balance of it to the following year. Let it not be said that we did not do this; we did.

Mr Brian Burke: Which year?

Mr O'CONNOR: Last year.

Mr Brian Burke: I am not trying to be smart, but you really do not understand this.

Mr Clarko: You should never try to be smart.

Mr Brian Burke: If I can, I will explain it to you just once.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Mr Brian Burke: In 1980-81, \$12.6 million was committed to the 1981-82 Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget. This amount was estimated as that needed to bring the 1981-82 Budget into balance.

Mr O'CONNOR: Correct.

Mr Brian Burke: Only \$4.2 million was left over. The remainder was transferred to the General Loan Fund to support the capital works programme for 1981-82. Here is the year you are talking about when you talk about taking the money and putting it into the Consolidated Revenue Fund or capital works programme. You have not got the years right when you do your calculations. In 1981-82, \$30.9 million was committed to the 1982-83 Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is correct.

Mr Brian Burke: The money was from the 1981-82 Budget.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is correct.

Mr Brian Burke: At the end of 1982-83, \$37 million is committed to the 1983-84 Budget. What you are saying is that you take it back into the 1982-83 figure.

Mr O'CONNOR: It can be done either way.

Mr Brian Burke: Of course it can be. I agree with you. What I am trying to tell you is that the year before you took the amount from last year's figure and put it into 1982-83 and now you are suggesting that we took it back at the end of 1982-83 and have used both amounts in that year.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am suggesting we use part of the money—the Treasury man does not know what he is talking about—from the 1981-82 Budget to offset the 1982-83 deficit.

On 7 July 1982, I had this to say—

He was confident that there would be no more increases in Government charges over the next 12 months.

Revenue collections included \$4.2m. from earnings on the investment of Treasury cash balances.

In the same article the then Leader of the Opposition was reported as follows—

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burke, said that in fact, the Budget had a surplus of more than \$25m.

That was in the same statement. It continues—

The surplus had been concealed by the Government's failure to declare the interest earned from investments on the short-term money market as part of its revenue, he said.

Mr Hassell: That was last year. The world has changed since then.

Mr Brian Burke: The \$25 million to which you refer came from the previous year.

Mr O'CONNOR: There is no argument about that. Please do not confuse the people in the Press Gallery. You have confused them many times as you have many other people.

I quote from *The West Australian* of 5 April as follows—

Mr Burke said yesterday that the Labor views had always been that such earnings would be used in the year in which they were earned. He thought that the earnings this year were between \$20-30 million.

They were earnings from the short term money market. I repeat that—

Mr Burke said yesterday that the Labor views have always been that such earnings would be used in the year in which they were earned.

Yet, he never put one cent into the 1982-83 Budget even though the total amount was earned in that year. He transferred \$27 million to the 1983-84 Budget to give him a boost, in order that when he balances the Budget next year he will be able to indicate that he had done a wonderful job. He has done this with the money that has been left to him.

Mr Brian Burke: We have not balanced next year's Budget yet.

Mr O'CONNOR: Is the Premier telling me that he has not transferred that money to the 1983-84 Budget?

Mr Brian Burke: I am not telling you that. I have not balanced that Budget yet.

Mr O'CONNOR: The amount of \$37 million was earned in 1982-83, but the Premier has not used it for that period and has transferred it to the 1983-84 Budget. Despite the fact that he has just contradicted what I said, what I said was that it was money earned by the Government when we were in power. The Premier will use this money in the 1983-84 Budget in an endeavour to show what a marvellous job the Treasurer has done.

Mr Brian Burke: Because you were in power it does not make it your money or our money.

Mr O'CONNOR: How much did the Government earn in the last six months we were in power?

Mr Brian Burke: I do not know.

Mr O'CONNOR: It was \$34 million and we were in power for another two months after that.

Mr Brian Burke: It is not your money or our money—Treasury invested it. I will give you the reason for our transferring that amount to the 1983-84 Budget. We would like to show the inefficiency of your Budget deficit. Why should we pick up your deficit?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: In my experience in this House, it has been more or less traditional when the Leader of the Opposition speaks to the Address-in-Reply that there be some conversation between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier. I have tolerated that until now, but I will not tolerate other members endeavouring to get into the act and I would suggest they might remain silent.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am not seeking to attract interjections. I am seeking to explain the facts for the people who do not know them. I say again that the \$14.2 million deficit for 1982-83 is phoney. A further \$37 million was earned in that year and could have been used to offset the Budget deficit. However, the balance of \$23 million has been transferred to the 1983-84 Budget. Instead, the Premier has decided to make it appear that there is a \$14.2 million deficit and he has transferred \$37 million to the next financial year in order that he can gain political advantage out of it.

I refer now to the \$14.2 million deficit. That figure is not bad because it is only about one-half of one per cent of the total Budget. One must also take into account the extravagant expenditure by the Government since it has been in office. It includes the reopening of the Perth-Fremantle railway line; the multitude of advisers and backup; and the dozens of inquiries which have run into substantial costs. These amounts were not allowed for in the Budget. Yet, the amount spent up to 30 June 1983 would be included in the \$14.2 million deficit—if it is that amount, and I do not accept that it is. I believe that we not only would have balanced the Budget, but also would have transferred \$30 million to next year's Budget.

I now mention the "jobs for the boys". These have been substantial. The inquiries, the refurbishing of the ministerial offices, and the Perth-

Fremantle railway line have involved so much expenditure.

Mr Grill: Talk about the deficit your Government ran up. It was absolutely horrendous.

Mr O'CONNOR: Let us see how the Minister will establish an electrified railway system to Bunbury.

Mr Grill: I will make up my mind as to what I will do and it will be done after proper study.

Mr O'CONNOR: I agree that the Minister will do what he wants irrespective of whether he has otherwise promised. Promises mean nothing to the Government, and the Minister is no exception.

I turn now to Government charges. Miscalculation by the Government has resulted in increased charges. The Government is like a circus—it continues with the variation in figures and with making errors. Initially I accepted them as errors, but they are constant and I can no longer accept them as such. In my opinion it is deliberate deception by the Government.

Let us look at the increase in charges for electricity, water, etc. Before I proceed with this matter, I refer members to a full-page advertisement which appeared in the newspaper prior to the election, under the following heading—

Labor will seek to freeze Government taxes and charges during the period of the wage freeze.

Mr Parker: It does not say we will go into Parliament with it and say certain things. You are misleading the House.

Mr O'CONNOR: The advertisement reads—

At 9.00 am today, in an emergency session of State Parliament, Brian Burke will stand up and fight for a fairer way to stabilise the economy without risking job security.

Mr Pearce: And we did, too.

Mr O'CONNOR: Christ, Mr Speaker, it is impossible to talk without some members opposite interjecting. The advertisement continues—

Labor will seek to freeze government taxes and charges during the period of the Wage Freeze.

- No Increases in Water Rates
- No Increases in Electricity Charges
- No Increases in 3rd Party Motor Insurance
- No Increases in Land Tax
- No Increases in Stamp Duty.

Mr Pearce: And you voted against the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: The advertisement continues—

- No Increases in Bus and Train Fares

- No Increases in Rail Freight Charges
- No Increases in Irrigation Charges
- No Increases in State Petrol Tax.

I wonder how members opposite think, knowing they have been a party to this sort of deception.

I will give another example, just in case members opposite are in any doubt as to what their Premier and Ministers said. I wish to quote from an advertisement headed, "With Labor there's a future in the north!" Frankly, with this Government, it would have to be a long way north of Australia.

Mr Parker interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Minister for Employment and Administrative Services is interjecting yet again; if there is any doubt in his mind as to just what his leader said on this matter, he should listen. The advertisement states—

Labor will reduce the cost of living in the north.

That is a laugh. It continues—

Labor will drop the price of fuel by 3c a litre . . .

Mr Parker: We dropped it by a lot more than 3c a litre.

Mr O'CONNOR: It continues—

Labor's airline policy will benefit everyone in the North.

Labor will freeze Government charges for the duration of the wages freeze and halt unjustified price rises.

Mr MacKinnon: Does that say "may" or "will"?

Mr O'CONNOR: I know many members do not believe what they are hearing, so I will read it again. It states—

Labor will freeze Government charges for the duration of the wages freeze and halt unjustified price rises.

Mr Thompson: Have they done it?

Mr O'CONNOR: Labor has done the public in!

I make those points because they coincide with a few other remarks I wish to make. As I say, initially I thought the Government had miscalculated in connection with its charges; however, I now believe it has been engaged in a deliberate deception. This becomes clear when one examines the extent of the error made in its public announcements regarding increases in rates charged by public utilities. A newspaper article on the matter states—

SHARP increases in WA Government electricity, gas, water, sewerage and hospital

charges and bus and train fares were announced yesterday . . .

The charges announced yesterday are expected to yield an extra \$60 million in 1983-84.

The Opposition continually attacks the Government in this area. As a matter of fact, when the Premier and I appeared on the television programme "Face to Face" I handed him a list which indicated that his figures were wrong and that the amount to be raised by the increased charges was in excess of \$92 million. I must admit the Premier was very truthful. He said, "I do not understand them". I do not think he understands any figures, but that is what he said. However, the next morning, on Howard Sattler's radio programme, what did the Premier say? He said, "Mr O'Connor does not understand arithmetic. My nine-year-old son Matthew—no, my seven-year-old daughter Sarah could teach him."

Mr Barnett: I heard him.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, and I will bet the member for Rockingham was disappointed when he found out that the Premier's seven-year-old daughter Sarah should be giving arithmetic lessons to her father.

The Government has been expert in media manipulation, and has been able to confuse the public as to the actual amount of money to be raised by these increases. Initially it announced that an extra \$58 million would be raised. The Opposition knew this was not the case, and I issued Press releases and contacted the Press for a week, attempting to point out the error. Indeed, I called a Press conference on the issue, but could not get people to believe the Government was so far out in its calculations. Eventually, the *Daily News*—to its credit—accepted my case.

I should like members to note the dates on which these various announcements were made. The increased charges were announced on 22 June. However, it was not until 28 June that we were able to get the Government to admit it was wrong, as the following article indicates—

THE WA Government agreed last night that increased charges it announced last week would raise more than \$100 million in 1983-84.

Only a slight variation, I would say!

Mr Laurance: Get him a new abacus.

Mr Rushton: They should have asked the Deputy Premier.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier knew the situation, and he shot through. *The West Australian* of 2 July contained the following article—

PROPOSED increases in government charges will bring the WA Government an estimated \$145 million.

Not \$58 million as was originally announced, but \$145 million.

Mr Laurance: Sarah will have to help her father with his homework.

Mr O'CONNOR: The report of the Deputy Premier's comments continues—

. . . the increase in government charges would net the State Energy Commission \$65 million, the Metropolitan Water Authority \$12.2m., country sewerage, irrigation and drainage \$6.2m., Westrail \$5.9m., the MTT \$3m., public hospital charges \$12.2m., SHC \$4.6m., and harbour and marine charges \$853 000. In addition, the tax on cigarettes will raise \$21 million. . .

Not the \$15 million which was suggested for the tobacco tax, but \$21 million.

How is this Government performing in the Treasury, in connection with figures? Mr Speaker, if a child brought home these sorts of figures from school, his parents would take him away from that school and send him somewhere else.

Mr Clarko: Yes, to reform school.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is what the electorate would like to do with this Premier—send him somewhere else.

Mr Pearce: The Gallup-Morgan polls could not have been very comprehensive, if you believe that.

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not blame the Minister for Education for trying to protect his leader. I agree the Government has been expert in media manipulation. It has been able to get its message through much clearer than we were able to do, even though what the Government is saying is wrong.

I hope the Press will now list the major errors made by this Government.

I make a further comment on the Government's claim that charges would be kept down during the wages pause. I have already shown members a full-page advertisement in which the Premier stated that a "wages freeze won't work without a prices freeze". When I referred to this advertisement, the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services interjected as though I was saying something that was wrong. I refer members to *The West Australian* of 5 April this year in which the following appeared—

Ministers agreed that during the wage freeze, the undertaking not to increase State taxes and charges would be honoured.

Honoured! It took members opposite only a few days to break that promise and to increase all Government charges, in many cases by more than the inflation rate.

Mr Clarko: Twice as much as the inflation rate.

Mr O'CONNOR: The article continues—

[It is understood that the Cabinet is about to consider ways of tightening the wage freeze to make it more effective.]

I agree the Government should do that, because already during the reign of this Government there have been 57 breaches of that principle that I know of, including some granted by the Minister for Industrial Relations himself. One has to look at only the MTT and the Metropolitan Water Authority to see where these have applied.

If the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services is in any further doubt, let me refer him to an article in *The West Australian* of 23 February, in which the Premier is quoted as follows—

He could not see how any government could in good faith freeze wages and then hit the people with increases in water rates and electricity charges.

That is unbelievable! I will read the article again—

He could not see how any government could in good faith freeze wages and then hit the people with increases in water rates and electricity charges.

In other words, what he has done since has not been done in good faith; on that point, I completely agree with the Premier.

It is despicable for a Government to make public announcements on these matters, and then to renege on them as this Government has done.

This Government has a mandate; it was elected by the electorate of Western Australia. It has a mandate to ensure job security for those in work, but has done very little about that. I wish to make some further comment on this point. I am sure some members opposite would like copies of these documents, because they are rather enlightening; they can have them, if they so desire.

Another article reads—

Ensure job security for those in work.

The Government has a mandate for that. In the article the Premier said—

To reach our positive plans our employment task force will create 25 000 real jobs. We have already pin-pointed—

That was a skinny pin, and it was as shallow as the promises made by the Premier in that regard. The 25 000 people calling for those jobs must be disappointed.

Mr Parker: We are talking about a three-year programme of government, not a five-month programme.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Premier referred to "jobs we have already pin-pointed". The Government is talking about a three-year period. That shows the deceit of the Government—the deceit that obtained the Treasury benches for the Australian Labor Party, and the calculated cunning and deceit that will remove the ALP from those benches.

The Government has a mandate to create jobs for the unemployed; we have no doubt about that. It has a mandate to reduce interest rates; it has a mandate to contain prices and assist small businesses. However, it has been a dismal failure. In his policy speech, the Premier said—

A Labor Government will start providing real jobs immediately we are elected.

How many of those jobs have been provided?

Mr Hassell: There are a few in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes. The Premier has provided jobs for ALP members and union executives at very high salaries. He has provided some of those people with cars, and given them tax-free concessions of \$3 000 a year. In some cases, the allowances mean that the wages are doubled. For instance, to a person receiving \$30 000-odd a year, a \$3 000 tax concession or allowance would be worth \$7 000 or \$8 000 a year, and the car would be worth another \$5 000 or \$4 000. Over and above the salary of \$30 000-odd, those people receive a \$3 000 concessional allowance and a motor vehicle. They are on a good wicket. Will they have a 10 per cent cut in their \$3 000 tax-free allowance? Will they have a 10 per cent cut in their car allowance? Of course they will not.

However, the Premier has been intent on cutting back the people who have worked for 30 years or more to obtain standards of living. They are the people who have gone to country centres, at great inconvenience to themselves and their families. Some of them have had to stay in the country, and because their children need to go to high school, they have sent their wives and children back to Perth, seeing them once a fortnight only. Those people have had to qualify for the

positions they hold, but they will sit in offices, receiving 10 per cent less, while the people sitting next to them who are on Federal awards will suffer no reduction at all. I wonder what this will do for loyalty within the service.

Mr Blaikie: The Premier just smiles. That is all he cares.

Mr O'CONNOR: In his policy speech, the Premier said—

A Labor Government will start providing jobs immediately we are elected.

Between March and June, employment figures decreased by 5 900. In other words, there were 5 900 fewer jobs in Western Australia in the first three months of the Government's term of office than there were before. That is an indication that the people have lost faith in the Premier. People may be closing down their businesses and going back to the Eastern States, and other places.

Mr Brian Burke: That could not have been the first three months of our Government.

Mr O'CONNOR: April, May, June—5 900 fewer in employment. I did not bring in the figures for the first quarter, when we were in office; and I did not bring in the figures for the first month of the present Government. We could not blame it for anything that happened during that period.

Mr Brian Burke: Thanks!

Mr O'CONNOR: I am very kind. I am sure that if the Premier were on this side of the House, he would be as kind to me.

There are bleak prospects for school leavers. The position in most areas has deteriorated. Let us consider some of those areas as reported in the following Press articles—

GOVERNMENT UPSET AT MINE'S SHUTDOWN

KOOLYANOBING iron-ore mine near Southern Cross will close at the end of August.

This was in an article on 8 July. Another article read—

BIG STEEL FIRM TO SHUT; 80 JOBS GO

The State's biggest steel manufacturer, Vickers Hadwa, will close down.

It has been making spare parts for machinery and mining equipment in its Bassendean factory for 49 years.

The company had to wait until this Government came into office to retire from the business. Because of the deterioration in the business sector, the following was reported—

Boans will put about 100 of its shop assistants on a part-time basis.

And the following—

Firm angry over lost contract

The WA Government has expressed anxiety over a Federal Government decision which caused a local shipbuilding company to lose a \$5.5 million contract from Madagascar.

The Government should have pushed the Federal Government to a much greater degree to retain that business for this State. At Bunnings, 80 workers have been retrenched. GMH is positioned mainly in the Eastern States, but it will have some effect here.

I mention those matters to show that since the Government has been in office, we have seen a substantial deterioration in employment in Western Australia. In the three months ending in June, 5 900 fewer people have been in employment. That is not something the Opposition likes to see. We would like to see the reverse happening.

Had the Government carried out its election promises, not only would those 5 900 people be in work, but also a further 19 100 people would have prospects of jobs.

I am sorry that the Minister for Consumer Affairs is not in his seat, because I wanted to make a few comments dealing with his portfolio, and the prices legislation. Has anyone ever seen a greater farce or fiasco in this House than during the debate on that legislation? We came back for a one-day sitting and the Government knew little about it. The Premier and the Minister for Consumer Affairs had to go outside, obviously to discuss the matter and to find out where they were heading. We saw errors in the legislation. Many of the things said by the Minister for Consumer Affairs during that one-day sitting proved to be false.

The Minister said that the Government would bring prices down and that it would look after the people. The Commonwealth Government, which is a Labor Government of the same ilk as the one in Western Australia, brought down its mini Budget and that cost the people of this State \$8 a week each. The increased State charges cost an average of \$10 per week each.

It is obvious that the prices legislation went exactly as we told the Government it would, and that the sitting of Parliament was unnecessary and, in fact, a farce. We certainly have not seen the benefit of the Government's indication that the price of fuel would drop by 3c a litre. As a matter of fact, when the Burke Government went into office, the metropolitan price of fuel was

42.9c. It is now 44.3c. At Rottnest Island—and the Premier is the chairman of the island's board—fuel was selling at 48.5c. It is still selling well above the price of 44c here.

Mr Williams: It is 46c.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is correct. Commodity prices have continued to rise, as we warned the Government that they would. The one-day sitting has had no beneficial effect.

If household budgets were stretched when we were in Government, they are certainly broken now. I have documents which I will not go through to any extent; but in July the following statement was made—

FAMILY MAN HIT HARD

The mini-Budget will leave a typical family man with his own home about \$8 a week worse off . . .

The people in the "mortgage belt" were affected substantially. The previous Commonwealth Government gave them a tax concession on interest rates over 10 per cent, which concession was removed. That has made a substantial difference in the ability of those people to retain their homes.

If we consider shopping complexes and food bills, we realise that things have taken a turn for the worse since this Government has been in office. I quote now from *The West Australian* of 9 July—

BATTLE AT THE CHECK-OUT

Food bills take an extra 20 per cent

Retailers admit that grocery prices are continuing to rocket and since March a number of items have risen by as much as 10 per cent.

This is all since the Government introduced its prices legislation, which was a hoax and a phoney. I said at the time that the Government could not do anything about interstate or overseas commodities because it had no control in such areas. However, in the five months this Government has been in office, or the four months it has had the prices legislation, one commodity only has been declared since I last spoke to the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, and that commodity is fuel. We all know a fiasco has surrounded the pricing of fuel. But prices for some commodities have risen by as much as 10 per cent. This newspaper article indicates that the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Mr Tonkin) admitted that there was nothing the State Government could do to contain these prices. He said that on 9 July. That is a little different from what he said in Parliament

when the prices legislation was introduced. I am glad to see he is now back in the Chamber.

Mr Tonkin: Do you remember that I said I didn't think that one-tenth of one per cent would be affected? In fact, people on the other side made great play of it and said it was hardly worth the trouble. But we made it clear that we would not have a large number of price controls. We believe in competition.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Minister led people to believe otherwise.

Mr Tonkin: Read *Hansard*.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Minister is like the forgetful man who got up at 4.00 o'clock one morning, spent three hours combing his hair, and then left it home. The Minister forgets these things; he forgets what he said. I shall continue quoting the article as follows—

And the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Mr Tonkin, admitted that there was nothing the State Government could do to contain prices.

Mr Tonkin: Which prices?

Mr O'CONNOR: The Minister said it, so he ought to know. The article is about food prices.

Mr Tonkin: It is because they come from the Eastern States. Did you really believe we had the constitutional power to go to Victoria and start setting their prices?

Mr O'CONNOR: I knew the Government did not have that power.

Mr Thompson: At the last election you told the people of this State that you could.

Mr O'CONNOR: Here we have the Minister admitting the Government can do nothing about these things, yet his Government recalled Parliament to do something the Government could do nothing about.

Mr Thompson: It was a farce.

Mr O'CONNOR: Fuel prices overseas have decreased since the end of February by as much as 10c following a drop in price by the suppliers, yet in this State fuel prices have continued to rise.

Mr Tonkin: They are cheaper than when we became the Government.

Mr O'CONNOR: Wrong. At that time the price of fuel was 42.9c.

Mr Tonkin: No, it was not.

Mr O'CONNOR: The price of fuel is now 44.9c a litre.

Mr Clarko: Do you think it is a good policy to have standard petrol dearer than super petrol?

This morning I went to my service station and found that standard was dearer than super.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: Let me quote now from an article by Chris Walsh which appeared in the 30 May edition of *The West Australian*. It states that "the price control law has made little impact". It has made no impact! It states, "Rottnest Island fuel price too high". Did the Government not realise that Rottnest is part of this State?

Mr Pearce: Are you reading the *Readers' Digest*?

Mr O'CONNOR: I am illustrating how false the Government has been and how disgraceful its actions have been. People on Rottnest were paying 48.5c a litre.

Mr Williams: With the Premier as chairman of the board.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Government promised to reduce interest rates. Mr Burke's policy speech indicated that, "We will provide realistic assistance to those suffering genuine hardship from high interest rates". An ALP election advertisement read, "The Labor Party's plan will give you the option of reducing your monthly home mortgage payment under one family allowance conversion scheme". This is another deception. There has been no interest rate reduction since the election; in fact there has been every indication that interest rates will rise. Mr Hawke has withdrawn the interest rate subsidy, and we all know what that has done to home owners and the fears they now have.

The Government also promised to help and foster small business; instead it has started to crucify small business.

The extravagant charges for water and electricity are very detrimental to small business and to employment. The Government reduced turnover in this State by ripping off \$120 million—\$145 million according to the Deputy Premier—from the wage packets of workers by increasing charges for water and electricity. The Government has decreased turnover among small businesses. The Federal Government has taken even more than the State Government from the people of this State. Mr Hawke's strategy meeting certainly has not helped.

It is time the State Government stopped its wasteful spending, which has contributed largely to the deficit, despite the fact there is no real deficit. Any State Government, and particularly this one, should follow its Premier's policy speech and the promises he made to the people prior to the election. The Premier said, "A Labor Government

will introduce a range of measures to cut wasteful Government spending and improve efficiency". What a joke that is. Is the reopening of the Perth-Fremantle railway service cutting wasteful spending? I can see the Minister for Transport—they would not make him Minister for Mines—jumping up and down.

There has been much wasteful spending on advisers. If the advice this Government is getting is from these newly appointed advisers, it is time they were sacked and the Government appointed people with knowledge.

Another area of wasteful spending has involved the upgrading of ministerial offices and the additional expenditure for the transport of the wives and children of Ministers into and out of the metropolitan area. This is unnecessary unless there is a crisis. It is unnecessary because wives get six free trips a year. But even if there were a crisis, surely the giving of benefits to the families of his own members is something he ought to be putting aside at the moment.

Since gaining office, this Government has increased country sewerage charges by 20 per cent, a very substantial rise. I believe country people can see a great deterioration in their standard of living since this Government has been in power. Country drainage charges have risen by 18 per cent.

State Housing Commission rentals have increased by 10 per cent. Hospital charges have risen by 19 per cent, and it is a wonder the Minister for Health did not resign because of this, considering the way he squealed so much in previous years when hospital charges were increased. Gas charges have increased by 15 per cent and as much as 100 per cent.

Mr Rushton: During a wage freeze!

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, at a time when the Government should have been able to hold down prices. There is no justification at all for the Government's increasing prices the way it has.

If we consider the additional money the Government will receive from its new tax—over and above what it thought it would be, according to what the Deputy Premier said—an extra \$64 million, we must realise that the figure will be much more than that. If we consider the Government's initial figure of \$60 million and also Government charges for electricity, water, and other items, we realise the figure is \$145 million, so the Government is out by \$85 million. We find then that \$91 million is to be available over and above what the Government expected. This indicates that the Government should be able to substantially drop charges for electricity and water

and to substitute the loss of income in this area from Consolidated Revenue.

The Burke Government's inability to control its finances has destroyed the confidence of the Public Service. The Government intends to rip money from public servants in an effort to provide a smokescreen to cover its increases in charges on the community. The Government has chosen the top section of the Public Service and is to remove 10 per cent of its wages while at the same time increasing Government charges, because market research shows that people in the community believe public servants should have their wages cut.

But people will not be diverted for long by this smokescreen. It will not take them long to find that their pockets are affected by the Government's actions. The Government has destroyed confidence in the Public Service and, what is more, we have no guarantee that this proposed drop in wages will apply for just one year. Considering the way the Government has not honoured its promises, public servants cannot be confident that the cut will be just for one year. Neither do the rest of the public servants know whether this drop in wages will later include people earning perhaps \$15 000. Even if the Government gives an undertaking that this will not occur, no-one is in a position to believe the Government.

The Government has demoralised the Police Force by not defending it against such people as Ron Reid, the Secretary of the TLC. The Government stood back and allowed abuse to be heaped on the Police Force when its members were carrying out their duty to defend the rights of citizens in this State.

Mr Brian Burke: That is not right. I had a meeting with Mr Reid and Mr Porter where I told Mr Reid in no uncertain terms what I thought, and then I gave two or three television interviews concerning the same thing.

Mr O'CONNOR: In that case I apologise. I did not see anything in the Press; nor did I see where the Minister came out in support of the Police Force in any way.

Another problem is the inability of the Government to make decisions. Every time something happens, the Government sets up an inquiry. How many inquiries are proceeding in this State now—dozens? And all since this Government has come into office.

Then we have the fiasco of the fuel prices. All these problems show the inability of this Government to govern properly. The serious errors in the calculation of increases in Government charges are shown in almost every figure the Government

has presented. We must remember, too, the misleading of the public about the state of the Treasury.

There is also the failure of the Government to look after Western Australia's interests in Canberra. Those of us who went to the Constitutional Convention with the Treasurer were amazed to see that he and his group did not stand up for the rights of Western Australia.

Mr Hassell: They invited the Commonwealth to interfere in the internal affairs of the State.

Mr O'CONNOR: They did not defend the interests of Western Australia. Can the Treasurer correct me when I say that in every case at that convention he supported Gareth Evans? The only time I can remember his not supporting him was when the Treasurer was absent for one of the votes.

Mr Brian Burke: I voted on the merits. I cannot remember who I voted with at the time. I might say that you voted against him every time.

Mr O'CONNOR: I remember, and so does the Treasurer. I know how I voted. I voted with our people sometimes and against them at other times. I sometimes voted with Gareth Evans. Quite frankly, there were many issues debated when the Treasurer could have got up and supported the State, but did not. He deserted Western Australia at that convention. He deserted the State in favour of a centralised policy. He supported the Federal people, including Gareth Evans, on every occasion.

He supported Hawke on the Franklin dam issue, which was disgraceful. This is an issue about which we will live to rue the day that the Commonwealth Government took its action. I see that in South Australia this has worked against that State already.

We have a world heritage committee deciding what will be declared in Western Australia and in Tasmania. I did not want to have a say in what happened in Tasmania; that was up to the Tasmanians. I do not want the Tasmanians to have a say in what happens in Western Australia, because what happens in Western Australia is up to us. But the world heritage committee can make a decision whether to declare something in Western Australia.

Do members know which countries form this committee? They are Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Egypt, France, West Germany, Guinea which is a dictatorship, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Libya, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, Switzerland, Tunisia, the United States, and Zaire. The world heritage committee comprises 90 people who make decisions as to what will be declared in

Tasmania or Western Australia. Good heavens, it is time we brought things back here and made the decisions in this country.

Mr Parker: It was referred to the former Prime Minister (Malcolm Fraser).

Mr O'CONNOR: Go back to Russia!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: I am trying to complete my speech before the tea suspension.

Mr Brian Burke: I am sorry to interrupt. Just point out one thing for me. You will speak until question time, I suppose. When you talk about the loss of revenue and the revenue that we predicted would be raised by these things, you added together two lots as though one was a surplus.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am not going to go back to that. I have covered them very well and aptly. An hour ago I spoke on that issue.

Mr Clarko: He rang Sarah!

Mr Pearce: You are on tape this time so don't try to correct the *Hansard*.

Mr Brian Burke: It was wrong. I just wanted to get it in before question time.

Mr Clarko: Sarah will tell you!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: I know it is fairly hard to get things through to the Premier. I will briefly explain it to him again. In the 1982-83 financial year—

Mr Thompson: Hold on, you are going too fast!

Mr Pearce: Your colleagues can't follow you.

Mr O'CONNOR:—\$60 million was taken from the short-term money market.

Mr Brian Burke: I was not talking about that. I was talking about the loss incurred by the statutory authorities you are beginning to talk about.

Mr O'CONNOR: I was talking about the Tasmanian dam issue, so the Premier has got me.

Mr Brian Burke: I did not mean to confuse you.

Mr Clarko: Don't help him with his interjections!

Mr O'CONNOR: The Premier does it very easily. Every time I pick up a newspaper and see a figure quoted, I am confused because I know it is incorrect. I am waiting for the next figure to come through so I can rectify it.

The Government has not performed in connection with employment issues. It dropped Job Bank.

Mr Parker: Did you say it dropped Job Bank? Job Bank did not exist; it was a barrage of lies.

Mr O'CONNOR: Job Bank would have provided many jobs in this State for people who were unemployed.

Mr Parker: Absolute nonsense!

Mr O'CONNOR: We would have gone on with the Royal Perth Hospital extensions.

Mr Parker: You mucked it up because you didn't read the contracts. You were involved in an illegal act.

Mr O'CONNOR: We took action in connection with a motel—I think it was in Derby.

Mr Brian Burke: With Job Bank, I think if you had run your own race and not been discredited by the member who is now your deputy, you would have done a lot better.

Mr O'CONNOR: I think he does the job exceedingly well.

Mr Brian Burke: Everyone knows how nervous he was when the election approached. Look at the silly decisions he made.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Government failed to spend the money from the wages pause and out of \$8 million I think it spent \$200 000 and the Commonwealth has disbanded that for the time being. This money should be spent on the provision of jobs for our State. Plenty of people want jobs. Look at the Yeelirrie project which has gone into mothballs; with this Government it will never get off the ground despite the fact that the Minister for Transport indicated when he was in the Esperance and Kalgoorlie areas that it would. The whole thing was abandoned. The Deputy Premier would not talk with them. They could not get through to him. They had an operation going to get the housing scheme started, but because the Deputy Premier was not available they could not proceed.

Mr Hassell: He would not talk to me about a computer factory, either. I rang him 10 times.

Mr Brian Burke: They don't want to build a town; that is the problem as I understand it.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Government has generated scarce funds away from capital works and has provided extravagancies such as the Perth-Fremantle railway line; the appointment of administrative staff; and the refurbishing of offices. Let us get on with Job Bank and start to get a few people working.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr O'CONNOR: Instead of allowing a drop of 5 900 in employment which occurred in this State at the end of June, firm action should be taken against industrial vandals who are destroying jobs in this State. We have seen it happen and we have

seen how badly Mr Bennett acted in relation to the garbos' strike some two or three weeks ago. It was detrimental to the people of Perth and to the employers.

The Government should recast its wage structure to bring it into line with the economic requirements of this State and that would assist recovery. It should eliminate the massive and wasteful Government spending and redirect funds into capital works programmes. It should reassess public utility performances and cost increases in line with the Consumer Price Index.

I sincerely believe it could be got way down. Obviously the Government has a sock containing an amount of money. We realise it must have when we look at the amounts it has said it will receive from tobacco tax, increased charges, and in other areas. I repeat that the Perth-Fremantle railway line should be abandoned.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr O'CONNOR: The train will carry a lot of people next week and there will be a lot of interest generated by it, but after a fortnight or a month the train will travel with just the conductor and the driver.

The Government should abandon its effort to have the Shannon River diverted. The Shannon River basin is very important to people in the Manjimup area. I was in the area a week or two ago, and I am quite sure that if the Premier went down there he would get a reception equal to his reception out the front of this building today. The people in those areas are extremely concerned about their jobs and the effect on the district.

Mr Blaikie: And the performance of the Government, too.

Mr O'CONNOR: They certainly are. The Government ought to get on with it and get money to sustain the area. It ought to try to stimulate and encourage the private sector, where most of the jobs in the country and State are. It ought to get on and do something about that and should stop trying to nationalise industries and organisations in this State. It has already been tried with the contract cleaners changing over to day labour. The Government has had to reverse its decision in that regard.

Mr Pearce: We made no decision on that matter.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Minister notified them to the contrary.

Mr Pearce: That is totally untrue.

Mr O'CONNOR: What about workers' compensation?

Mr Pearce: In relation to contract cleaners, I announced I had reviewed the financial situation and had made a simple decision.

Mr Blaikie: Dry up!

Mr Laurance: You go from one disaster to another.

Mr O'CONNOR: He is a disaster. School contract cleaning should be maintained. In regard to workers' compensation, people should be given the right to select the company with which they want to insure for workers' compensation. People should not be compelled to go to one company only. They should lobby against Medicare because it will do no good for this country.

The Government should give a commitment to pursue development at Yeelirrie because something ought to be done to get it off the ground. Approximately \$28 million has been spent by the company in an area which will create employment and bring income into the State. Both these are very vital to our State, yet this Government will never get around to getting that project going, despite the fact that the company has spent \$28 million, despite the fact that jobs are badly needed, and despite the fact that, if we do not sell the uranium, people will get it from elsewhere.

I think I have said enough to indicate that this Government is not worthy of being in Government. It has breached promises. Look at the action it has taken.

I wish to move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply.

Mr Parker: It is a stunt, is it?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes, it is a stunt to let the people of this State know how they have been misled, and to support the people of this State who have been pushed about left, right, and centre by the Government and who have had to face higher electricity charges, water rates, and other charges contrary to the Government's indications. The Premier should say very little about this, frankly.

Amendment to Motion

I move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply—

That the following words be added to the motion—

But we regret to inform Your Excellency of the erosion in public confidence in Her Majesty's Government for the following reasons— The Government cannot be trusted with the finances of this State as they—

(a) gave false undertakings to the electors of this State;

- (b) have been deceitful in their several projections of the Budget deficit;
- (c) have been grossly inaccurate and misleading in telling the public the amount of money that will be raised from increased charges.

MR COURT (Nedlands) [5.26 p.m.]: I second the amendment and in doing so point out that the deficit fantasy that the Premier has given us in recent months must be cleared up. The Premier has either been deceitful—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I remind the member for Nedlands that questions without notice will be at 5.30 p.m. Do you want me to give you the call?

Leave to Continue Speech

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

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

QUESTIONS: ON NOTICE

Closing Time: Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mr Harman): Before I call for questions without notice, I wish to make another announcement. As the House has varied its sessional hours, it is appropriate that I acquaint members of the change in the times by which questions on notice can be received by the Clerks. Under Standing Order No. 108 questions may be received up to 30 minutes after the meeting of the House, or such other time as may be approved by the Speaker. Accordingly, I have determined that questions for Wednesdays will be received until 3 o'clock on Tuesdays. Due also to the large number of questions handled by the stenographer, I ask members wherever possible to have their questions typed. Today I had occasion to see a handwritten question received from a member which was extremely difficult to read, interpret, and comprehend. The co-operation of members in this regard would therefore be appreciated.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 p.m.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SECOND DAY

Amendment to Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR COURT (Nedlands) [7.15 p.m.]: In seconding this amendment, I would like to say that

the deficit fantasy which the Premier has given us in recent months has to be cleared up. The Premier has either been deceitful and attempted to manipulate the public with his trumped-up deficit crisis—

Mr Tonkin: Do you think we should ask for the withdrawal of the word "deceitful"?

MR COURT: —or alternatively he could be suffering from the terrible disease—which I hope is curable—of advisers anorexia. That is a disease of one who is starved of good advice. The deficit crisis which he trumped up just did not exist.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Did your father give you that one?

MR COURT: The Premier set about manipulating the public only days after he became the Premier. The Leader of the Opposition took us through the sequence of events, and I will summarise them again. It started off with a \$21 million deficit, and then on 14 March it was \$23 million. A few weeks later—on 5 April—it went up to \$30 million, and on 11 May it went up to \$33.2 million. I will quote from *The West Australian* of that day, as follows—

WIDE-RANGING increases in government charges after June 30 and a severe 1983-84 Budget seem certain as a result of the State's deteriorating financial position.

Latest Treasury estimates put the 1982-83 Budget deficit at \$32.3 million, with a grim outlook for existing services and activities in 1983-84.

Then on 21 June—only nine days before the end of the financial year—the Premier said—

WESTERN Australia will seek special financial assistance from the Federal Government to cover its worst-ever deficit.

The Premier, Mr Burke, announced the decision last night after revealing that not only was the State facing a record \$30.5 million deficit this financial year, but that it could fall even further into the red in 1984.

Mr Burke said that "first run" figures for next financial year suggested that without major controls the State could show a deficit of \$274.8 million, merely if it maintained existing services.

The public, after having been given an upper figure of around \$32 million, had this figure of \$274 million for next year thrown in front of them. Now that statement was irresponsible and it was alarmist. It served to confuse the public even more in regard to something that was becoming a sham on figures.

While this theatrical performance in regard to the deficit figures was going on from the Premier, the Government was spending literally millions of dollars in totally unnecessary areas, and I would like to run through these areas. There have been jobs for TLC and ALP officials—and incidentally these are the only jobs which have been created since the ALP came into Government—a mountain of inquiries, the Perth-Fremantle railway—which has the prospect of actually lowering the standard of transport services in that corridor—aeroplane rides for Government members' families, new offices, cars for the boys, and so it goes on.

Then came the big financial drama. In the week beginning 11 June, a well-produced four-act theatrical extravaganza took place. Act I, the address to the State; act II, the Premier announces savage Government charge increases; act III, he brings in discriminatory cuts in Public Service salaries; and act IV, supposedly a sweetener for low income earners is brought in—and what a farce that has turned out to be.

In the week prior to the extravaganza, the Premier revealed some of his true sentiments. He staggered the public by passing judgment on himself, admitting mistakes, and saying he was looking forward to the day when he stood down as Premier.

Mr MacKinnon: Hear, hear!

Mr COURT: I will quote what the 36-year-old leader said. He said, "The other thing about the job is that I do not like it". Then two weeks later, after saying he does not like the job, he pressed the panic button on the economy and said, "We are in big trouble financially. We are in the middle of a crisis", but four months previously, just before the election, he had all the answers. He was going to solve the unemployment problem and he was going to keep Government charges down.

In the meantime, during the five months of the Burke Government, the public had become completely confused by the Treasurer's deficit figures. Then the truth was revealed when the Treasurer was forced to announce that, in actual fact, there was not a \$30 million or \$32 million deficit, but a \$14.2 million deficit. The good friends of the Treasurer in the media wrote that up in a very good fashion for him when they said that the State deficit was "kept down" to \$14.2 million. The public needs to understand clearly that there was no need for any deficit at all. Even the \$14.2 million deficit was trumped up.

I ask the Treasurer: "Were departmental heads sent a memo asking them to bring forward from July into June as much expenditure as possible?"

Mr Tonkin: What a load of rubbish!

Mr COURT: I want to know if such a memo went out to the departmental heads.

Mr Brian Burke: Not to my knowledge. As far as I am concerned, the answer is "No"; but if I answer all your silly questions—

Mr COURT: If I put it on notice, will I obtain an answer to it?

Mr Brian Burke: Of course you will.

Mr COURT: Expenditure from July was brought forward to June; and the \$14.2 million deficit was a trumped-up figure because the Premier would have been red-faced if there was not a deficit.

We end up with a \$14 million deficit; and in keeping with practices started during the 1960s, the Government invested its daily cash balances from the State Government departments and instrumentalities to produce a much-needed income which the Treasurer told us, at question time yesterday, amounted to some \$37 million. That is not a bad start—to go into a financial year with \$37 million.

The Civil Service Association, members of which came to the House today, were aghast at the variations in the State deficit estimates. They would pick up the paper on a day-to-day basis and see the mythical deficit growing. They were particularly concerned about the actions of the Treasurer when he tried to counteract the so-called financial crisis. I will quote the words of Mr Tony Black during a "Nationwide" interview when he said—

Mr Parker: That is a reliable source? He is the person who said that the Government ought to get used to the fact that "urgent" means "three months" in the Public Service.

Mr COURT: Mr Black's words were as follows—

We believe the Premier has been grossly exaggerating his financial situation for some months, we're not too sure what his motive is, but we are perfectly sure the figures he has been giving us are inaccurate and these latest figures tend to confirm the view we have held for some time.

Mr Black was asked the following question—

Would you like to hazard a guess as to what the Premier's motives might be?

To that he replied—

I find it very difficult to make guesses, frankly I believe the government itself is operating more by guesswork and you don't really like to guess about other people's guesses. The only guess I think could reasonably be made is that the government does have proposals up its sleeve which are going to cost money and I believe they are building up a very healthy nest egg for that purpose.

On the same programme, John McIlwraith, a leading financial journalist, was commenting on the final deficit figure of \$14 million. He was asked—

...was the Premier exaggerating the deficit problem back in March with talk of the State being \$30m or so in the red?

He was kinder to the Treasurer, and he said—

I would say it is both a mark of the inexperience of the government in handling budgets.

That is the scenario. The Treasurer builds up the public mind to expect a huge deficit by saying, "We are in the midst of a financial crisis". Then he pops up with the \$14 million deficit, which is half the deficit that he estimated; and he wants to be applauded for his performance, saying, "What a great effort I have made". That reminds one of the nursery rhyme about Little Jack Horner who sat in the corner eating a Christmas pie. He stuck in his thumb and pulled out a plum and said, "What a good boy am I!" That was the reaction the Treasurer was hoping to get after his five months of trumping up his deficit crisis.

The Treasurer knows well that a \$15 million variation in the State Budget is not significant when the overall Budget is some \$2 500 million; yet he used the excuse of the deficit for the introduction of the savage increases in charges, and of salary cuts.

The Treasurer should know that the increases in charges for the State Energy Commission and the Metropolitan Water Authority are not related to the deficit. Those two bodies are self-funding. However, the Treasurer skirted that question when he was answering questions yesterday. No doubt the member for Murdoch will mention that.

Mr Hassell: Are you sure he was answering the questions, because not many does he answer?

Mr COURT: When the Treasurer has been talking about the Budget deficit, he has not taken into account one important consideration, and that is the fact that for six months of that period a wage pause was in existence. Certainly that would have helped the budgetary situation. Without taking into account the wage cuts that the

Treasurer wants to introduce, a wage pause has been in existence, which has certainly helped the State's financial position. He introduced savage increases in Government charges; and members should recall that, prior to the election, the Treasurer said he would not have any increases in these charges. Those savage increases will send many businessmen broke and add to the unemployment situation, which is already not good.

The Treasurer must realise that budgeting is a two-edged sword. He has to control the spending of the Government, and at the same time he has to maintain an environment which is healthy for economic development. The Treasurer knows that he inherited the best-kept Treasury in this country, yet he continues to deny that. He knows that the Treasury in this State is in that good position, and that the deficit crisis he trumped up was a big con trick which was used to con the public servants out there today, who want to know why they were discriminated against in having their salaries cut.

Mr Watt: It's a wonder he didn't sell the railways and lease them back.

Mr COURT: We heard a lot about the international economic scene. The Premier said that we would be well placed for our recovery next year; but the international recovery is a very brittle recovery. The Premier has to base the plans for this State's economic growth not on the anticipation of growing international markets, but on the level of existing markets. We have to go out and become more competitive within the existing markets.

Australia is not geared to be competitive, because we can see since the Government has come into office that we are still facing the problems of its wanting to increase wages and to index wages; we still have the industrial problems at Mt. Newman and other places, where we see one strike solved and another strike begin. We have problems on the waterfront where we have, apparently, the worst strike record for all ports throughout the world.

Mr Parker: There have been virtually no strikes since we have been in Government.

Mr COURT: The Premier's continual financial pessimism, combined with the massive increase in Government charges at a time when we have a wages freeze, will set this State back a decade.

This Government did not inherit a huge deficit; it should not be in a difficult monetary situation. The Premier's comments on the estimates of the Budget for next year, when he said that unless he trims them back we will have a \$274-million deficit, are alarmist comments. They are alarmist and

typical of his pessimism. It would appear that the State of excitement is too much for this Premier. All he wants to do is put on his media performances to manipulate the public's thinking on the state of our finances. His inaccuracy and his misleading comments on this State's financial affairs are such that he should heed his own advice and get out early so as to enable someone to come in who can perform. The Deputy Premier might come back from overseas to give it a go.

As the Minister for Consumer Affairs will undoubtedly know from his experience with the complaints he receives, a Government can con people only once, or possibly a few times, but not forever. The Premier should stop conning the people of this State over what he has been saying about this State's financial position.

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch) [7.33 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I will concentrate my remarks on that part of the motion which refers to the Government's having given false undertakings to the electors of this State and I will also concentrate my remarks primarily in the area of energy charges; but before doing so I will comment briefly on the general area of the Government's undertakings.

To do that I will refer to a couple of points already made by the member for Nedlands and the Leader of the Opposition. I refer the Premier to the introduction in his policy statement issued just prior to the election. I will read as follows right from the very beginning of that document—

The aim of the Labor policy makers has been to "cut their cloth" to fit in with the current economic climate.

It would appear that since gaining office, what this Premier and this Government have done is to increase the cloth by increasing charges and also by an unprincipled attack on the Public Service. They have made a bigger coat necessary to fund the things that the member for Nedlands referred to: Government advisers, the ill-advised reopening of the Perth-Fremantle rail link, the magnificent office refurbishment for the Deputy Premier, one of whose offices I once used, which was brand new. I mention also the Perth City Council dispute and the inane offer by the Government of taxpayers' money under the Premier's word and under his signature when the current economic climate is such as it is, clearly demonstrating he is not abiding by his policy statement I mentioned previously.

Clearly, right in the introduction of the Premier's policy, his party's policy, for the recent elec-

tion, he was giving false undertakings to the electors of this State.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I will deal primarily with energy charges. I will work progressively through from January 1982 to February 1983 and remind the Premier of some of the statements he made over that 12-month lead-up to the election. The first comment is in an advertisement in *The West Australian* of 26 January 1982 and states, "Brian Burke's leadership will build you a better future". That is, if you emigrate. I refer to the article again where we find "Labor's plans will stabilise water, electricity and gas charges". It gets better.

On 22 December 1982, in an advertisement referred to already by the Leader of the Opposition, the Labor Party said, "Labor will seek to freeze Government taxes and charges during the period of the wage freeze". Note that the Premier said there would be no increases, and not a slight increase.

Then on 2 December 1982, in the political notes of *The West Australian*, the self-same person had this to say, "To my knowledge, the contribution of State Government taxes and charges to the inflation rate has never before been quantified publicly". The Premier was talking about the provision of those figures by the Bureau of Census and Statistics. I quote further—

The revelation highlights the importance of bringing these charges under control to fight inflation, increase business activity and saten an economic upturn.

It is clear from this analysis that efforts to fight inflation and assist business activity will be fruitless unless they bear down on State taxes and charges.

I wish the Premier had read that particular quote of his own words prior to the recent increases in Government charges.

The final testimony, the final nail in the coffin, which clearly gives the lie to anything the Premier might have said since the election about his Government's being "responsible" is found in his policy speech addressed to the people of Western Australia on 7 February 1983 when he said—

Labor will act to untangle the Liberals energy mess and lift the veil of secrecy surrounding the cost to consumers of unused gas from the North-West Shelf.

Western Australians pay more for electricity than any other State—we don't want you to pay any more.

I can just imagine, and, in fact, I can reflect back and picture, the Premier looking out of the tele-

vision set and saying to all the people of this State, "We don't want you to pay any more" in that voice he uses on television.

What an abysmal record. Those four statements by the Premier clearly condemn the Government.

The next reference happens to be the Premier's own Press statement of 21 June 1983, but I first remind members that on 7 February he had said, "We don't want you to pay any more". I quote from his Press statement as follows—

Domestic electricity and natural gas charges will increase by an average of 15 per cent from July 1.

All non-domestic electricity tariffs will rise by 15 per cent.

The natural gas tariff for non-domestic users will be restructured in four quarterly steps, resulting in the majority of these customers also experiencing a 15 per cent rise, though the increases for some will be greater.

There is in the tail of that statement a very severe sting which I will explain, remembering that the Premier said that the increases for some will be greater. How much greater? We will see in a moment.

My next quote is also from a Government publication, being an advertisement for tariff charges dated 24 June. Those charges indicate to me quite clearly that companies in Western Australia on the L3 gas tariff charges will have their charges increased from between 15 per cent to 117 per cent over the next 12 months. Again, I remind the Premier of what he said on 7 February—"We don't want you to pay any more". What a load of poppycock!

Joe Popteczny of *The Sunday Times* picked up this hypocrisy in an article on 26 June.

Mr Parker: Is he a member of your party?

Mr MacKINNON: I do not know.

Mr Parker: He was a delegate to your last conference.

Mr MacKINNON: I quote as follows—

Local consumers pay 170 per cent more than counterparts in Brisbane and 23 per cent more than in Sydney.

Perth's top energy charging slot is shown in figures supplied by the world renowned energy costs monitoring company, NUS International Pty Ltd.

He then gives the chart of power tariffs which shows exactly the comparative costs and the fact that Western Australia is far and away now, be-

fore and even after, the recent tariff changes in both Victoria and New South Wales, the most expensive State. Western Australians pay more for electricity than people in any other State. But the Premier said, "We don't want you to pay any more". We do not want the Premier saying later that it is all our fault. He is now in Government. He is the man who had all the answers prior to 19 February. I presume he still has them.

The Government's response to all this was absolutely pathetic, and I will refer now to the remarks of the Minister for Mines, and for Fuel and Energy. In a response to a complaint about projected and conjectured energy increases, Mr Dowding had this to say, and what a pathetic excuse for a Minister he is—

I assure Mr Butler and other readers who may share his concern that both the Government and the commission understand people's feelings and needs and will continue to keep this in mind when making decisions concerning energy tariffs.

I bet! To continue—

The Government will continue to require the Energy Commission to keep its costs to a minimum, while maintaining adequate reliable supplies to the public.

It seems it will keep its costs to a minimum by giving members of the FED & FU pay increases, by offering Mr Kirkwood a \$15 000 salary increase, and by granting a shorter working week to all SEC workers. This is no way to minimise costs while maintaining adequate supplies to the public. There was no mention of positive action to improve the efficiency of the commission, simply a weak statement that the Government understands people's feelings. I hope it does, because I am one of those people; I am paying those increased charges.

The people of Western Australia know what the Premier said on 7 February; they will not forget quickly.

The impact on companies and businesses, as the member for Nedlands has said, will be severe, especially on large consumers of energy. Today, I asked a question on notice of the Minister in this House representing the Minister for Mines, and for Fuel and Energy, to find out what proportion of companies were on the new L3 tariff charges from which I quoted a little earlier. It is interesting to note that before 1 July, those consumers were paying for gas \$1.49 a unit over 4 600 units. The marginal cost per unit of gas was \$1.49. By 30 June, when these new charges had been phased in, the charges paid by these con-

sumers was \$3.24 a unit, or 117 per cent of the cost faced by them last year.

The Premier has said, "We do not want you to pay any more", but big business will have to pay 117 per cent more, so says the supposed "friend" of the businessman. Two-thirds or 60 per cent of consumers will pay above the 15 per cent increase; so much for the tail of the Premier's Press statement, "though the increases for some will be greater." Note that he did not say 117 per cent greater.

To give an indication of the impact this will have on this State's industry, I will mention two companies on which I have obtained information. These companies have given me specific statistics relating to the impact that these gas and energy charges will have on their companies. The increased charges being applied to company A will go up by 60 per cent. That company faces a 60 per cent increase on its new gas tariff and that means that energy costs will now double as a proportion of the total costs of the tariff of that company. However, the Premier has said, "We do not want you to pay any more." The real tragedy is that the same company is a national company which operates in four or five other States and it is likely to transfer its operations to the Eastern States, perhaps to Victoria, which has an inefficient energy corporation which has just imposed an increase of 18 per cent in energy charges. However, the cost to the company in Victoria is still 152 per cent below that of its Western Australian counterparts.

Mr Davies: Why is Alcoa pushing out of Victoria?

Mr MacKINNON: That really is a great way to attract industry to this State and to become friends of business.

Company B is in an even worse situation. It is also a national company which has places of production around the country. From 1 July, it faces a power charge increase of 101 per cent. Its Victorian counterpart after the 18 per cent energy increase in that State—I stress the word "after"—is 159 per cent below that of its Western Australian counterpart. Notwithstanding all this, the Premier said, "We do not want you to pay any more." Those words will ring in the ears of every company and every gas and electricity consumer in this State for another two years and five months until they have the chance to take action against those people who sold them down the drain.

It also makes very hollow the statement in today's newspaper by the Minister for Housing calling on building companies, builders, and the

like, to restrain their building costs. These gas charges will be passed on to the brick manufacturers who will in turn pass them on to new home buyers. I wish the Minister for Housing would speak occasionally with the Minister for Fuel and Energy and try to urge him to take a much saner view of the energy costs these people face.

Mr P. V. Jones: The price of bricks is going up.

Mr MacKINNON: The point I have made publicly on this issue is that Governments should be taking a sensible approach to energy charges. The Government has done so, I am pleased to say, with water rates in line with our previous policy. It has phased in over a period of time the increases faced by these people; in other words, the cost increases are limited to a maximum of 40 per cent each year. The very least the Government could do would be to do the same for energy charges. The imposition of a 40 per cent limit in any one year in itself is too much, but at least the limit is something and the Government would be seen to be taking a step in the right direction by giving business and energy consumers—large energy consumers—time to plan for the future, to budget, to re-adjust, and to take action in regard to those charges.

One final comment I want to make in relation to fuel and energy relates to the Government's undertaking in relation to "Bunbury 2000". I would very much like the Premier to respond and comment on the commitment the Government has given in regard to our charges that he has given false undertakings to the electors of this State. I again quote from the Government's policy document under the heading "Bunbury 2000" as follows—

Labor will expand and diversify rural industry in the region, and in particular will: . . .

It does not say "may". To continue—

. . . expedite the development of the new power station in Bunbury.

Mr Kirkwood was recently in Bunbury having discussions with the councillors and a few other people, trying in my view, to soften up those people for a decision not to proceed with the power station but to transfer the location of it elsewhere. Rumours to that effect are rife in the south-west. The Government has a responsibility to put paid to those rumours or to stand up and be counted. In my view, the counting will show that the decision on that undertaking, like so many others, will be wrong.

I repeat again for the benefit of Government members—and I will repeat it again before the

next election—the Premier's statement on electricity on 7 February—

Western Australians pay more for electricity than any other State—we don't want you to pay any more.

Western Australians certainly have the most expensive electricity in Australia and the future looks awfully bleak for most of them.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [7.52 p.m.]: The question of the financial administration of Western Australia is crucial at any time, but particularly now. As I said earlier by way of interjection, the only way to describe this Government is to call it the highwayman Government—highwayman Burke, if we like—because it puts them up and sticks them up in terms of charges.

Mr Davies: You are being rude.

Mr CLARKO: All Governments in the middle of the year have traditionally increased their public utility charges, but where is the justification for an increase of the order of 15, 16, or 30 per cent when the forecast inflation rate stands at seven per cent? If we compare public utility increases this year with those of last year, we will appreciate that when they were increased last year the inflation rate was of the order of 11 per cent and we can make the necessary adjustments; but this Government, which came to power on the basis of a philosophy of doing all things to all men and women, certainly has begun to implement its policy of class division and of tearing the Australian community into shreds. First of all, it decided to hit public servants earning more than \$24 000 a year.

Mr Pearce: That is untrue.

Mr CLARKO: The figure of \$24 000, I understand, was put to Cabinet and it was subsequently raised to \$29 500.

Mr Tonkin: I don't remember that.

Mr Pearce: That's rubbish!

Mr Tonkin: You had better check your leak.

Mr CLARKO: In *The West Australian* of Thursday, 23 June, the Premier said that initially the figure was put at a lower level. He made that comment on the Channel 7 programme "Face to Face" of the previous evening. I challenge members opposite to say that \$29 500 was the first figure at which it was contemplated to apply the cut. There is no question that socialism—

Mr Tonkin: You had better go back to your leak!

Mr CLARKO: That is the basis on which members opposite operate. It is of course a

foreign policy; it is certainly not a policy put together by Australians. It was put together by people in continental Europe over 150 years ago before this State came into being. That is the philosophy which they want to bring to Australia. It is a foreign policy which is 150 years out of date. They have worked on the basis of the typical socialist and have said, "We will take from the rich and give to the poor". I do not believe that a police sergeant who has spent 20-odd years travelling around the outback regions of Australia is rich.

Mr Parker: A police sergeant is not affected.

Mr CLARKO: I believe senior police sergeants do come into the \$29 500-odd category. Principals of schools of any size will be affected. I do not think it makes any difference to the Minister. He was originally going to use the \$24 000 figure. The amount does not make any difference, but it is designed particularly to be a case of class warfare. Class warfare is the core of the Government's policy.

Mr Parker: There is nothing in our policy about that; in fact, our policy specifically excludes class warfare.

Mr CLARKO: An amount of \$11 million in a Budget which this year I assume will be of the order of \$2 600 million or \$2 700 million represents less than half a per cent. The Government wants to take that \$11 million from those members of the Public Service who have spent a generation working for the people of Western Australia. It will be wasted in the most disgraceful way by the spending of half that sum—approximately \$5 million per annum—on the shambles called the Perth-Fremantle railway.

Mr Parker: How much did you say—\$5.5 million?

Mr CLARKO: I said about \$5 million and, if that figure is not correct, I would be happy for the Minister to tell me the correct figure.

Mr O'Connor: That is the starting point.

Mr CLARKO: Whether it is four or three, it is just a figure. I said it is about \$5 million a year.

Mr Parker: I am saying it is a lot less than that.

Mr CLARKO: The typical niggling mosquito approach! Why does not the Minister take on a Boucher-like approach?

Mr Barnett: Don't be aggressive, bullfrog!

Mr CLARKO: The situation is quite clear: This is an amount of \$5 million out of the \$11 million which has been taken off the Civil Servants who have dedicated their working lives to the State, for this fiasco, to pay off a debt for a bunch of Greenies or whatever who happen to live

along that railway line, which railway line, by the way, in an area of the size of metropolitan Perth having a small population, is not the most acceptable form of transport. Perhaps if we had a huge population, it might be more successful.

That particular group of people will be given a handout because they happen to live by a railway line which serves the electorate of Fremantle and it is bad luck for the people who live in the northern suburbs. Those people living in the northern corridor will help fund the service. An amount of \$2.35 will be lost every rail journey by every passenger—what a great waste of money. In addition, at the same time as the Government was to save this \$11 million, it decided, within a matter of a few days, despite the fact that the Industrial Commission had just refused MTT bus drivers an increase, to provide another \$5 million about equal to go to the Perth-Fremantle railway—in deliberate defiance of the orders of the Industrial Commission which offset what was taken from the 4 000 people. If the wages freeze was to continue for another year, it would save them about \$100 million a year together with all the Government's broken promises, as illustrated earlier by my leader.

Look at the sheer hypocrisy of this group of highwaymen who are interested in only one thing—putting charges up and keeping them up—and yet they turn around and do something such as give the Chairman of Committees a motor car. I held that office from 1977 to 1982. It is as much sheer nonsense to suggest that the Chairman should have a motor car as it is to suggest that every member of Parliament should have one. As for the nonsense that was uttered that he has been given a few extra invitations to cocktail parties on behalf of the Ministers is an absolute distortion of the truth in an extreme way.

I understand that the Chairman of Committees has a fridge in his office. I do not know if it is true, but if he invites me to his office I will endeavour to find out the truth. Drinking on the job might improve some of the decisions that he will make! It is disgraceful. This is only one example. I understand it is a pay-off from the Government because he stood down from the Ministry and this allowed the Government to bring in a courteous gentleman from the other House, Mr Dowding!

The Liberal Party has been in power for 21 years out of 24 years and has won seven out of the last nine elections; but can anyone imagine what would have been said had the President of the Liberal Party been appointed as a State adviser to the Premier? The Government, when in Opposition, bleated about the appointment of W. W. Mitchell, who was paid an amount of \$19 000 last

year and who had to provide the cost of an office, secretary, and telephone. Now, we have Mr Farrell receiving a salary of \$35 000 approximately; and this does not include the cost of being in a public building.

Last year an article was printed in *The Independent* newspaper which stated that the cost of employing a person was his take-home pay plus 50 per cent of his salary. Therefore, Mr D. Farrell is costing the State \$50 000, a year and the Government bleated and whinged about W. W. Mitchell.

This is to say nothing about the other people who have been appointed as advisers to the Government—for example, the appointment of Mr Butler. We know that the Premier needs an additions teacher. The position is clear. The Minister for Education has employed an adviser who has a Bachelor of Arts degree and who is one of his former mates in the State debating team. She drives past a couple of schools on her way to work, but what else does she know about education?

Mr Pearce: She is as well qualified as you. Ask me this question at question time and I will tell you.

Mr CLARKO: Has the Opposition provided her with a motor vehicle?

Mr Pearce: No.

Mr CLARKO: Is she travelling on buses?

Mr Old: Probably on the Perth-Fremantle railway.

Mr CLARKO: The system of advisers that has been adopted by the Government is the greatest rip-off that has occurred in this State. Appointing someone like Mr Butler, who was the President of the Australian Labor Party, could not be a more classical example of "jobs for the boys". It is also "jobs for the girls" to appoint one of the Minister for Education's debating team—on a salary of \$20 000 to \$30 000—to write his speeches; although he probably needs that. Another example is the appointment of Mr McGinty to the field of Industrial Relations in order that he can advise the Minister. Dr Wood I understand is paid approximately \$45 000 a year. Add 50 per cent on to that and work out how much that is costing.

Look at the classic Whelan the wrecker's job at the superannuation building. Certain rooms have been locked up—they must be the ones that house the direct lines to Moscow. Remember the caravan that Cowles had—the Government probably bought it!

The Government has taken \$11 million from public servants in this State, including primary school teachers and the like—some of the finest workers in this State—in order to provide positions for its friends. All I can say is that, if the people they have taken from the Labor Party are the most skilful available, the Government will soon return to the Opposition and remain there during my lifetime. It will be only a couple of years before it is in Opposition again.

The greatest thing is the Premier's attempt to show that our financial position is now dramatically worse than it was last year or the year before. The inflation rate has decreased and I cannot see how the situation will not improve. It would be interesting for the Premier to tell the Parliament at the earliest opportunity how much he expects to lose on stamp duty, taxes, and so on. It will be peanuts compared with the amounts wasted on blue collar workers and a score of other things—whether it be the Perth-Fremantle railway or "Bunbury 2000". What a great farce that is.

Where is the four-lane highway to Bunbury, while the Government is giving consideration to providing electric trains to this town? All these promises will come home to roost.

The wage freeze should be offsetting all faults I have mentioned, but what is being done is not helping the people of Western Australia.

The Government has an industrial policy where its aims are to provide employment. Employment is the first thing that the Government is attacking because it is saying that public servants should be replaced with only one for every two employees who leave. This has caused consternation in both the Education Department and the Health Department where the appropriate Ministers have been given the power to determine what happens when employees retire. The current policy is not clear to employees in both those departments.

To rub it in a little further, it is interesting to note that in a newspaper of 23 June 1983 the Premier was quoted as follows when referring to the pay cut—

He said that part of the reason for the cut had been to provide an example of sacrifice.

If the Government is really serious about acquiring additional moneys why do not members of the Ministry forego their ministerial allowances? That would be an excellent example of a sacrifice—Ministers could live on the same amount of money as those people working around them.

Mr Parker: You resent it.

Mr CLARKO: It will not hurt Ministers to get by without the \$21 000. I refer now to two other items.

Mr Gordon Hill: Empty vessels make the most noise.

Mr CLARKO: One item concerns day labour and school cleaning contractors. At the behest of the advisers, who happen to belong to the ALP—

Mr Hassell: No political taste.

Mr CLARKO: No, I do not think they have. They were prepared to waste the sum of \$4 million per annum in relation to school bus contractors until they finally backed down. The amount of \$3 million to \$4 million per annum apparently means nothing in regard to cleaners and blue collar workers who might vote for us.

With regard to school cleaning contractors the Government says, "We will make them pay." The Government has set about destroying these small businesses which are situated around the State, and the contractors have been put in a state of complete anxiety. Turmoil has occurred in every country town in Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

Mr CLARKO: The road transport association said—

Several members interjected.

Mr CLARKO: Members opposite are trying to talk me down but they will not succeed.

The school bus contract system is the Government's and the Premier's responsibility and they have made a complete mess of it. Last month the Government said that the system would involve a completely open tendering scheme and now the Government has backed off.

Mr Pearce: Not at all.

Mr CLARKO: Mr Birks wrote to every school bus contractor and said that the Government had agreed in principle to an open tendering system, and now it has backed down.

Mr Pearce: The letter was sent to bus contractors who were told that the Government was having discussions with the road transport association about a different method of assessing contracts. They were warned not to transfer their buses until these discussions had been finalised.

Mr CLARKO: Mr Birks' letter stated that the Government had adopted a fully competitive open-tendering system, and what the Minister has said will be recorded in *Hansard*.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balg—Premier) [8.12 p.m.]: One cannot help but conclude that members of the Opposition are real whingers.

Mr Clarko: That is something which you know about.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have not been willing in the past to try and direct the Opposition on the right track and if they are in the mood for any advice, my advice would be this—that the politics reflected so precisely in their demeanour tonight is the reason defined exactly for their defeat at the last election.

Mr Clarko: Why were you defeated three times prior to that?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If they are yet to learn a lesson that hard politics marched out of the door with Sir Charles Court, their defeat will last a long time. The Government really does not mind because the way in which the Opposition has carried on, in a fairly traditional amendment to the Address-in-Reply has been, to say the least, a shabby and a poor attempt to repeat what Sir Charles Court simply was much better at doing—being strident and unreasonable, and in today's terms, being unsympathetic to the general feeling of the public.

That is my view, for what it is worth. I venture to say that if the Opposition fails to learn its lesson they will sit on the Opposition benches for a long time to come. The amendment that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition cavorts from the absurd to the ridiculous, drawing strength from issues that simply do not support the contentions that the Opposition leader makes in a fairly stumbling sort of manner.

Mr O'Connor: Not as stumbling as you are at the moment.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let us start at the beginning and look at the first paragraph of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition in which he says—

But we regret to inform Your Excellency of the erosion in public confidence in Her Majesty's Government for the following reasons—

I do not know whether this man cannot read, but if he cannot, I wish someone on his side of the House would tell him that published on 26 July was the result of the latest opinion poll conducted by the Morgan Research Organisation.

Mr Hassell: That is how you conduct your Government, isn't it—Government by opinion poll!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That shows that, from the Government's point of view, its popularity stands higher than it was when we won the last election.

Mr O'Connor: How did you feel out on the steps today?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know whether that supports the Opposition leader's contention that somehow or other the Government's popularity has been eroded, but certainly it was not something the Leader of the Opposition referred to and he was careful not to define what it was that he drew his strength from in making the assertion that the Government's popularity has been eroded. It was not borne out by the opinion poll, and it was not borne out by the shabby sort of performance the Opposition has mounted tonight.

I want to move quickly—I do not want to delay the House unnecessarily on this matter—to one of the absolutely bewildering gymnastic tricks that the Opposition leader mounts when he talks of mistakes in calculations about deficits of statutory authorities, and I must admit that this had us tricked for about a week because we could not understand just how the Leader of the Opposition could be making the claims that he was making. It was in a moment of jest that I said my nine-year-old daughter would be able to complete the calculation correctly, and, even in reference to her, the Leader of the Opposition was wrong because she is nine years old and not seven. My comment was only in jest, and I am pleased to be able to explain to the House how it is that the Leader of the Opposition repeatedly makes this mistake.

Mr O'Connor: No, you made the mistake, not us.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Members will find this hard to believe, and I will repeat it slowly for the benefit of those who need a steady pace. This is the truth—

Mr Blaikie: It will be interesting for a change if it is the truth.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —referring to the State Energy Commission. The Leader of the Opposition has said repeatedly that our Press release stated that the increases in charges to be imposed on SEC consumers would raise \$56 million. Nowhere in the Press release was that figure mentioned. We tried to ascertain the option that the Leader of the Opposition had pursued in arriving at the figure, and we found it—and this will split your sides, Mr Speaker.

Mr O'Connor: Your total was \$58 million.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In two statements in the Press release these things were said. The first was that, in 1982-83, the SEC would incur a loss of \$12 million, and the second was that in 1983-84, were there no increase in charges, the loss would be \$68 million. So that was \$12 million loss in

1982-83, and with no change in charges, a \$68 million loss in 1983-84.

Do members know what the Leader of the Opposition did? He subtracted the first deficit from the second to arrive at \$56 million. It is quite an amazing thing! He took the \$12 million loss off \$68 million loss to get to \$56 million.

Mr O'Connor: You will admit that when I quoted that I gave you the greatest benefit of taking the smallest figure I could get.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do know if that somehow remedies the arithmetical capacity of the Leader of the Opposition that he is prepared to make mistakes to advantage the Government.

Mr O'Connor: I didn't make mistakes.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The truth is this: We cannot take a loss from one year off a loss for the next year to get a lower loss that never existed anywhere but in his mind. That is the sort of arithmetical gymnastics that the Leader of the Opposition gets up to and then he says that somehow or other the Government cannot understand mathematics.

Mr O'Connor: It can't.

Mr Clarko: You proved nothing there—not a thing.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There is another matter about which the Leader of the Opposition made great play and that is the question of prophesying Doomsday and generally making provocative statements about the deficit. Now the Under Treasurer advising the present Government is the same man who advised, without criticism from the then Government, the present Opposition, and this is the situation in respect of the deficits.

On 3 February the Under Treasurer advised the then Premier that the prospective deficit that his Government was facing was \$21 million. The election had not even been held and that was the deficit that the then Government was told it was facing for the present financial year. Do members know what happened then? The Opposition that accuses us of being deceitful and secretive concealed that minute from the Under Treasurer and refused to make it public and then Opposition members had the gall to say that we are deceitful.

Members of this Government who, 16 days before an election, can take a minute like that, put it in a drawer, and keep it secret, are then saying we are deceitful. Do members know what, after the elections the member for Narrogin said in excuse was the reason the Government failed to reveal that minute? He said it could have been misinterpreted.

Mr P.V. Jones: That is not true.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Had the latter been released, it is very likely that the member for Narrogin would not be here to say anything. Any party that would do that and then accuse this Government of being deceitful—

Mr Clarko: We'll see what you do in January 1986.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —would not have a feather to fly with. On 10 March the same Under Treasurer who advised the Opposition when it was in Government told us that the prospective deficit was \$23.9 million. On 2 May the same Under Treasurer said that the prospective deficit was \$32.3 million. That is the advice from the Under Treasurer.

Mr O'Connor: But he would know also that at the end of the year a lot of money comes in.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am simply trying to get through the minds of Opposition members that this was the advice coming from the Under Treasurer about the prospective deficit. Presumably he had taken into account all the likely variations to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, but then in talking about my being misleading—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition says that at some Rotary Club meeting I told people who were gathered there that the deficit was a prospective \$175 million.

Mr O'Connor: Correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Now that is nonsense; absolute nonsense.

Mr Clarko: We can get some witnesses to say it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member may get some witnesses, but it is still nonsense.

Mr Clarko: Is it?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Even the least among members opposite—the member for Murchison-Eyre—would not be on public record one day saying the deficit was \$34 million and the next day saying it was \$175 million.

Mr Clarko: But you might.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: One would not have to develop a theory of relativity overnight to know one would not get away with that.

In my brief contribution to the rejection of this amendment, amongst other things I want to refer to the absurd proposition put up continually by the Leader of the Opposition that we should somehow or other do something that Sir Charles Court and other Treasury people have advised

against doing and that is to take the investments on the short-term money market and use those earnings to balance the Budget retrospectively.

Mr O'Connor: No.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is exactly what everyone seems to be saying tonight.

Mr O'Connor: That is not true.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let me say this is the true situation in respect of the last two financial years. At the end of 1980-81, \$12.6 million was available and was allocated to the 1981-82 Consolidated Revenue Fund. Only \$12.2 million was needed, and \$8.4 million was injected into the capital works programme. At the end of 1981-82, \$30.9 million was put into the 1982-83 Consolidated Revenue Fund to balance the Budget. As it turned out, that \$30.9 million earned the previous year was insufficient to balance the Budget and the deficit that has remained is the result of that inability. But now this is the proposition from the Leader of the Opposition that we should depart from that tradition that his Governments have followed and take the earnings from last year from the investments of cash balances on the short-term money market to balance the Budget. So in the same year he suggests we use the investments from two separate years.

Mr O'Connor: You have always supported this view.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will get onto that support later. That is what the Leader of the Opposition says, and I will tell members why we will not do it. We will not do it because we will not be seen to be covering up for a deficit he created and that we have been able to pull back from \$34 million to \$14 million.

Mr O'Connor: The comedian!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: And does it not hurt members opposite that we will not pick up their Budget deficit for them, that we will show the public of this State exactly what the situation was. I will tell members also that we will carry that \$14.2 million deficit, every year reducing it as we can, as a reminder to that Opposition of its efforts when it was in Government. Let me say that I do not claim authority for my interpretation of the then Government's intention.

Mr O'Connor: We left you with \$60 million on the short-term earnings of 1982-83.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This is the answer that the now Leader of the Opposition gave when he was Premier on 12 August last year. This is what he said when asked about the practice of using cash balance investment funds for the year past to balance the Budget. He explained his actions by

saying that not using the money in that way was a practice of reducing uncertainties in the Budget by taking the amount earned in any one year into account in the following year's Budget when the actual sum earned up to the previous 30 June is known. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said when he was Premier.

Mr O'Connor: So you admit we left you a nest egg to take into next year?

Mr Clarko: He doesn't want to answer that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let me answer that by trying to explain once again that had we decided to balance the Budget by using the funds from the investment of short-term money cash balances, we simply would have been digging a bigger hole for next year. Can members opposite understand that?

Mr Clarko: What do you know about Government finances?

Mr O'Connor: It makes no difference. If you had left the \$50 million deficit which you could have done, and carried the extra \$50 million into next year's account, does it make any difference financially? Of course it doesn't.

Mr Clarko: It is a paper entry.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The knowledge of the member for Karrinyup is quite outstanding. He talks about paper entries; that is in the tradition of the worst socialist-oriented mentality: Deficits are a paper thing. One does not worry about deficits; one simply runs them up and somehow or other one forgets them. Sir Charles Court told us that running the State is like balancing the family budget. When a family runs out of money, the wife cannot print any more, and neither can the husband.

I want to touch on one or two other matters. The first is the Perth-Fremantle railway line. How long are we to put up with the sort of nonsense we have heard from the member for Karrinyup who says it will cost \$5 million to open the Perth-Fremantle railway line?

Mr Clarko: I said per annum.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Consistently we have said the true cost is \$1.6 million.

Mr Clarko: To open it or to run it per annum? Is that the annual loss?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The net cost in the first year of operation is \$1.6 million and \$800 000 is the capital expenditure associated with the opening. So if the member for Karrinyup wants to pursue the matter, he will find the ground on which he stands is leaner than he thought. The main point to be drawn from that sort of exercise on which the Opposition embarks is this: When it

suits the Opposition, the Government should not honour election undertakings, and, when it suits the Opposition, the Government should honour election undertakings. As I said previously, if the Opposition is of that mind, then it should give us a list of those promises it thinks we should honour and those promises it thinks we should not. Strangely enough, we are of the mind to try to honour them all.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I shall make a couple of quick comments about overseas travel. On 22 March 1982, when we were talking about overseas travel for the then Government, the present Leader of the Opposition approved an overseas trip by the then Minister for Labour and Industry that cost \$25 000.

Mr I. F. Taylor: That is disgusting!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I ask members: How is that? The Opposition prattles on about the number of inquiries established and their cost. During the years of the last Government, a total of 124 inquiries were set up and they cost \$6.8 million.

Mr O'Connor: You will not disclose yours.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Referring to ministerial advisers, I wonder whether the Opposition is prepared to admit that, in 1975, the Court Government proposed appointing ministerial advisers; but what happened? I understand that the opposition was not pursued, because the then Premier (Sir Charles Court) wanted all the advisers in his office!

Mr Clarko: What a lot of nonsense!

Mr MacKinnon: What a lot of rubbish!

Mr Clarko: The President of the Australian Labor Party is your adviser—stealing from the public purse!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If members opposite want some more argument about advisers, I indicate that the Reid committee appointed by Mr Fraser to review Commonwealth administration had this to say in January this year—

Both sides of politics have in recent years when in Government seen a number of advantages in some Ministers having special advisers in their private offices.

I will tell members why W. W. Mitchell occasioned such criticism, if it has not dawned on them already. The reason was not that W. W. Mitchell was a member of any political party, but that when he was on the public payroll he was politically active making public statements in support of the then Government.

Mr MacKinnon: And the State ALP isn't? What is the State President of the ALP doing?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is the difference—

Mr MacKinnon: What is the State President of the ALP doing?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is the difference, Mr Speaker—

Mr MacKinnon: What a hypocrite!

Several members interjected.

Mr MacKinnon: Sit down!

Mr O'Connor: Come on! You can do better than that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is the difference between political advisers under this Government and political operatives under the previous Government.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Don't they squirm! It is all right for members opposite to stand up and try to dish it out, describing members of the Government as flies, fleas, and, mosquitoes, but they can't take it!

Mr Hassell: What a weak effort!

Mr MacKinnon: You had better boost his ego.

Several members interjected.

[Applause.]

MR RUSHTON (Dale) [8.34 p.m.]: It has been some time since we have heard members clapping in this House.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: I understand the microphone is working. Initially I point out the Premier has blown his disguise of being shy and caring—a disguise which he made a great effort to present to the people. He has blown the lot tonight by showing himself to be cynical, as we have known him to be all these years.

Mr MacKinnon: They should televise Parliament!

Mr RUSHTON: The Premier presented a dissertation on the Budget and he has shown himself to be totally inexperienced in his role as Treasurer. I hoped that the Premier would go home to Sue tonight so that she could give him some fundamental information on arithmetic. The Premier suggested that the present Leader of the Opposition, the previous Premier, did not disclose to the public the alleged deficit of \$21 million as indicated to him just prior to the election.

Anybody who has been in Government would know that such a figure is prospective and not only were funds available on the short-term money market to balance the Budget at the end of

the year, but also every year the Government reviewed its position and arrived at a balance as at 30 June.

This has been done year after year and was a course followed by the Court and O'Connor Governments and, indeed, the Brand Government. Balancing the Budget is a restraint which the present Government could well afford to emulate.

The point is members opposite do not understand financial matters and they demonstrated that tonight. The Premier has left the House just as I was about to refer to the comments he made.

When in Opposition, the Premier used to lean on the front bench and take on the mantle of Perry Mason, saying, "Did the Budget balance?" Of course, the Budget balanced. It is about time the media put that in headlines. Of course, the Budget balanced.

I shall read some of the latest remarks the Premier was reported to have made as they appeared in *The West Australian* this morning. They read as follows—

If the money was used to balance last year's deficit—a practice not favoured by the Treasury or followed by previous Liberal governments—it could not be used in the 1983-84 Budget.

Where the devil does the Premier think the money goes? If the Budget is not balanced this year, the figure must be adjusted next year. It is simply too stupid and infantile to suggest that the Budget was not balanced. A total of \$37 million was earned on the short-term money market last year when we had the O'Connor Government until February and the Burke Government after that. The Premier admitted that \$37 million was earned, and yet he is saying it could not be used.

I hope that at last the media will check the situation. Indeed, it does not even need to do so, because the report appeared in the newspaper this morning. We can all see this ludicrous saga on the part of the Government has continued with the objective, as admitted by the Premier, of ensuring the record of the O'Connor Government was blemished.

The Premier cannot succeed in his objective, because it is not true and, indeed, one of the great strengths of the Liberal-National Country Party coalition Government was that it managed its financial affairs in an orderly fashion.

I ask members: What has the Burke Government done since 19 February? Already it has added \$1.4 million to a potential deficit—if, in fact, there was one. However, the Burke Government had a \$23 million cash credit to start with,

but it wasted \$1.4 million on MTT wages. Another \$0.8 million was spent on refurbishing the railways. The Minister for Transport has not answered my questions in that regard. He does not want to do so, because the answers would show up his Government. We will not receive that information until after the Fremantle-Perth railway has been opened again and, at that stage, I suppose the details will not be so important to the Government.

The Government has set about reducing transport services and wasting money. I can assure the Minister that the re-opening of the Fremantle-Perth railway will cost the taxpayers of this State more than \$5 million a year. However, I will say more about that matter on another occasion when sufficient time is available.

In my opening remarks, Sir, I intended to congratulate you on your appointment and I feel sure you will do a good job. I also congratulate all new members on their election.

This Government is inexperienced and, therefore, one cannot look in depth at its performance at this stage.

Mr Parker: You had a lot of experience, but it did not seem to help your performance much.

Mr RUSHTON: It is reasonable that the Government has not carried out anything of note as yet and it could not be expected to do so. The Government has taken three initiatives in my previous portfolio of Transport. The first was to re-open the Fremantle-Perth railway. That was a disaster. The second was to install a new platform at Midland station which was a commitment by the Minister to his electorate, although his advisers were dead against such a move.

Mr Gordon Hill: The Minister does not represent the Midland area.

Mr RUSHTON: No, but a number of people in his electorate asked for a new platform.

The third initiative related to the expenditure of \$1.4 million. In that case the Minister acted over the heads of his advisers and directed that the sum be paid. This morning's *The West Australian* indicated this was a total disaster and an embarrassment to the Government. The following statement was made about that decision—

A WA Government lawyer told the Arbitration Commission in Melbourne yesterday that the State Government's handling of a bus drivers' wage claim earlier had been embarrassing.

Mr O'Connor: It is time they changed the Minister.

Mr RUSHTON: The report goes on in some detail about the matter, but members can read it for themselves. However, this was an embarrassment to all, including the management of the MTT. It is one of the reasons that the deficit of the MTT will continue to blow out.

The Government intends to reopen the Fremantle-Perth railway and on top of that it has spent \$1.4 million—

Mr Grill: Your policies created this situation and you were the Minister who presided over the biggest blowout in the public transport deficit ever known in this State.

Mr RUSHTON: Isn't it funny? The Minister has told untruths previously and he is doing so again. They will be rammed down his throat, because he is totally incorrect and what he is saying is completely untrue.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: Members opposite can speak to Treasury about the tremendous savings achieved in my time in the Transport portfolio. The Minister was not aware that during the period my Government was in office, we saved a colossal amount in terms of employment. The Minister looked into the matter and got into real trouble, but we will fix him up when we have the time to speak in detail on the matter.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: However, it was amazing that, before the Minister acquainted himself with his portfolio—he certainly is not acquainted with it yet—he went off to Singapore. Today I directed a question to him and, of course, the answer was gobbledygook. However, the Minister went to Singapore to learn about matters which bore no relation to public transport in Perth. All the information he gathered in Singapore is already available in Western Australia. All the information the Minister could gain about shipping was already held in his own portfolio.

Mr Grill: You mean all the information of which you are aware is available in Western Australia.

Mr RUSHTON: Therefore, the Minister was wasting the taxpayers' money.

Mr Grill: Just like you did, I suppose.

Mr RUSHTON: I support the amendment moved by my leader which condemns the activities of the Government during its first five months in office. It is quite obvious the Government has not done anything worthwhile yet, but we condemn the way the Government has gone about preparing to do things and the way in which it has criticised the previous Government.

The public transport fare increases instituted by the Government this year are a disgrace. The same proposal for zoning came forward last year and I knocked it back for a very good reason: We cared about the people who most needed the transport; that is, the people who were hit hardest by this new move. They are the people who live in distant parts and yet this Government has introduced the biggest hike in fares that has been seen for a long time.

An increase in fares is not the way by which to reduce the public transport deficit. Other measures should be taken and we shall have the opportunity to mention those in due course.

In a facetious answer to a question I addressed to the Minister, he invited me to tell him something about transport and I shall do that at another time in debate in this House.

The Government is creating a fund which, when we were in office, members opposite used to call a "slush fund" and they charged us with the responsibility for creating one from money made on the short-term money market. However, the Government is creating such a fund by excessively increasing public transport fares and other Government charges. That is obvious when one realises that a wages freeze has been in operation and workers expect a four per cent increase in wages this year. Despite that, we have this huge blowout in public transport fares.

Ministers have not yet answered all the questions directed to them. This is the place where such answers should be provided, but the Government has been very stubborn and does not want to explain fully what it has done. However, it will all come out in the end, because we are tenacious and will follow up the questions and obtain answers in due course.

It is upsetting to see this Government manipulating the minds of members of the public by a vast increase in the number of party political stories being written by ALP followers. The media has given these people a long honeymoon. However, I hope that situation will change soon, because very long honeymoons make for very tired Government members. Indeed, they are looking rather distressed at the moment and it would be good for them to come out into the open and be subjected to the normal pressures of a free interchange of information regarding their actions.

Obviously the Government received some treatment today when public servants vented their spleens in the way they did, and as they should have done, as a result of the Government's aggressive and unsympathetic treatment of the Pub-

lic Service in the short time this Government has been in office.

The question of political advisers represents a disgrace. What would have happened if, when in Government, we had appointed political advisers to the extent that this Government has? It could be rightly said that we had two political advisers during our period in office, but I am told that already 55 people have been appointed by this Government through the Public Service to spy, one might say, on apolitical people. It must be distressing to people who have served this State so well for so many years to have infiltrators mixed amongst them.

Soon after this Government took office I was called by someone who would not give me his name and who said that the calls going out of his office were monitored, obviously for the purpose of determining whether the people calling out were in sympathy with the previous Government. Such monitoring is disgraceful. Public servants are afraid to mention this monitoring in case their disagreement with it gets back to the Government, but what I have referred to is an example of what is taking place. It is an example of the form and structure of the Wran Government. We know what happened in New South Wales. A huge media team of advisers has been set up, and of course we know what will follow from its establishment.

We must consider Tasmania, which stood up to the Federal Government. This Government sold us out over that issue. Federalism means nothing to this Government; its members are centralist and socialist in their beliefs, and we must suffer that situation for the next two and a half years.

The actions of this Premier over the visits of American ships to Fremantle have been a total disgrace. He says his Government will carry out whatever the Federal Government says it should do about the visits of these ships to Western Australia. Why should not this Premier have an opinion of his own about what Western Australia should have? However, I believe we should say to our people and to the world, "We welcome the American ships that come here to defend us in times of stress. We welcome them here." They are the words the Premier should be using instead of saying that whatever is the policy of the Federal Labor Government, this Government will abide by. The Premier is in a bind with his State party; he is in a mess because he does not have an opinion of his own. He is not standing up for Western Australia and saying what should be done.

The differences between the philosophies of this Government and the Opposition will become clear

as we watch financial management by this Government and its stand in regard to federation, and the nationalisation of medicine that is taking place. These differences will be seen further in industrial policies, land rights, and other questions so vital to all who live in Western Australia.

This Government stands condemned by its deliberate misleading of the people of Western Australia, especially in regard to the State's finances. The Premier is not sitting in his seat because he is not prepared to be questioned on these matters. He was willing to stay in his seat when he was in Opposition, but now he is in Government he runs away.

Mr Parker: What are you talking about?

Mr RUSHTON: The Premier is not in his seat.

Mr Parker: This is the first time all day he has not been in his seat.

Mr RUSHTON: I know where he is. He will not answer these questions. He has run away from these questions. It is about time the media printed the facts and headlines such as "The 1982-83 Budget balances".

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [8.50 p.m.]: It has been interesting to listen to this debate and reflect on the change of roles that has taken place in this place. While this country's finances are going down the drain, tonight not one speaker on this amendment has made any suggestion to improve our situation.

Mr Blaikie: One thing is for sure, you are consistent.

Mr STEPHENS: We are consistent. It is a pity we have not had consistency from other members of this House.

The Government should feel flattered that the amendment was moved. I refer members to the amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply motion on 6 August 1980 by the then leader of the Labor Opposition, the member for Victoria Park. The intent of that amendment was identical to the intent of this amendment, although the phraseology is different. Members would be aware of the amendment moved to this Address-in-Reply, but they may not recall the amendment moved in August 1980. It reads—

But we regret to inform Your Excellency that your government—

- (a) was wilfully dishonest about the State's financial position before the recent election,
- (b) failed to subject requests from government departments and authorities for increases in charges

to the rigorous scrutiny expected of a responsible government,

- (c) manipulated the State's finances for its own electoral advantage before the recent State election with the consequence that subsequently the citizens of the State have had to meet unnecessarily high bills for government services, and,
- (d) has, thereby, lowered the standard of living of the average West Australian family which was already under attack from the policies and decisions of the Fraser Government.

Members of this House would agree that that amendment is almost identical in intent to the amendment before us. As I said, nothing has really changed except the roles, which have been reversed. If the present Government can feel flattered that an amendment it moved in 1980 has been followed up by this Opposition, I suppose the present Opposition can likewise feel flattered that this Government in increasing charges the way it has done in recent months took a leaf out of the Opposition's book.

On 31 May 1979 the then Premier, Sir Charles Court, announced a 3.5 per cent tariff increase for electricity and gas use. In making the announcement the Premier said that the State Energy Commission estimated that in the 1979-80 trading year there would be a surplus of \$2 million. When the Estimates for 1979-80 were presented to the House a surplus of \$1.54 million was indicated. However, on 23 April 1980, just eight weeks after the 1980 election, electricity charges increased by 18 per cent and gas charges by 24 per cent. What did we see reported in *The West Australian* of 23 June this year, not many weeks after the 1983 election? We saw that electricity and gas charges were increased by 15 per cent; the increases marginally less than those the Court Government introduced in 1980.

Mr Court: But they didn't promise no increase.

Mr STEPHENS: That all depends on what the member means by the word "promise". In 1980 the then Premier said that there would be a surplus of \$1.5 million, and if that was not a promise, it certainly was an indication of what was expected. The member would be playing around with the King's English if he said that a surplus did not indicate there would be no increase in charges.

Mr Rushton: Why not sit with your colleagues on the other side?

Mr STEPHENS: I am stating facts. If the member does not want the facts, he should re-

move himself from the House. I am sure the truth would hurt him. Possibly he finds it difficult to understand the truth at any time. In May 1979 the Metropolitan Water Board proposed increases for the provision of water, sewerage, and drainage for the 1979-80 year. The fixed charge was to be increased from \$36 to \$44, an increase of 22.2 per cent, and the excess water rate was to be increased from 17c to 21c, an increase of 23.5 per cent. This proposal was rejected by the Cabinet and subsequently the increases for the fixed charge and the excess water rate were 11.1 per cent and 11.7 per cent. The then Government indicated that the proposed increases had been slashed because, had they been left at the level recommended by the board, the board would have had a substantial surplus by the end of the year. This statement was made in May 1979, yet at the end of that financial year the board incurred a loss of \$5.5 million. On 5 June 1980, a few weeks after the 1980 election, the then Premier, Sir Charles Court, announced that the fixed charge for water would increase from \$40 to \$60, an increase of 50 per cent. What have we seen the present Government do? It has increased the fixed charge rate by 7.9 per cent, although that is less than the increase imposed by the previous Government.

Mr Clarko: The inflation rate is different.

Mr STEPHENS: Is it that much different?

Mr Clarko: Last year it was 10 or 11 per cent, but this year it is running at 7.5 per cent.

Mr STEPHENS: That is not so according to the paper I read yesterday or the day before. The inflation rate is still in double digits. The excess water rate was increased by this Government by 16.1 per cent, whereas the previous Government increased it by 26 per cent. In 1980 sewerage rates were increased by 15 per cent and the present Government has increased them by 11.3 per cent. The figures I have cited are sufficient to indicate that the principles applied by the present Government are virtually identical to those applied by the Court Government in 1980.

I go further to suggest that next year increases will be substantially less than they have been this year, and in the following year, an election year, they will be less again or held at the rate set for that year. If that happens this Government will be following exactly the pattern adopted by the Court Government. In one way this Government can feel flattered that the Opposition has copied the amendment to this motion, whereas the Opposition could feel flattered that the Government is following the pattern set by the Court Government.

As I have said, this debate has not made any contribution to solving the State's ills. It has been a futile exercise. The member for Vasse said that my party has been consistent, and I certainly agree that it has been consistent in its attitude towards amendments to the Address-in-Reply—we will not support them. We did not support them when the Liberal Party was in power and we will not support them now. If we are to make any progress in this State, members should move substantive motions to achieve something. Certainly an amendment to the Address-in-Reply will achieve exactly nothing, except, perhaps, a wastage of time.

MR BLAIKIE (Vasse) [9.00 p.m.]: I wish to make a contribution to this debate on the amendment. It did not surprise me that the member for Stirling, as has been the case on a number of occasions, is supporting the Government. That stand is similar to the stand he has taken over the years.

Mr Cowan: We supported you on an amendment to the Address-in-Reply.

Mr BLAIKIE: I wish to comment about the policy announced by the Australian Labor Party during the election in relation to "Bunbury 2000". The Government has perpetrated a hoax upon the people of the south-west with the policy it has announced on "Bunbury 2000". The people have certainly been misled by this information. The policies were dishonest.

The document to which I am referring is the 1983 State Election Policy of the Australian Labor Party. The document contains a section entitled "Bunbury 2000". For the purpose of the House and for the *Hansard* record I will read out some of the items contained in that document. I believe them to be pertinent points because the *Hansard* is a record of the Parliament and the Government has a responsibility to answer that record. The *Hansard* record serves also as a medium whereby members can advise their electorates of the events in which they have taken part. That is what Parliament and the *Hansard* record is about. The document states—

A State Labor Government will improve inter-city transport by:

Introducing a rapid transit passenger rail service between Bunbury and Perth.

Electrifying the railway between Bunbury and Kwinana.

Upgrading the highway to Bunbury to a dual carriageway.

Supporting improvements and extensions to the Bunbury airport.

A State Labor Government will improve communications between Bunbury and Perth and ensure that the full range of communication facilities are available in the Bunbury region at a standard no less than that available in Perth.

It is little wonder that the people of the south-west believed that they would be getting the equivalent of a Metropolitan Transport Trust passenger service. It is little wonder also that they believed they may be getting an additional channel of the Australian Broadcasting Commission because that is part of the communication network that the people of the metropolitan area enjoy.

Notwithstanding that, I have some pity for the Minister responsible for the implementation of all this. The document states further—

The strategy outlined is entirely feasible within this State's financial resources.

So, the ALP claims the State's financial resources are quite capable of meeting all the requirements and promises of the Australian Labor Party to the people of the south-west.

I will pause now to enable the Premier, or the Minister, to comment and say whether that document is wrong or whether the Premier or the Minister responsible will say that there has been a misprint. Perhaps they will say whether I have been reading the correct section. Perhaps the member for Bunbury might say whether I am reading the correct page.

Mr Court: Can you hear anything?

Mr Grill: I will not retract from that document. It stands on its own two feet.

Mr BLAIKIE: The Minister will not retract from that document. The people of the south-west are expecting the Government to perform and comply with the undertakings it has given in that document.

The Government cannot perform and cannot provide all those undertakings out of the State's own financial resources.

The Government is now seeking a new site for a power station in the south-west and is looking in the Collie area. This document states that the Government will expedite the development of a new power station in Bunbury. That is a categorical statement printed in the policy document. If the Minister wishes to disagree and say it does not appear there, he may say so.

Mr Grill: We thought you might co-operate with "Bunbury 2000".

Mr BLAIKIE: I would be pleased to co-operate but I believe the Government must be honest. It is

unfortunate that the Premier should run out of the Chamber now. He has left the whole matter to his Minister.

Nowhere in this document can I find any reference to what the Government proposes to do with the Shannon River Basin. Maybe the member for Bunbury or the member for Mitchell may be able to tell me where I can find such a reference.

Mr D. L. Smith: In the ALP policy document.

Mr BLAIE: I would like to know where. I have read the policy document from cover to cover and cannot find any such reference.

In December 1982 the ALP printed another document which was called the "Bunbury 2000 Development Strategy". It set out in great detail the comments which are shown in the State policy platform. I hope the member for Bunbury can understand that I am explaining it in "third-grade failed" terms because it is obvious the Premier and the Minister cannot understand their own policy. Nowhere in the "Bunbury 2000" document is mention made of the Shannon River Basin, yet the Government has denied the timber industry an important resource. The Government did not tell the people of the south-west what it would do and in the world of politics it is palpably wrong to deceive.

The document stated further—

In consultation with industry representatives move to stabilise and consolidate the timber industry.

What a laugh that turned out to be: Before the timber industry knew what was happening, the Government made a decision to acquire an area, without consultation, now known as the Shannon River Basin and the timber industry was denied that area.

Mr D. L. Smith: When you were in Government, how many were out of work?

Mr BLAIE: I am surprised we have a comment from the member for Mitchell. I was worried my message was not being heard.

Mr D. L. Smith: As you know, I am a maiden.

Mr BLAIE: There was no comment relating to the Shannon River Basin and that decision will cost the timber industry dearly.

The basis of my leader's motion is that the Government cannot fulfil the undertakings to the electors of this State because of the financial position of the State. Although the Government has been in office for five months only it has been proved that it cannot fulfil all its undertakings.

Let us remember the election time and what happened in the electorate of Warren. It is unfortunate the member for Warren is not here because I would have liked him to be in the Chamber when I made my remarks about his electorate.

During the election campaign the member for Warren became concerned about the allegations of what the Australian Labor Party would do to the timber industry if and when it became Government. The member for Warren was quoted in *The Warren-Blackwood Times* of 9 February 1983 as follows—

Mr Evans said that the timber industry did not have anything to fear under the next Brian Burke-led State Labor government.

That comment was made prior to February 1983. I wonder what would happen if he made those comments in Quinup, Nannup, Margaret River, Pemberton, and other areas now, and tried to explain the policy. The Premier did not come clean. He did not tell the timber workers that he would create a national park forthwith. He said that under a Labor Government jobs would be saved and that the workers would be looked after. He told the people not to believe the Liberals because his Government would look after them. The Premier is welcome to interject on me and state where in the document mention is made of the Shannon River Basin. The Government has been completely dishonest with the people of Western Australia and especially the people of the south-west.

Again I invite the Premier to say that my information is incorrect. He is welcome to put me on the right track. However, the Premier's silence indicates that I am right.

Mr Tonkin: You are far right!

Mr BLAIE: During the election campaign members had an opportunity to express what they would do for their electorate should their party become Government. I will quote from the *South Western Times* of 10 February 1983, where the Labor candidate for the Lower Central Province (John Bird) said in part about the timber industry—

The timber management policy of the ALP is balanced and sound.

It recognises the role of the Forests Department's research and the tailoring of the timber industry to a perpetual yield.

Labor is committed to maintain the supply of logs to the sawmill and wood chip industries at the levels set down in the Forests Department working plan.

Both the timber industry and forest reserves must be protected. "Timber, trees and jobs" best sums up Labor's policy.

There has been consistent neglect of the well being of all country dwellers. People who live in the country have disadvantages which are not fully recognised by parliaments and city people. The ALP policy in relation to the timber industry really refers to timber and trees and to hell with the jobs because workers do not really count. The Shannon River decision will have a profound effect on the scale of employment and investment opportunities and the future of the timber industry. I make the point that at no stage did the ALP come clean—they were not honest during the election. At no stage did they tell the people of the south-west what they were going to do with the Shannon River Basin. I refer now to remarks by the member for Warren who, in his final comments during the election run-up, said—

A State Labor government is committed to undertake a number of actions aimed at developing the Lower South-West and these include:

Intensively treating an additional area of degraded forest of at least 2000 ha-year to restore its timber potential.

A detailed investigation and trails of whether an increased soft wood industry and plantation hardwood industry can be achieved in this region. . .

The setting up of a task force comprised of representation of government departments, the timber industry and chamber of commerce to determine what industries can be established in the Lower South-West to offset the downward trend.

At no stage did any Minister, member, or senior officer of the Government indicate to the people of the south-west what this Government planned to do. The Government by its actions has cost jobs and confidence and has seriously damaged an industry that had a future until this Government came along.

I refer now to the final piece of advertising which went out during the election campaign. It was issued by the member for Warren, obviously in co-operation with the ALP. It appeared in all the papers in the south-west and stated—

An important message for all timber and forestry workers from Dave Evans. "Your jobs are safe with Labor".

It goes on to refer to other factors. I would like to table this paper for the edification of members.

The Leader of the Opposition has said already that the Government gave false undertakings to the electors of the State. I have referred to only one area but I could have spoken of others. I could have said the Government deceived the people of the south-west by not advising them that it would put in train a system whereby the Government is intent on taking over country water supplies. It did not come clean about that during the election.

To return to the timber industry; it is an important industry and has been a vital employer of labour in the south-west. The Government did not indicate to the people in its election manifesto or the strategy paper "Bunbury 2000" what its intentions were. The people were entitled to know what the Government proposed to do.

Mr Grill: Isn't it true that that industry declined dramatically under your Government?

Mr BLAICKIE: I would like to protect the Minister from himself. He has a very important job looking after "Bunbury 2000". This is a great region and needs assistance, protection and understanding. I trust the Minister will realise the importance of the timber industry to this State. The tragedy is that when the upturn in the economy comes we will need resources and there will be opportunity for increased growth and employment in the timber industry. The Government's decision will make it far more difficult for the industry to recover than in the past. The Shannon River decision is very damaging.

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin) [9.20 p.m.]: I want to comment on some matters relating to the State Energy Commission. The Premier made a comment about a statement I was supposed to have made in regard to a Cabinet minute or some advice to the former Premier. I want to make it clear I have never seen any minute and none was presented at any Cabinet meeting at which I was present. In particular, I did not make that statement.

I was referring to the Price Waterhouse report which was received by the SEC and forwarded by the commission to me immediately prior to the election with the request that it be made public. I refused to do so. The SEC was keen that it be made public because the then Opposition had levelled attacks at the SEC over its bookkeeping and financial duties. The report referred to the SEC's bookkeeping, if one can use that term, its financial management and duties, and drew the attention of the Government of the day and the SEC to some aspects that could be improved. But

the report supported the contention of the financial advisers that the SEC was a financially efficient utility. I do not think we need dispute that. I want to make it clear that the Premier's implication was completely wrong.

I have referred to the SEC as an energy utility. That is all it is. Unfortunately, it appears that the Government has not monitored what it is doing and has not honoured the promises it made before the election. I agreed with some of those proposals and told the SEC that I did. The ALP promised very specific reforms as far as the SEC was concerned. Some matters related to its commercial operations. The now Minister for Transport asked a lot of questions about it and was very critical of the SEC. He also sought a great deal of confidential commercial information which I as Minister at the time did not make available. It should not be made available and the new Government should not make available some aspects of commercial confidentiality. That is a simple fact of commercial negotiations; I am not being critical of it.

However, all the Government's promises about the SEC have suddenly disappeared. Some of them should disappear, but others had some merit and were similar to the proposals the then Government indicated it would be looking towards carrying out. One related to energy planning. We made it clear and I told the commissioner privately prior to the State election that although we were not as definite in our proposals as the present Government—which proposals seem temporarily to have been abandoned—our intention if re-elected was to make some changes in the SEC. These related particularly to energy planning and the long-term use of energy because the SEC is a utility and it has grown to doing other matters for which it was not and still is not completely suited.

It will be interesting to see what the Government will do and whether it will follow what I had intended to do; that is, when the Stanford Research Institute report which is imminently available—

Mr MacKinnon: The Minister denies it.

Mr P. V. JONES: The member and I know it is available. When it becomes public consideration must be given to whether the options and information in the report form the basis for the future structural operations of the commission and of energy planning in Western Australia. The report was commissioned to advise the Government on that point.

Some comments were made in answers to questions on tariffs and the Minister said the

Government had set up a small team to review SEC tariffs later in the year. The Minister should ask the commission where is the Ernst and Whinney report which was started two years ago. It deals with the structure of tariffs. It was not to determine the level of tariffs. The report was not completed but I wonder if the Minister has been told by the commission that it has been coming forward for some time and ought to be considered by the Government as the basis for future action.

I notice the member for Collie has little hope of getting information from his own party because the answer to question 190 on today's notice paper does not provide any information. Indeed, it provides less than I gave him on some matters.

I asked a question about consultations and the effect on SEC tariffs. In answer to question 221 I have been provided with a list of groups and various organisations which the Minister says were consulted prior to the determination being made on tariffs. My question asked—

Further to question 62 on Tuesday, 26 July respecting increases in Government taxes and charges, would he please detail those bodies with which consultations were held, and from which submissions were received?

I do not know whether submissions relating to energy were received from country shire councils, the Trades and Labor Council, local government, and so on, but in relation to energy I have seen the written report of one meeting between a group and representatives of the SEC, which report can be summarised in a few words as follows: "Take it or leave it. Whatever price we set, you will pay." If that is the way the Government monitors the SEC it is not fit to be the Government. An SEC spokesman was reported some time ago as saying that last year the SEC asked for a 15 per cent rise but that the Government of the day would give only 13 per cent. If there had been a further examination prior to the determination of the tariff levels, it might not have got that.

What examination did the Government make of the SEC's finances and the justification for its asking for the amount it originally sought? How thoroughly were the SEC's requirements examined? One of the areas in the Price Waterhouse report which I indicated we would be acting on, and which I discussed with the Under Treasurer, was that from this year the SEC's budget would be presented to Parliament in the Budget papers as are those of other Government instrumentalities. Parliament is entitled to discuss in detail the finances of every department and instrumentality. It has not done so with the SEC. We set that in motion. I discussed with the Under

Treasurer its being presented in considerable detail and in more detail than appears in table 28 in the financial statement of the Budget last year. All that gives is a very sketchy outline and it is not adequate.

I am saying that in the full knowledge that for three years I was responsible for the State Energy Commission and that it needed very severe handling and the involvement of a Minister.

I am well aware of the fact—and I make no apology for it—that the SEC was inclined to the view that I interfered too much. I know the present Minister has made a comment to the effect that he was left by me with no papers and no ideas or advice. I understand from some officers that he has made that point, although he has not told me that is what he said; but he very kindly wrote a letter to me to thank me for the information I gave him. I made clear the sorts of things he ought to be watching. I am suggesting that if he had not been seduced somehow by the SEC to accept whatever it was putting forward as holy writ, there would not be the kind of increase that is now being inflicted on the people.

What the Minister and the Government do not seem to have woken up to is that the charges are not levelled in accordance with percentage increases. They are only the tip of the iceberg. What happens, as others have made us aware, is that by adjustments to various tariff scales on a range of criteria, what the Government might consider it is doing in terms of an increase of 15 per cent does not always work out that way.

The Minister answered a question indicating that no information has been given about next year and likely movements then. For the edification of the Minister, I tell him that one or two businesses know what will happen next year in relation to gas, and the range of increase they can expect. One industry group has indicated there was no discussion with businesses, no justification, and no assessment of what was needed.

The Government needs to be a little more watchful about energy charges. It should make certain it is not just following a do-and-change operation; it should inquire into the way in which the SEC is operating its affairs. As the Minister, I was involved in the employment of every single person; but there was no great ministerial involvement until I was the Minister. If that involvement has not been maintained, the Minister might wake up one morning and be somewhat surprised at how much his outfit has grown. Is he continuing the kind of involvement that the Minister ought to have, not just because the SEC is an independent statutory authority? If he is not

doing that, and if the Government is not requiring him to do that as well as making its own assessment and being involved, as the Treasury and the Government ought to be, that could be one explanation for the increased SEC charges and the rise in energy costs, not just at 15 per cent, but at far greater rates.

I am trying to make it clear that in all Government instrumentalities the one thing to be determined is public accountability. I am speaking of utilities only, with some knowledge of the State Energy Commission. I agree wholeheartedly with the attitude of the Government, even though it did not adopt it in Opposition, when it was seeking all sorts of information regarding coal contracts, gas purchase contracts, and so on. I refused to give that information. I make it clear that I agree the Government should not give details of elements of those commercial negotiations.

What I do seek is a degree of public accountability from utilities that were monitored previously. As far as the SEC is concerned, some of the changes forecast by the Labor Party when it was in Opposition should not be introduced. There was some value in them; and this must not have been lost on the Labor Party.

At the time of the election, I agreed with some ALP members in relation to the structure of the SEC, its degree of accountability to the public, and its financial relationship with the Government. We did that; and I am seeking an assurance that the present Government is doing so. I do not know if it is.

We have not been given that assurance by the present Minister, and certainly not by the Premier. We need that assurance in relation to the work entrusted to the SEC in industrial and major resource development projects such as the aluminium smelter. I am beginning to wonder whether the Government will allow the SEC to buy a smelter. That is what we indicated publicly would not occur; and members of the then Opposition, now the Government, suggested that they would not allow that. I want to be assured that they will not allow it now.

In view of the pressure being placed on the Federal Government by the Victorian Government regarding the Alcoa smelter at Portland, I want to be assured concerning the promise of a smelter—we know it will not be at Bunbury, if it comes—and whether the Government is prepared to allow the SEC to fiddle the books and buy a smelter. I assure the House that is one matter of which we have knowledge—

Mr Davies: What, fiddling the books?

Mr P. V. JONES: I am referring to the way in which the SEC was going about financing the project in terms of its overseas borrowings, and the various ways in which it can utilise the financing of the pipeline, for example, in order to maintain the facade of financial accountability and financial responsibility which it has at present. We want to see that maintained; and it will be maintained only by a degree of intense Government involvement.

I am not referring to the SEC alone, or to the Minister. I am referring to the relationship between the State Treasury and the SEC, which has not always been good, and which needs to be better and total. That relates to the programmes proceeding before the election, such as the rural electrification programme, the assistance to remote localities, and the assistance to small businesses.

At the time the Government took office, the electricity tariff for small businesses was reasonable. In this House on a number of occasions I gave examples relating to shopping centre sizes. Those in the 50 000-kilowatt range had the lowest tariffs in Australia at the time the Government took office.

In some areas on the table, the tariffs were higher than those in other States. The figures were produced by me and tabled in this Parliament; and in fact they were updated during 1982 when I produced figures twice. Today, however, when the member for Murdoch questions the situation, all of a sudden, we are told the figures are not being produced.

The Government would do very well to ensure that the efficient electricity utility, the State Energy Commission, remains just that. It will remain just that only with the vigilance of the Government.

MR TRETHOWAN (East Melville) [9.39 p.m.]: I support the amendment, and in doing so I wish to discuss the type of trust contained in it. The amendment states that the Government cannot be trusted with the finances of the State. Trust has to be earned by anyone. If a person makes a promise and does not carry it out, the person to whom the promise was made will question any future statement.

The nature of the promises made by the Government when it was the Opposition before the election were calculated to produce a feeling of trust within the electorate of Western Australia—a trust that, should the then Opposition become the Government, they would provide for the people of Western Australia the things which they said they would provide. The performance of

the Government so far does not match the majority of its promises.

I suppose it would not be unusual for most people to consider that members of the Opposition do not trust what the Government said. We did not trust the promises made by the Government before the election; but obviously a large number of West Australians did so. I hope sincerely that the arguments placed by the Opposition this evening have been listened to by the people present, and that they will be carried to the rest of the Western Australian public by the members of the news media who have been listening. This is the performance related to the promises made—promises which have been broken in a majority of cases.

I question why those promises were made in the first place. I would have thought that if most reasonable people had any knowledge of the way the State is run, they would not expect the Government to keep all the promises made during the election campaign. If one accepts that premise, one realises that the making of the promises was purely a cynical exercise, with the knowledge that those making the promises would not be able to fulfill them if they became the Government. That was a cynical exercise calculated purely to delude sufficient people into voting for them in order that they might win Government.

The fact is that sufficient Western Australians placed their trust in those promises to vote in a Labor Government in this State. Since the election, that Government has formulated a style which I would call "government by media image". We have seen the continual opportunism of Press releases conveying a particular image that has led to the discrepancies which have been brought forward so clearly this evening by members of the Opposition in terms of the reality of the performance of the Government since its election. There is an old saying about fooling all the people some of the time but not being able to fool all the people all the time.

Quorum

Mr Williams called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr TRETHOWAN: Trust has to be earned. Certainly it must be said that in chasing media image the present State Government has been at least partially successful, but in the long run it will be measured by its performance.

I am also very interested to see how members of the public, when they receive their water rates and electricity accounts over the next few months, react to the massive increases in charges that have been imposed and which they will have to pay from their pocket.

It is our job in opposition to remind the people of Western Australia when they are meeting these increasing costs that they were promised by the current Government that there would be no increases. In the long run, if the Government's performance does not match up to its promises and to its media projections, the trust of the public in the Government will be eroded, and as its trust is eroded its popularity in the electorate will be eroded and it will have to face up to what the people will ask at the next election.

The other aspect of trust I want to raise relates to the advisers the Government has appointed to its ministerial staff. I question the reason that those advisers have been appointed. The obvious answer is that they were appointed because it was a case of "jobs for the boys" in return for work put in for the party machine to assist the Government to win office. Obviously that is one of the reasons for their appointment.

But why were they really appointed? Were they appointed not just to advise on policy, but also to act as a form of informers or monitors, or perhaps even as members of a secret service to look at the operation of the Public Service? I wonder how many members of the Public Service, particularly after receiving the kind of promise they have about salary cuts, are happy about people from outside being appointed to Ministers' offices. I begin to wonder about the professional integrity of the Public Service, which has always been high in this State; I wonder whether it is being questioned and whether in fact the Government does not trust the Public Service and, because it does not trust it, requires its own men in there, its own appointees, to make sure its will is done.

Mr Hodge: Do you think they might be ASIO officers?

Mr TRETHOWAN: I would more properly call them the unions' KGB. I imagine their position adds to their political standing in the eyes of many.

I also wonder about the way some of the Ministers may feel about their appointment. It is quite clear that the majority of the appointees have very strong ties with the Labor Party policy-makers and with the trade union movement. I wonder whether some people within the Labor Party were very concerned about the apparent right-wing stance being taken by the present

Premier in his statements before the last election, in the kind of Liberal image he was trying to develop in association with the business community in his statements and support for the resource and industrial development of this State.

I wonder whether some people wondered whether a Labor Government headed by this Premier would be sufficiently responsive to the party platform which the party had decided was right for the Government to follow. I wonder whether the appointment of these advisers cannot be seen as an insurance policy for the party that the policies of its lay party would be carried out by the Government. I wonder how much pressure will be exerted in the area of the prevention of the establishment of, for instance, mining which deals with any form of radioactive product.

Mr Parker: You have a very fertile imagination.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I find the Premier's answers about the visits of US warships and his relationship with the Federal policy somewhat unconvincing.

Mr Parker: Federal policy on foreign affairs is the important thing. The State party does not have a policy. It has a motion carried by the State conference which, if adopted by the Federal body, becomes policy.

Mr Hassell: That is a bit different from what your leader said a few weeks before the election.

Mr Brian Burke: Are you in doubt about my position in relation to nuclear ships?

Mr TRETHOWAN: I am in doubt first of all about the Premier's commitment to the US alliance and to visits by US warships. I understand his position from what he has said in relation to this part of the Federal platform.

Mr Brian Burke: It is not something I seek to hide. I acknowledge the importance and the pre-eminence of the US alliance and of ANZUS in respect of the defence of the country; that is the first thing. The second thing is that I have said I will welcome visiting warships from the US. I cannot say anything more clearly than that. It is publicly on record, and if you are in doubt, I do not know what I can do to clarify your mind.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I am also interested to watch the kind of pressure the Premier will be subjected to by his party within this State.

Mr Brian Burke: I have stated my position quite clearly. It was reported in the Press and your leader welcomed my statement and my position.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I did too; long may that position remain. How far will the Premier go to fight for this State?

Mr Brian Burke: You can talk about that when it happens, but you cannot convict me for not going far enough in the present circumstances.

Mr TRETHOWAN: How hard will the Premier fight for mining development involving radioactive products, remembering he should be working for the development of the resources of this State to ensure they are produced and sold? Will he give in to the predeterminations of, perhaps, the Federal party without any sort of fight?

Mr Brian Burke: I do not know whether you understand that it is not within my capacity to do anything about Federal policy until the next Federal conference. I will not commit myself now. It would be fairly idle of me to be commenting now on a Federal Government prerogative; that is, the granting of export licences.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I understand that, but it still seems to me that concern exists about the reasons for the appointment of these advisers. It is a question of trust.

Mr Brian Burke: You of all people should be sensible about it. You know that in other States in this country and internationally in the UK and the US, advisers have been the order of the day, for many years in most cases. In addition, of all those people who have been appointed as advisers I would guess that there are as many Liberal voters as Labor ones. People like D'Arcy Farrell and Brett Goodrich have never been known to me as being strong Labor supporters.

Mr TRETHOWAN: But they were strong supporters of the Premier during the week leading up to the election.

Mr Brian Burke: That is different. But in some cases that is not true. That is different from what you have been saying all night. In any case, I don't think you can expect us to appoint advisers who are antagonistic to our policies.

Mr TRETHOWAN: You appointed the President of the ALP, senior union secretary and—

Mr Brian Burke: I can see your arguments about the appointment of those union people; I think there are three of them. But in that specialised area it is very unlikely that we could draw the expertise required for the job other than from the union movement or from the employers' federation. I do not know what else we could do, but that is the narrowness of the field.

Mr Court: Are you saying that the only people trained in industrial relations are to be found on the union side?

Mr Brian Burke: I said on one of two sides. Mr Butler, who has not made any public statements to my knowledge, has been responsible for solving

a dispute that could have cost the State \$9 million.

Mr TRETHOWAN: The appointment of these advisers, coupled with the promises which have been broken, will increasingly erode the confidence of the people of Western Australia who have seen fit to place their trust in the Government.

Mr Brian Burke: If that happens we will be voted out in three year's time.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I hope the Premier accepts that it is our job in opposition to remind the people of Western Australia of the broken promises and shortfalls that occur.

Mr Terry Burke: As long as you honestly believe what you are saying is true.

Mr TRETHOWAN: I finish by saying that the evidence produced by the Opposition this evening of the reality of this Government's performance entirely justifies the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I have great pleasure in supporting his amendment.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.58 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and in doing so I seek in some sense to review the course of the debate and what we have been about in moving this amendment, late as the hour may be.

The very thrust of the amendment was that, in the terms used, the Government cannot be trusted with the finances of the State as it has given false undertakings to the electors of this State. That is the first proposition and I will refer to it specifically.

I ask members to consider the stance which Government members would have adopted had we been returned to office and sought to maintain the wages freeze that the Government, when in Opposition, strenuously opposed and, further, had we then increased charges in the midst of that freeze by percentages as high as 30 in the case of transport and 15 in the case of electricity.

False undertakings were given to the electors of this State who were led to believe the Government thought that kind of behaviour was unfair and unjust.

The Government's style has emerged after a few months in office. The Government was confronted by its first no confidence motion in the form of this amendment in a debate in which the only Government speaker was the Premier, who spoke for the allotted time but did not really get down to the details other than in the style of tactics involving shouting and denigration directed at

the Opposition. The style of the Government has been shown in its diversionary tactics and its media presentation; it is not a style of substance or of deep thought and decision, but one of shallowness, exemplified tonight by the Premier's delighted quotation of some opinion poll results. I return to my opening point: What would have happened if we were in Government and sought to maintain the wages freeze and at the same time increase charges in the same proportions as the Government has done?

Mr Pearce: But you were intending to do that.

Mr HASSELL: I wonder how the Trades and Labor Council would have behaved, what kind of industrial strife would have ensued, and what kind of condemnation would have issued forth from the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition. No practical or reasonable person would suggest that the Government could necessarily have proceeded through this year without any increases in charges, but it seems to me that here we see the first days of where the Government really failed because it simply budgeted backwards.

I want to return to a simple example or explanation so we can understand clearly what happened. In a simplified form, let us take the example of the State Energy Commission which told the Government, "To operate this year we will need \$115"—to use basic figures for the sake of clarity—"but our income will be \$100, therefore the required increase is 15 per cent". That budgetary process was clearly adopted in relation to these increases in charges.

The Government was not prepared to take on its departments and show that increases in charges of such proportion or magnitude were not acceptable in the middle of a wages freeze and in the middle of an economic downturn and in the wake of the commitments and promises made by the Government itself. Instead of undertaking that proper and essentially governmental process of budgeting properly and of making hard decisions with departments, the Government allowed the increases to go through in the proportions requested by the departments without regard for their impact on the community. In the shallow style of the Government, on the basis of opinion-researched evidence, it discovered that a lot of attention from those increases could be avoided, deflected or diverted by introducing another measure, no doubt popular with the public, to cut the salaries of some civil servants, judges and politicians. Of course, the media focused on this, and public attention was successfully diverted from the real issue of the extent of the increase in charges and concentrated on the peripheral issue; namely, the reduction of salaries.

No amount of attempts by the Opposition—try as we may we could not succeed—resulted in that public focus being directed to the real issue of the extent of the increases.

The Government has talked a lot about its mandates. Whatever it wants to do, it claims it has a mandate for it. Clearly, one mandate that it had was to tackle the problems of employment and unemployment. It was to stimulate economic activity, to provide jobs for people, for families, to get the State going again. When the Government was in Opposition it spent literally years building up its contacts with the business community and the small business community to convince them that the Government—as it is now—would be genuinely concerned about their interests, welfare, profitability, viability and their capacity to provide jobs. It sold its package well, yet in its first budgetary move and its first decision of substance the Government has failed to deal with its departments and instrumentalities and to impose on those bodies the very restraints which it sought to impose through prices control legislation when it introduced amendments to the wages freeze legislation in December 1982, and through its own prices control legislation which it introduced in a one or two-day sitting of this House within a few weeks of its being elected to office.

On the very central issue of what this Government was elected to do—to promote business activity, profitability, investment and essentially employment—it has hit very hard and deep at the people who provide most of the employment. While the clever tactic of diverting attention from the issue of the level of charges might have succeeded in the short run, it will not succeed in the long run because eventually the chickens will come home to roost. Bit by bit business in this State will feel the impact of the very substantially increased Government charges which will add to their problems.

Mr Gordon Hill: You are a gloom and doom Opposition.

Mr HASSELL: It will add to these people's real problems which the Government played on to help it win office and which it exploited when trying to persuade the business community to vote it into office. The Government has failed its first test. It can play all the games it likes in saving a few million dollars in civil servants', judges' and politicians' salaries which when added together will pay the cost of re-establishing the Perth-Fremantle railway and the cost of its party-political advisers; that is all it will pay for, but it will not help the Government as the chickens come home to roost with the people whom it quite deliberately deceived.

The Government has failed the test in its Budget. We have yet to see the rest of the Budget.

Mr Gordon Hill: We haven't presented the Budget yet.

Mr HASSELL: This is part of the Government's Budget.

Mr O'Connor: Payroll tax, probably.

Mr HASSELL: These charges are part of the Government's Budget. The cigarette tax which the Government is increasing will divert significant numbers of businesses away from this State, make no mistake about it. The increases in transport charges will flow through to businesses throughout the State, particularly in the more remote areas. The increases in rates and charges which were a continuing problem we recognised when in Government, and which we tried to do something about, will flow through to those businesses that the Government so falsely convinced it was concerned about. This is the style that comes through—the media research or the opinion research showed that cutting salaries would be popular; what a good trick! The Government said, "We will cut a few salaries. The civil servants will squeal about that, but the public will like it, and while they are loving that they will forget about the 15 per cent increase in electricity charges."

Mr Davies: Where was the research done? Who did the research on this question?

Mr HASSELL: The member can check it out for himself and find out the basis upon which his Government proceeded to do this.

Mr Davies: If you have any evidence of it, please tell the House, because it just does not exist. It is another figment of your imagination.

Mr HASSELL: Why does not the Minister get up and make a speech on this subject?

Mr Davies: There is plenty of time yet.

Mr HASSELL: I hope the Minister does make a speech on this matter because we have not heard him or his fellow Ministers reply to the question of the justification for a whole series of increased charges.

Mr Davies: There is nothing but repetition to answer from your side, nothing but tedious repetition!

Mr HASSELL: A whole series of increased charges has been put forward in the House tonight—

Mr Davies: They have all been adequately answered. You are holding up the record.

Mr HASSELL: —referring to the matter of style, the matter of party-political advisers, which

is the way it has been done, looking at the blatantly partisan way in which the matter has been approached. If the Ministers of the new Government needed extra staff, advice or extra research facilities, it might have been a reasonable proposition after several months' experience, after obtaining advice from the Public Service Board, and after dealing with the matter in a reasonable manner, but not in the style that was adopted by the Government. Instead of that, we have seen a hasty lobbying after the election for the plums and the fruits of office, the pay-off to the party faithful, the party hacks and the party committed, the pay-off in jobs and positions similar to the discussions of Mr David Combe with his Russian friend.

I do not know what sort of reward he was to receive for what he had done for the Labor party. Over here it was all carried out; the president of the party and union secretaries were brought on to the Government pay roll. There was no attempt at balance; no attempt at objectivity; no attempt to recognise that ultimately the Government will have to account to the public for those views.

The Government's industrial proposals outlined in the Premier's speech indicate very clearly its intention to put the unions outside the general law. The proposal is to remove what was described as harsh and unworkable penalties so that unions are free to conduct their affairs democratically—heavens knows what provision of the law stops them conducting their affairs democratically now. That is not specified.

A further proposal is that industrial matters be confined to industrial law and that the industrial field be insulated from the intrusion of other legislation which does not have industrial purposes such as the Trade Practices Act. Where is the mandate for that?

Mr Parker: In our green paper that was distributed throughout the State last year.

Mr HASSELL: The mandate to put the unions outside the law would not have been accepted by the community for one minute. This community would not, and will not accept unions being above the law.

Mr Parker: No-one wants to put them above the law.

Mr HASSELL: The Government does. It has said it will and I have no doubt that it will attempt it. What is particularly interesting to note is that the Premier, who has so often lectured us in this House about legislation that contravenes the Commonwealth law and affects section 109 of the Constitution, brings into his speech the proposition that the Government will legislate to

avoid the effect of the Trade Practices Act, which is Commonwealth legislation and cannot be overridden by this Government's legislation. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 17		(Teller)
Mr Blaikie	Mr O'Connor	
Mr Bradshaw	Mr Old	
Mr Clarke	Mr Rushton	
Mr Court	Mr Spriggs	
Mr Coyne	Mr Trethowan	
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby	
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Watt	
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams	
Mr McNee		
Noes 27		(Teller)
Mr Barnett	Mr Jamieson	
Mr Bateman	Mr Parker	
Mrs Beggs	Mr Pearce	
Mr Bridge	Mr Read	
Mrs Buchanan	Mr D. L. Smith	
Mr Brian Burke	Mr P. J. Smith	
Mr Terry Burke	Mr Stephens	
Mr Burkett	Mr A. D. Taylor	
Mr Cowan	Mr I. F. Taylor	
Mr Davies	Mr Tonkin	
Mr Evans	Mr Troy	
Mr Grill	Mrs Watkins	
Mrs Henderson	Mr Gordon Hill	
Mr Hodge		
Pairs		(Teller)
Ayes	Noes	
Mr Crane	Mr Bryce	
Mr Mensaros	Mr Carr	
Mr Laurance	Mr McIver	
Mr Thompson	Mr T. H. Jones	
Mr Grayden	Mr Bertram	
Dr Dadour	Mr Wilson	

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MRS WATKINS (Joondalup) [10.21 p.m.] After listening to the abortive filibustering of members opposite for the last 3½ hours or so I rise to perhaps bring a little relief in this, my first address to the House. Firstly, I would like to pay tribute to the leader of the Australian Labor Party in Western Australia, our Premier, Brian Burke, who led our great party to such a resounding victory on 19 February this year—a remarkable feat for the young man who stood before this House less than 10 years ago on 18 October 1973 to make his own maiden speech.

I thank you, Brian, for your encouragement and support over the last 16 months since my pre-selection for the seat of Joondalup.

Likewise, I wish to thank all my Labor colleagues who were always ready to give me advice and support prior to the State elections, despite their very busy schedules.

I, too, wish to thank the many dedicated people from within the Labor movement, both from the branches and the union movement, who worked unstintingly for me throughout my campaign. I wish to make special mention of my campaign manager, John Halden, whose guidance, drive, and discipline continually convinced me that victory was achievable. Without those people mentioned, my task of winning Joondalup for the Australian Labor Party would have been much more difficult, if not impossible.

I would also thank the members of the staff here at Parliament House who have been so helpful since my attaining office; it is difficult as a new member in a strange environment to learn the ropes. This transition has been extraordinarily easy thanks to the co-operation shown me by the staff members. According to most political analysts prior to the State election, I had "Buckley's chance" of winning the seat of Joondalup, particularly against a sitting member of the establishment, and a male to boot. Well, along with my sisters here in Parliament we have proved that women can indeed win marginal seats.

I noted with interest that the four seats which achieved the greatest swings in this State were Pilbara with 18 per cent; Joondalup with 16.8 per cent; Whitford with 15.1 per cent; and Albany with 12 per cent. All those seats had women as candidates.

My colleagues, Pam Beggs and Pam Buchanan, now hold the seats of Whitford and Pilbara. Josephine Lynch in Albany just missed out this time; however I have no doubt that after the next State election Jo Lynch will be joining us in this place.

All women, irrespective of their political leanings, must recognise and commend the ALP for the faith shown in women as political candidates.

Since being elected to Parliament as the member for Joondalup I have found that the promises we made, prior to the election, to achieve changes are not being fulfilled as quickly as we would like. This is due to the difficult economic conditions and in a large part to the deficit inherited from our predecessors.

However, I trust the public of Western Australia will be sympathetic with our plight and realise we were as deceived as they were by a less than honest Government, an Administration which stands condemned by the people.

In my electorate there is a pressing need to increase the school building programme, both for new schools and additions to existing schools, particularly in the areas of Beldon, Greenwood, Kingsley, and Marangaroo. With over half of this

year's education allowance already committed by the previous Government we have a difficult task ahead of us to carry out a heavy education programme this year. However our Government has proved in a very short and hectic five months that we will honour our promises.

The excessive prices legislation passed in this house in March is an example of our commitment. We have moved quickly at local levels also.

I am delighted to report to this House the results of representations made to the Minister for Health by myself and the Member for Whitford on the intolerable situation at Wanneroo Hospital.

The residents of the Shire of Wanneroo had a hospital which cost the taxpayers \$6.5 million to complete. When it was officially opened on 8 August 1980, all three floors of the hospital were in operation but there was no casualty service, people still had to be taken by ambulance to one of the large teaching hospitals for emergency treatment.

After 25 December 1980—perhaps an appropriate date—the maternity wing of the hospital was closed down. This in turn caused much anxiety to the people of the Wanneroo Shire. Despite this extravagant commitment to the health of our residents the services offered were inadequate. We did not have a casualty unit. We did not have a maternity wing. Time and time again requests were made to the Government of the day for a full-time casualty service and for the maternity wing to be opened. Time and time again, the then Minister for Health denied our people their requests.

However, we at last have a Minister for Health who really does care about the real people and is ready to listen to representations made to him on their behalf.

The Wanneroo Hospital can now boast a full-time casualty service using salaried doctors and by the end of 1983 many of the doctors in the area will become sessional appointees to the hospital, thus saving the public many thousands of dollars in the fee for service area.

The Minister has also made a commitment to make beds available in the maternity wing of the hospital as soon as funds are available, which hopefully will be within the next financial year.

Other than incompetence, the lack of initiative the previous Government showed in the area of transport, was, I believe, a contributing factor in its demise.

While southern metropolitan members gained better public transport and freeway access, those

in the north achieved next to nothing for their constituents. While the growth in the northern suburbs ballooned, transport facilities lagged behind to the point of public disgrace.

Fortunately we now have a Minister for Transport with vision and a desire to turn our public transport system into one of pride.

I have made representations to the Minister regarding the inadequacies of public transport in my electorate and have suggested to him that buses will be used more by the public if there can be developed an interconnecting system, perhaps using mini buses, across suburbs, so people can move easily between suburbs instead of travelling into Perth and out again in order to reach an adjoining suburb. Currently the Minister is considering my representations with a view to re-routing existing buses in the northern metropolitan region. The people in my electorate will, I know, be delighted when these new routes eventuate.

The unemployed will be able to get to the Commonwealth Employment Office in Greenwood more easily. They will also be able to use the facilities of the Wanneroo Community Youth Support Scheme.

Pensioners will be able to visit their friends and relatives in neighbouring suburbs without needing a cut lunch and water bag to sustain them on what is currently a marathon journey. Families will be able to get to our beautiful beaches during school holidays and weekends. Women will be able to use the facilities in the suburbs of Heathridge, Whitford, Greenwood, and Wanneroo without needing expensive private transport in order to do so.

If I have your indulgence, Sir, I wish to make mention of an area of legislation which I believe needs urgent reform; namely, the Adoption of Children Act.

Currently adoptions are carried out in secrecy; secrecy which is one sided.

The mother who relinquishes her child is still treated as a second-class citizen. She is not given the option of permanent legal guardianship which if introduced would allow her to relinquish her child with provisions. She would be able to see her child develop, and have access to that child on a basis set down by a court of law in negotiation with the adopting parents.

In essence she would not suffer the anguish suffered by every mother who relinquishes her child, an anguish which has resulted in a number of suicides and an anguish not diminished by the passing of the years. A relinquishing mother is not

offered any options, she either keeps her child or relinquishes that child forever.

She is not offered the option of temporary fostering. In many cases when a single woman has a child outside marriage circumstances at that time preclude her from caring for her child.

Those circumstances are invariably financial, pressure from her parents, or pressure from studies.

If she were given the chance to have her child fostered for a short period of time until she were both financially and physically able to care for her child there would be far fewer emotionally distressed women searching for a child which by right of birth is their child.

If a child were battered or sexually abused by its parents, the State would remove that child from its environment and arrange fostering at no cost to the parents.

It seems somewhat iniquitous to me that a child who is born of love but not of marriage can be abducted permanently from his or her mother, purely because that mother cannot in the interim care for that child.

I am sure many would argue that the mother should not have become pregnant in the first place. The old argument of, "You made your bed now you must lie in it" will of course rear its ugly head. That argument is as archaic as those who utter it. How can we say to an accident victim, "you should not drive", or to a doctor who contracts a contagious disease, "You should not treat your patients"?

We are soon to reach the twenty-first century—just 17 years away. I am enough of an optimist to believe that by that time legislation will have been changed retrospectively to allow every relinquishing mother, past, present, and future, the right to know her child.

Much has been said in the last 12 months regarding electoral reform, and I do understand the reticence of the Opposition in approving change; after all, it has had the hallowed Chamber of the Legislative Council sewn up since 1890 with its gerrymandered electoral boundaries and the totally unacceptable inequality which exists between country and city electorates.

An area which has received little attention and deserves a mention is local government—the government closest to the people. It gave me much heart after the recent local government elections to read the comments attributed to the Leader of the Opposition in the *Daily News* dated 12 May 1983 as follows—

Mr O'Connor has admitted phoning one Stirling councillor, a liberal supporter, to ask whether it was true he has pledged his vote to a Labor supporter in the Mayoral elections.

Mr O'Connor said he played no active role in the campaign but another Liberal official said—

I'm not going to say this was a Liberal Party campaign but Yes, we were pleased to see some of the ALP people knocked off.

Further in the same article, it is stated that at least four candidates in Wanneroo and Stirling were well known members of the Liberal Party.

Mr O'Connor said he believed his party had definitely suffered in the State election because of Labor influence in Wanneroo and Stirling councils and a Liberal Party source said the Opposition had decided the way to win Government was to win local government. So much for the Liberal cry, "keep politics out of local government". At last, some honesty about politics in local government.

Having lived in the Shire of Wanneroo for over 12 years the last eight of which I have spent actively involved in the community, I have been acutely aware of the politics involved in local government.

Past protestations uttered by the conservative elements in the community of there being no politics in local government, are utter nonsense.

One has to look only at Jim Clarko, Ernie Bridge, Clive Griffiths, Dick Old and Graham Burkett—to name just a few who began their political careers in local government—to see just how rife with politics local government is and has been.

If I may cite the Shire of Wanneroo as a case in fact, the campaign waged to unseat the President of the Wanneroo Shire, Keith Pearce, was a very clever strategy on behalf of the Liberal Party. It was made clearer on the night of the shire elections by the "heavies" from the Liberal Party who were out in force with their candidates and stooges from all four wards of the Shire of Wanneroo.

They included my predecessor, an ex-member of Parliament, a dismissed ex-shire clerk, and a number of ex-councillors with axes to grind against an efficient, forward thinking, and socially aware administration.

May I serve warning that the Australian Labor Party at least has realised that honesty is the best policy and has begun the honesty process by endorsing, for the first time in the Shire of

Wanneroo, a candidate for the forthcoming by-election to be held on 24 September, and where possible we will continue to endorse candidates of the calibre of Phil Davenport if those candidates are worthy of bearing the endorsement of the Australian Labor Party.

An example of the foresight of the previous President of the Wanneroo Shire was the commencement of the Wanneroo Tourist Council of which I am a member.

Tourism is a labour-intensive industry as yet barely tapped in Western Australia. The last 10 years have seen the almost total neglect of the tourist industry at the hands of a resource-orientated Government. No priority was given to tourism; in fact it was usually the most junior Minister who held the Tourism portfolio.

Since 19 February this attitude has changed. The Premier recognises the value of the tourist industry and has taken on that portfolio himself.

Despite the fact that a very low priority was given to the tourist industry, Australia has shown real growth in this area, while most industries have been in an economic recession. This is very encouraging when one considers the growth has occurred with little emphasis being given to tourism.

By the year 2000 tourism will be the biggest industry in Australia. Currently it employs 400 000 people throughout Australia, and 35 000 in Western Australia; so the potential is enormous, especially when one considers the major social ill in the community is unemployment.

Unlike the resource industries tourism is labour-intensive. It is not affected by the silicone chip so it can make a major contribution to the economic welfare of this State and its people. To create one job in the mining industry requires a capital investment of \$1 million. To create one job in the tourist industry requires a capital investment of just \$30 000, just a fraction of the cost in comparison with other industries.

In regional areas tourism is turned on only when other industries take a nose dive.

Tourism is not as cyclical as other industries and therefore it should be developed through the good and bad times, and not turned on and off like a tap. Investment in tourism must be an ongoing activity. Provided this is ensured, the flourishing tourist industry will help keep the economy buoyant if the bottom falls out of other industries. But it must be an ongoing commitment. Currently, tourism in Western Australia contributes \$800 million to the economy and the surface as yet has barely been scratched.

By acknowledging the fact that it is a sunrise industry with huge potential for employment growth, we will be on our way to becoming the best tourist State in Australia. It will take courage and foresight for this potential to be realised. Hard economic decisions will have to be made.

In making those decisions we will have long-term perspectives rather than short-term adventures that generate a fast buck for the few and leave misery and chaos in aftermath.

Cutting wages and conditions of the workers at present employed in the industry is not the answer and will not fulfill the objectives of making tourism the largest industry in Australia by the year 2000.

In achieving these goals we will require the co-operation of all members in this Parliament to become involved and enthusiastic about tourism and to support the initiatives instigated by this Government.

In closing Mr Speaker, may I congratulate you on attaining the office of Speaker of this House and thank the people of my electorate who voted for me in such overwhelming numbers, thus enabling me to be here today, to make my maiden speech.

[Applause]

MR D. L. SMITH (Mitchell) [10.41 p.m.]: I begin by offering congratulations to you Mr Speaker on attaining your high office. I recall when I first met you in Kalgoorlie when I went there as a young solicitor to practise, I recognised then the qualities which have made you Speaker today. You have the admiration of both sides for the qualities you have retained notwithstanding your period of political office. It is often said that after a period in office politicians lose many of the qualities that first attracted electors who put them there. You are one of the people who has retained those qualities throughout your period in politics and I congratulate you on that and on attaining office.

I also want to say how pleased I am to follow the member for Joondalup who made her maiden speech. It is a noteworthy occasion when maiden speeches are made by women today both in this House and in another place in this Parliament. It is a great occasion because they are not nominal women put up by a political party in order to win women's votes. Nor are they pseudo women who have displayed masculine qualities to enter the hurly-burly of politics. They are real women interested in women's issues and also in the issues that concern us all. The active participation of all the women who have come into this House after the last election in the Caucus committees and

elsewhere can only be a credit for them and a blessing for the constituents they represent.

It is not often a person of my sex gets to be described as a "maiden". It is almost as rare that someone with 16 years' experience in the legal profession is called a "maiden speaker". I am thus somewhat loathe to give up these newly-won virtues by embarking on my speech. However, embark I must, because unless I do, so I am told, I must refrain from barking at members opposite, whether in relation to "Bunbury 2000" or something else. But if we do not bark at members opposite how else will they find their way through the righteous jungle that now painfully surrounds them?

As part of my preparation for this speech I took the opportunity of reading the maiden speeches of some other members who have preceded me in the House, past and present. The first speech I read for some reason was that of Sir Charles Court, made in this House on 20 August 1953. Early in that speech he said—

Human nature being what it is, there are always certain people who are prepared to devote a lot of their time and energy to finding loopholes in the legislation, and having found them they will prey on those who are less able or inclined to circumvent controls.

I do not have to tax my mind for any great length of time to work out about whom Sir Charles was talking.

The second speech I turn to is that of Margaret June Craig in this place on 25 July 1974. I wish I could say that she was my predecessor but, in truth, she is not so I cannot say the complimentary things about her that perhaps I could. I will have to leave that opportunity to the member for Murray-Wellington. In her maiden speech, Mrs Craig reminded herself of the modesty all new members are asked to portray, by these words—

I am a mere mortal, and I represent mere mortals.

What chastening words for all those who come into this place for the first time! Mrs Craig then went on to talk about a number of issues dear to her heart, and reached what I regard as the high point of her speech with these words—

It is little wonder, therefore, that the shire councils and local government generally are beginning to concede that the welfare of the people in their areas is important. But these authorities are faced with reduced incomes. Apart from this they are losing their autonomy and are becoming like puppets on

a string, and it seems that there is very little that can be done to help them.

She had some understanding of the reason she had come into the House.

I turn now to a speech given on 18 October 1973 by a person who, apart from my wife, probably has the most responsibility or blame for my being here today. That was a speech given by the Hon. B. T. Burke, the then member for Balcatta. As one would expect, it was the best of the maiden speeches I read in preparing my own. To some extent, it was that speech that I decided to copy.

The then member for Balcatta began by paying tribute to his late father, Tom Burke. On the occasion of my maiden speech, I pay tribute to my parents and my parents-in-law. My father (Bertram John Smith) was born at Fremantle in 1902, and he lived for 71 years. He attained no political office, though he was a branch president of the Waterside Workers Union and a delegate on two occasions to that union's national conference. When I told my father I was going to change my university course from science to law, he threatened to disown me, and described lawyers as greedy leeches on society. My greatest disappointment on 19 February this year was that my father was not present to acknowledge that, in his terms, I had finally done something worth while by helping to give this State a Labor Government.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr D. L. SMITH: My father believed, above all, that the wrongs of this world could be righted by men of goodwill, working for the common purpose of advancement of the whole community, and not individuals in it; and that the important things in life cost nothing.

My mother was Evelyn Joyce Wintle, known to her friends for some odd reason as "Louie". To many Bunbury people, she was known as "the dolphin lady". She was orphaned at 11; and she bore 12 children of whom she raised 10. Would that somehow we could legislate to make all mothers as she was!

My greatest disappointment tonight is that my mother is not here to hear this speech so I could repay part of the huge debt that I owe her by telling of her qualities and aspirations. She is not here, and I could not do her justice, so I will leave those qualities in my heart, to reflect on them.

I mention my parents-in-law, Joe and Marie De Marte. Since my marriage and the death of my parents, they have been as good to me as any son-in-law could wish. I am especially indebted to them for providing me with my wife, Tresslyn,

though I daresay Tresslyn rues the day when Joe gave his approval to our marriage.

The then member for Balcatta, in his maiden speech, went on to pay tribute to the Australian Labor movement, and I do the same. What a great movement it is, and what a great thrill it must be for the old-timers who have worked so hard to find that not only do we have a Labor Government in this State and federally, but also we have Labor Governments in three other States.

I also pay tribute to the many supporters of the Labor movement, and my family and friends, who worked so hard to ensure that I was elected to this House—John and Annette Whitelaw; Chris Evans; Baden Pratt; Geoff and Norah Thompson; Wray Shilton; Alan Cadby; my sisters, Pat Margaret, Maureen, and Roberta; Tom Hutton; Jack Triat; Betty Kirwan; George Baxter; Nola Hill; Lil Scantlebury; Don Odgers; Keren Neilsen; and the hundreds of others I need to mention in recognition of the great job they did—including the girls at my old legal firm, especially Teresa Paul, Valerie Bulman, and Peta Chambers.

I thank the electors of Mitchell for giving me their trust. I accept the responsibility they have given me; and I pledge myself to work loyally, sincerely, and continuously on their behalf, regardless of their own political affiliations.

My final thanks are given to the Ministers of the Burke Labor Government, to my parliamentary colleagues, and to the staff of the Parliament. It is often said that new members coming into this place find it a trying time. The assistance and co-operation given by all members of the staff are something of which we, as Western Australians and as members of the Parliament, should be justly proud. I have received from all of them the utmost courtesy and co-operation. I know I will continue to need that courtesy, co-operation, and assistance if I am to provide the sort of representation that the constituents of Mitchell have a right to expect.

Turning from the thanks and quotes from other people's speeches, I address myself to the matters on which members can expect me to speak from time to time in this House. They are not the matters which I, personally, regard as the most important; but I regard them as important to the electors of Mitchell.

The first matter I wish to raise is the need for State and Federal Governments to decentralise Government expenditure and employment. The percentage of Western Australians living in metropolitan Perth continues to grow year by year. In 1971, it was 68.8 per cent; in 1976, it

was 70.11 per cent; in 1981 it was 70.58 per cent; and today it is estimated to be 70.69 per cent. The total increase in the last 12 years has been 1.89 per cent, which may seem a small percentage; but if we had held to the 1971 percentage, we would have 25 363 extra Western Australians living in our rural areas. To put it into perspective, if all those people had remained in the country, we could have duplicated Bunbury City somewhere else in the country areas of Western Australia.

In the south-west statistical area, the picture is slightly more encouraging. That area is covered broadly by "Bunbury 2000". In 1971 we had 76 633 people resident in the south-west. They made up 7.34 per cent of the total State population. By 1981, the population was 97 834, or 7.53 per cent. Today it is over 100 000. To put that into perspective, one in every four country Western Australians lives in the area covered by "Bunbury 2000"; and one in every 16 lives in Bunbury itself, including the suburbs of Eaton, Gelorup, and Australind, in adjoining shires.

Over the next three years, members will hear me repeating time and time again those figures and those percentages. At every opportunity, I will ask that the Government expend in the south-west not a proportion of the Government expenditure based on our area, but one based on our population. If we could receive eight per cent of the Government expenditure in the south-west, we would be more than happy. On those occasions, I will seek to demonstrate that while the resources boom has brought private employees into the south-west to work, more and more of our public employees, and the expenditure of the Government, is being centred in Perth. I have a strong suspicion—as yet, not proved—that the increasing percentage of our population living in Perth is related directly to the fact that public sector employment is an increasing proportion of total employment.

In 1946, the public sector employed 16.6 per cent of the total workforce. By 1975, the proportion had increased to 22.2 per cent. I do not want to be seen as a knocker of big government or growth in the Public Service; but it is important that, if that sort of growth is to continue, the country receives its fair share of the public sector jobs and expenditures.

At the time when the technological revolution should mean that more and more clerical work can be done in country areas, in fact the tendency is to centre it more in Perth. I hasten to add that the former State Government was not the only Government at fault in this sense. The Federal Governments have done the same thing.

In 1974, despite having approximately 7.5 per cent of the population, only four per cent of Commonwealth public servants employed in Western Australia were employed in the south-west statistical division.

If one takes the example of perhaps the most decentralised of the Government departments, that is, the Public Works Department, and looks at the 1982 annual report of the engineering division of that department, one will see it had a total staff of 815. Of that staff, 389 were professionals and 26.2 per cent of them worked in country areas. There were 298 general staff and 55 per cent of them worked in the country. Clerical staff totalled 128, but only four per cent of them worked in the country.

One often hears it said that the reason the Government cannot force decentralisation of public sector employees is that professionals need the resources of other professionals and institutions to keep up their standards. However, in truth, when we look at the figures of departments such as the PWD, we see it is the clerical sector—that is, the people involved in administration and collection of data—who are concentrated in Perth. In this day and age, with the availability of computers and various means of telecommunication, no justifiable reason exists for such a concentration.

One of the problems experienced by country members is that when they leave their electorate offices they do not have the benefit of a typist. At this time of the night, even my handwriting becomes difficult to read.

In relation to the expenditure of the Government dollar, I refer now to the operating loss of the MTT which, in 1982, amounted to approximately \$43.7 million. In 1982, it carried a total number of approximately 62 million passengers. Therefore, the subsidy for each passenger journey was approximately 70c.

If that expenditure from Consolidated Revenue on public transport in the metropolitan area had been spent in the country area, it would have amounted to \$100 for every Western Australian who lived in the country.

Looked at in another way, it can be seen the loss incurred by the MTT last year was equivalent to the amount allocated to new capital expenditure on education in all of Western Australia, plus another \$14 million.

The expenditure of the Main Roads Department in the south-west statistical division does not indicate any better treatment of the area I represent. The total expenditure on roads in the south-west, whether through local authorities or

the Main Roads Department, in relation to the percentage of population was extremely low.

If one looks at the total subsidy paid for the large metropolitan hospitals in 1981-82, one finds that the total subsidy was of the order of \$202 million. The total subsidy for Albany, Bunbury, Derby, Geraldton, Kalgoorlie, and Port Hedland was \$20.4 million. The subsidy for Royal Perth Hospital alone was approximately 3.5 times the total subsidy expended on all these country hospitals.

Another area of concern to me apart from decentralisation is the increasingly small percentage of total State expenditure which is allocated to capital works. I understand the reason given for that is a notion which exists—I am not sure whether it is based on a rule or a convention—that Consolidated Revenue funds should not be used for capital expenditure and that capital expenditure should be limited to what can be financed out of the Loan Fund programme.

In my view, that is a concept which must be looked at, because if one examines spending in the two principal expenditure areas for the State—that is, education and hospitals—one finds that the percentage expended on capital works is a very small percentage of the total expenditure in those areas. For instance, in relation to education, in the 1981 annual report—for some reason that appears to be the latest annual report for that department—the total gross expenditure on education is given as \$526 million. Of that sum, only \$35 million was set aside for new capital expenditure of all kinds, including land acquisition, construction of institutional buildings, and grounds. That is, only 6.6 per cent of the total budget was allocated to new capital works.

In 1980 the figure was 9.1 per cent. Therefore, members can see the percentage is reducing. However, worse still, only \$21 million of that sum was spent on primary and secondary school construction; that is, only 4 per cent of the total budget.

In other words, we could almost treble the capital expenditure on primary and secondary schools, but only incur a total increase in expenditure on education by the State of something of the order of eight per cent.

I come from an electorate which has many old and small schools. Many of those schools could be brought up to the standards now expected in new schools and very little capital expenditure would be required.

In my view, most of these outdated and poorly equipped schools throughout the State could be brought up to the standard of modern schools

with a very small increase in capital expenditure allocated to education.

Smaller class sizes and more free periods for teachers are desirable, but the first prerequisite for a good education is a proper building in which to teach and learn and when one realises that more and more is being spent on education for what is a rather static school population, one is left wondering why so many of the country schools are left in such a substandard condition.

Although the position is somewhat better in regard to hospitals, of the total amount expended in this area by the State in 1982, only \$34 million was allocated to new construction. This was out of a total budget for hospitals of something of the order of \$344 million of State funds.

Again, by a relatively small increase in the funds available for capital works, many of the necessary improvements to health facilities in country areas could be put into effect. This could in fact be done by a one-off substantial increase in the capital expenditure programme for hospitals which would only have a minor impact on total State expenditure on health and hospitals.

Despite the knocks that John Maynard Keynes has taken over the past few years, I believe that expenditure on capital works in country towns could be a major boost to employment and we should be looking to increase that capital expenditure and making sure we create employment by using some of those Consolidated Revenue funds for capital works.

Mr Speaker and members of the House: I should like to have included many other matters in my maiden speech, but the two areas to which I have referred are of most concern to me at this time as far as my electorate is concerned.

In one of the speeches tonight a petition containing approximately 40 000 signatures was mentioned. That is something of the order of the number of people who were put out of work in the last few years of office of the State Liberal-Country Party Government. I hope that in the course of the next three years, we can accelerate the improvement in the economy that has been signalled to us by the improved position on the stock market.

It has been said that somehow or other there has been a vote of no confidence in us as a Labor Government on the part of the business sector, but if one looks at the way in which the economy is picking up and the stock market is improving, one sees that as the best indicator of business confidence. By and large business is saying that it is happy with the State and Federal Labor Governments and whatever minor mistakes they have

made on the way, it is believed that those Governments can best lead this State and the nation back to the healthy economic situation we have a right to expect.

Government members: Hear, hear!

[Applause.]

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Gordon Hill.

FIREARMS AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

STOCK: CATTLE

Computer Selling

60. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What progress has been made in implementing computer selling of cattle?
- (2) Is it the Government's intention to extend this method of selling to other livestock?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), when will other livestock be covered?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) A market co-ordinator has been appointed. Advertisements have been placed for four livestock assessors and most of the equipment is in place or ordered. It is planned to hold the first sale in October.
- (2) Not at this stage. The system has been developed for cattle selling and will need to be evaluated before any decisions are taken to provide such a service for other livestock species.
- (3) Not applicable.

69. *This question was postponed.*

AGRICULTURE

Initiatives: Expenditure

75. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Could he please itemise all the new initiatives within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which were not planned by the previous Government and for which

there were no specific allowances in the 1982-83 revenue Budget?

- (2) Could he also set the amount expended in 1982-83 against that item?
- (3) Could he indicate any votes or part votes in the 1982-83 revenue Budget within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which have not been expended, and have been used for initiatives as under (1) above?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (3) Although I have put in hand a number of new initiatives since assuming office, they have all been in the area of policy development and have not involved expenditure of any significance.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Initiatives: Expenditure

78. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) (a) Could he please itemise all the new initiatives within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which were not planned by the previous Government and for which there were no specific allowances in the 1982-83 revenue budget, or in case of an instrumentality not being subject to votes within the revenue Budget, items of the budget of the instrumentality; and
- (b) could he also set the amount expended in 1982-83 against that item?
- (2) Could he indicate any votes or part votes in the 1982-83 revenue Budget (or in the case of instrumentalities, in their budgets) within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which have not been expended, and have been used for initiatives as under (1) above?

Mr TONKIN replied:

(i) Metropolitan Water Authority—

(1) (a), (b) and (2)—

Expenditure relating to both the MWA revenue and the MWA capital budgets was as planned for 1982-83, allowing for normal variations as are expected in works programmes of this scale.

The only exception is the minor item of salaries of MWA staff assisting the steering committee for

the merger of State water authorities.

(ii) Public Works Department—

(1) (a) Public Works Department water resource expenditure was generally in accordance with the capital works and CRF Budgets.

(b) General Loan Fund expenditure of \$17 165 360 was \$482 640 or 2.7 per cent below allocation, while CRF expenditure was \$864 000 or 1.6 per cent less than the allocation of \$52.92 million.

(2) The only exceptions were salary and incidental expenditures totalling \$32 500 incurred on behalf of officers engaged as part of the project team associated with the Government's decision to proceed with the merging of the State's water authorities.

(iii) Consumer Affairs—

(1) (a) A prices advisory committee was appointed on 25 March 1983 to conduct a study into the retail petrol market in Western Australia.

(b) \$10 860.69.

(2) Nil.

(iv) Electoral Department—

(a) (i) Training of polling staff;

(ii) adoption of a common enrolment card with the Commonwealth;

(iii) joint processing arrangements for claim cards;

(iv) enrolment of persons already enrolled for the Commonwealth but not for the State;

(v) enhancing computer programmes.

(b) Nil.

(2) Nil.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: CABINET

Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet: Political Adviser

133. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet has been provided

with a political adviser at the expense of the taxpayer?

- (2) What part of the duties of a Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet is purported to require the appointment of a political adviser?
- (3) Has the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet been provided with any other special staff or research staff?
- (4) What staff was allocated to previous Parliamentary Secretaries of the Cabinet?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) I refer the member to the answer to question 125 of Tuesday, 26 July 1983.

TAXATION

Incentives: New Industries

148. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

Has the State Government made any specific approaches to the Federal Government seeking to have new taxation incentives for expanding or development industries, particularly high technology industries, included in the forthcoming Federal Budget?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Yes, this matter has been the subject of communication between the Minister for Economic Development and Technology and his federal counterpart.

OIL PRICING POLICY AND TAXATION

Incentives: Energy and Mineral Exploration

149. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

Has the State Government made any approaches to the Federal Government seeking changes to the Federal oil pricing policy, or to taxation incentives for energy or mineral exploration?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Yes.

ROAD

Armadale-Ravensthorpe Highway

150. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Transport:

When will the sealing of the Armadale/Ravensthorpe Highway between Hyden and Holt Rock be completed?

Mr GRILL replied:

A date for completion of sealing of the section between Hyden and Holt Rock has not been determined.

Current planning is to upgrade the section to a good gravel road standard over the next four years. An amount of \$660 000 has been provided in 1983-84 to enable a start to be made on this work.

WATER RESOURCES

Agaton: First Stage

151. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has a date been determined for the start of the first stage of the Agaton water scheme?
- (2) If "No", when will he be announcing the commencement date?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The State Government is unable to fund the high cost of this project (in excess of \$60 million) from its own resources and, because of the unfavourable cost benefit aspects of the project, is not optimistic that financial assistance will be forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government to enable the project to be commenced in the near future.

ROAD: FREEWAY

Kwinana: Telephones

152. Mr WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With respect to telephones recently installed on the Kwinana Freeway, could he detail how many telephones have been installed?
- (2) How many telephones are anticipated will be installed on all freeways in the metropolitan area?
- (3) Is it a fact the telephones are connected direct to the Royal Automobile Club of Western Australia (Inc.)?
- (4) If the caller is not already a member of the Royal Automobile Club of Western Australia, is it necessary that he or she become a member before assistance can be rendered?
- (5) Is it a fact that only three breakdown services are being used by the Royal Automobile Club of Western Australia to answer these emergency calls?

- (6) Is it a fact that these three services are under contract to the Royal Automobile Club of Western Australia, to provide this service?
- (7) If this is to be a public service offered by the Royal Automobile Club of Western Australia, should not all breakdown service companies be invited to participate?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Twenty-eight.
- (2) Thirty on the current contract. Further facilities are yet to be determined.
- (3) The telephones are automatically connected to a nominated Telecom system line which in this case terminates in the RAC control room.
- (4) No.
- (5) and (6) It is understood that the RAC has three towing companies under contract to provide towing services for its members. This does not deny any caller the right to nominate the attendance of any other service.
- (7) The service was installed by Main Roads Department. The RAC offered to monitor, handling response for members themselves, or transferring non-member calls to a nominated telephone number.

MINING

Royalties: Inquiry

153. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) When will the Government's announced inquiry into royalties on mining commence?
- (2) Who will conduct the inquiry?
- (3) What will be the terms of the inquiry?
- (4) How long is it anticipated that the inquiry will take?
- (5) Will the results of the inquiry be made public?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) To (5) No inquiry has been announced.

MINING: ACT

Aboriginal Reserves

154. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Referring the Minister to question 570 of 14 October 1981 respecting Aboriginal reserves, is he planning to amend the Mining Act to, as he said at the time,

"ensure that the grantee of mining rights or tenements has no right to enter upon Aboriginal reserves without an authority under the Aboriginal Affairs Housing Authority Act"?

- (2) If not, how will this "problem" be handled by the Government?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) and (2) No. Such an amendment is no longer necessary.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Union: Settlement

155. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Referring the Minister to an article in *The West Australian* of 10 May 1983 dealing with the increase granted to about 300 members of The Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association of Australia and indicating that the cost to the State Energy Commission of the settlement would be about \$9 600 for the rest of the financial year, how was this calculation arrived at?
- (2) What was the actual cost of the settlement to the State Energy Commission during the 1982-83 financial year?
- (3) What is the estimated cost to the commission of the additional settlement in the 1983-84 year?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) The cost of \$9 600 to the Energy Commission for the rest of the 1982-83 financial year was arrived at by deducting the existing cost from the new cost with the increased shift loadings. The new cost was determined by applying new shift loadings to existing shift rosters operating in commission power stations, as it applies to the number of employees on shift.
- (2) As above.
- (3) \$74 000 in a full year.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Stanford Research Institute Study

156. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) When does the Minister expect the Stanford Research Institute study into

the State Energy Commission to be completed?

- (2) When completed, will the report be made public?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) There is no such study. The member may be referring to the W.D. Scott and Co. Pty. Ltd. study into the SEC which has been completed.
- (2) It has been.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY AND GAS

Charges: Increase

157. Mr MacKINNON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) In relation to the State Energy Commission charges as recently announced for the 1983-84 financial year, were the proposed charges referred to Treasury for review and comment?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If the charges were referred to Treasury, were any private financial consultants engaged to help evaluate the proposals?
- (4) Did Treasury then provide a report to the Government on these proposed increases?
- (5) Did the Treasury, in that report, indicate whether the proposed increases were justified?
- (6) Did the Treasury, in that report, indicate any action which could be taken to minimise these charges?
- (7) Did the final increases, approved by the Government, differ from the recommended increases recommended by either the State Energy Commission or the State Treasury?
- (8) If so, what were the nature of these variations?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) to (8) As a matter of principle, I am not prepared to disclose confidential Treasury information of the Government.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Charges: Rebate

158. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Under the Government's recently announced rebate scheme for electricity supply charges, could the Minister provide me with details as to how much this scheme is anticipated to cost for the financial year ending 30 June 1984?
- (2) Could the Minister please tell me how much the previous scheme cost for the year ended 30 June 1983?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) \$5.5 million.
- (2) \$1.1 million.

EDUCATION: SPECIAL SCHOOL

Willetton

159. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In relation to the Willetton special school, what was the student enrolment at the school for the year ended December 1982?
- (2) What is the current enrolment at the school?
- (3) What was the detailed breakdown, by position, of staffing levels at the school as at 31 December 1982?
- (4) What is the current staffing level, by position, at the school?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) The enrolment at Willetton special school on the census date of 1 July 1983 was 76.
- (2) The enrolment on 22 July 1983 was 78.
- (3) and (4) I seek to table a paper in reply to these questions.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 185).

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

Natural: North-West Shelf

160. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Referring him to his comments reported in *The West Australian* of 21 January 1983, in relation to the North-West Shelf gas contract held by the State Energy Commission, what is the cost of the gas to the State Energy Commission

from its initial date of purchase until 1990?

- (2) What is the present price structure for sale of the gas to both individual and industry consumers?
- (3) Will some consumers be given preferential treatment over others?
- (4) How much of the gas has, to date, been sold or committed, and could he give me a breakdown of that commitment?
- (5) How much gas is it estimated by the Commission it will be using to produce electricity at the current time?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) This information is of a commercial nature and confidential to the parties involved.
- (2) (a) Details of all tariffs have been gazetted;
(b) gas is sold to larger customers on the basis of individually negotiated contracts, details of which are confidential.
- (3) No.
- (4) Approximately 70 per cent. Details of customer breakdowns are confidential.
- (5) The amount of gas to be used in power production will be dependent on a number of operational factors and contractual obligations to the various suppliers of primary energy to the commission.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Charges: Capital Cities

161. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What would a domestic consumer in each of the following cities pay for 2 000, 4 000, 6 000, or 8 000 kw of electricity—

- (a) Perth;
- (b) Sydney;
- (c) Melbourne;
- (d) Brisbane;
- (e) Adelaide;
- (f) Hobart?

Mr BRYCE replied:

(a) Perth:	Consumption	Cost/Year
	Level	(\$)
	2 000	218
	6 000	545
	8 000	708

- (b) to (f) This information can be obtained by writing to the electricity (gas) authorities in the cities named and obtaining their current tariff schedules. Alternatively these schedules could be obtained through the Parliamentary Library.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

Charges: Capital Cities

162. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What would a domestic consumer in each of the following cities pay for 2 000, 4 000, 6 000 or 8 000 units of gas—

- (a) Perth;
- (b) Sydney;
- (c) Melbourne;
- (d) Brisbane;
- (e) Adelaide;
- (f) Hobart?

Mr BRYCE replied:

(a) Perth:	Consumption	Cost/Year
	Level	(\$)
	2 000	89
	4 000	170
	6 000	221
	8 000	272

- (b) to (f) This information can be obtained by writing to the electricity (gas) authorities in the cities named and obtaining their current tariff schedules. Alternatively these schedules could be obtained through the Parliamentary Library.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

Consumption: Industrial, Commercial and General

163. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What percentage of industrial, commercial and general gas consumers consume—

- (a) less than 100 units per day;
- (b) less than 2 300 units per day;
- (c) less than 4 600 units per day?

Mr BRYCE replied:

On the L3 Tariff—

- (a) 8 per cent;

- (b) 48 per cent;
- (c) 66 per cent.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY AND GAS

Charges: Comparable Tariffs List, and Inquiry

164. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Referring the Minister to a letter to me of 27 June from the Minister for Mines, Fuel and Energy concerning State Energy Commission tariffs, could the Minister please provide me with a list of comparable tariffs as referred to in that letter, and which have been distributed to other interested groups?
- (2) Will the Minister also give an undertaking to provide to me full details of the commission's operations which will also be made available to the inquiry into tariffs?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) I invited the member to a briefing on the operations of the commission after he had been appointed shadow spokesman on Fuel and Energy and that briefing has been held.
- (b) The member may and does from time to time seek further information. Each request is and will be considered on its merits.
- (c) The results of the proposed inquiry will be published and the member may participate in making a submission to it.
- (d) An undertaking to provide all information to the member cannot be given.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY AND GAS

Charges: Inquiry

165. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Referring the Minister to the advertisement in *The West Australian* of Saturday, 14 May, headed "Call for Public Submissions on SEC Tariffs", the Minister stated the following—

This is not the ongoing inquiry into tariffs which the Government announced earlier.

In relation to that earlier inquiry, when was it announced?

- (2) What form is it taking?
- (3) Who is conducting the inquiry?
- (4) When is it anticipated that the inquiry will be completed?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) to (4) Shortly after coming to office the Government indicated it would set up a small team to review SECWA tariffs later in the year. Further information will be released in due course.

ROADS: ROUNDABOUTS

Replacement

166. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) As there is seemingly much confusion by motorists approaching road roundabouts and other traffic slowing methods as to who gives way, will he consider replacing the "give way" signs with "give way to the right" signs?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) The Road Traffic Code provides that—

The driver of a vehicle entering a roundabout shall give way to a vehicle that is within the roundabout.

It is considered this clearly defines the position. Any give way signs on approaches to a roundabout reinforce this rule.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Return Trip Concession: Extension

167. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In view of the fact motorists are still jamming the city and parking bays daily, will he encourage motorists to use city-bound buses by increasing the free return trip from two hours to three hours in off-peak period times?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) I am currently considering all possible ways of achieving an economic balance between public transport and private automobile use. In addition to extending ticket validity from two to three hours, there are other potential

means to encourage public transport use in the off-peak periods when a good deal of spare capacity is available. All these are being reviewed for their cost-effectiveness, and the Government will take action to implement whichever means are found most appropriate. I appreciate the member's interest in and support for viable and attractive public transport.

HOSPITALS: BOARDS

Nominations

168. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Why has Cabinet amended the basis upon which nominations are to be sought for appointment of persons to boards of non-teaching hospitals?
- (2) Why are members of Parliament being requested to nominate a person or persons considered suitable for appointment?
- (3) What other persons or organisations are being requested to submit nominations?
- (4) In the interest of local community support for the local hospital, would not the local community be the best judge of persons suitable to serve on the board?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) To enable each hospital board's annual general meeting to have before it a larger number of suitable nominations from whom it can select its nominees. Under the new nomination process, all nominations for appointment are to be submitted from the annual general meeting of each hospital board.
- (2) See (1) above.
- (3) (a) The local government authority for the area in which the hospital is situated and in certain circumstances neighbouring local government authorities which traditionally have submitted nominations for appointment;
- (b) The hospital board.
- (4) At the annual general meeting of the hospital board the local community selects candidates for nomination. I have no doubt that the annual general meeting would consider management skill and experience as well as the need to ensure reasonable continuity in hospital management experience in selecting its nominees.

HEALTH: DENTAL

Dental Technicians Registration Board

169. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it fact that the State Government intends to introduce legislation to enable registration of dental technicians to deal directly with the public for provision of removable dentures?
- (2) If this is so, is he aware of the effect this move will have on country centres, and is he also aware that marginal practices will probably disappear, leaving country communities without the services of a residential dentist?
- (3) Is it a fact that the Australian Dental Association, WA Branch, is strongly opposing this move?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes
- (2) No. I do not believe registration will have any effect on marginal practices in country centres.
- (3) I am aware that the Australian Dental Association does not favour this proposal.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: PARLIAMENTARY OFFICES

Party Meetings

170. Mr TUBBY, to the Speaker:

Are members' parliamentary offices permitted to be used for party political purposes?

Mr SPEAKER replied:

The outline of arrangements for Parliamentary offices as at 1 December 1982 provides, among other things—

In no circumstances is such an office to be used other than for a Member's legitimate electorate responsibilities . . .

No other signs, posters, or election material of any kind are to be displayed. Failure to observe these requirements may lead to forfeiture of the privilege of a parliamentary office . . .

A staff member accepting political party endorsement is required to take leave without pay forthwith . . .

ROADS: BICENTENNIAL PROGRAMME*South-West Shires*

171. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

What funding for roads from the bicentennial road programme will be available to the Shires of Narrogin, Cuballing, Williams, West Arthur, Wagin, Woodanilling, Dumbleyung, Kojonup, and the Town Council of Narrogin—

- (a) for the 1983-84 financial year;
- (b) for the remaining years of the programme?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (a) and (b) Schedule below sets out the information requested by the member. It should be borne in mind, however, that these allocations depend upon the Commonwealth's estimate of revenue to the Australian bicentennial road development trust fund being attained.

Schedule of Allocations to certain councils from ABRD Trust Fund 27 July 1983.

Council	(b)		
	(a) 1983-84 Allocation \$	Each Year 1984-85 to 1987-88 \$	(c) 1988-89 Allocation \$
Narrogin Shire	31 000	31 000	16 000
Cuballing Shire.....	21 000	21 000	10 000
Williams Shire.....	29 000	29 000	14 000
West Arthur Shire....	38 000	38 000	19 000
Wagin Shire.....	50 000	50 000	25 000
Woodanilling Shire....	18 000	18 000	9 000
Dumbleyung Shire	36 000	36 000	18 000
Kojonup Shire.....	60 000	60 000	30 000
Narrogin Town.....	49 000	49 000	25 000

RAILWAYS*Bowelling-Wagin: Report*

172. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has he received the Transport Commission Report on the Wagin-Bowelling railway line?
- (2) Is it intended to discuss the report and its recommendations with the appropriate local government authorities before any final decision is made by the Government?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There will certainly be interaction between local government authorities and myself.

AGRICULTURE: COLLEGE*Narrogin: Manual Arts Workshops*

173. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) With regard to the manual arts workshops at the Narrogin Agricultural College, when was the project originally committed?
- (2) What was the original cost estimate and tender price?
- (3) Was a cost estimate of the electrical wiring installation included in the original total estimates and in the tender arrangements?
- (4) If so, what was the estimate and tender price?
- (5) What construction stage has been reached?
- (6) What works remain to be undertaken and completed?
- (7) What Government approvals and financial allocations have yet to be determined?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Mid-1982
- (2) Estimate—\$134 000
Agglomerated tender price of the various parts—\$129 246.
- (3) No.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) to (7) The building has been erected. Documentation for the internal works has been completed and is now at tender. Funding has been allowed for in the works in progress amount, provided that acceptable tenders are received.

MINING: GOLD*Taxation*

174. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he approached the Prime Minister to clarify reports that the Federal Government is intending to make profits from gold mining subject to taxation liability?
- (2) If so, when was such an approach made?
- (3) What was the result of any approach?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) I have not read such reports.
- (2) I have spoken to the Prime Minister on a number of matters but such discussions are properly confidential and I do not intend to comment on them.
- (3) Not applicable.

HOSPITAL: NARROGIN REGIONAL

Alterations and Maintenance

175. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Health:

What alterations and maintenance works are being undertaken at the Narrogin Regional Hospital?

Mr HODGE replied:

No alterations or work other than routine maintenance is currently being undertaken.

ROAD: ALBANY HIGHWAY

Road Trains

176. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has he yet received the review of road-train operations on the Albany Highway, to be completed during May 1983?
- (2) Is it intended to continue these operations?
- (3) When is he intending to determine the matter of additional passing lanes about which I have been corresponding with him?
- (4) Are any considerations being given or inquiries being made regarding the introduction of additional road train operations in other areas of the Great Southern Region?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) No. There has been some delay in completing the trial.
- (2) to (4) These aspects will be considered and an appropriate announcement made after the Government has received the report referred to.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: DEPUTY PREMIER

Initiatives

177. Mr MENSAROS, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) Could he please itemise all the new initiatives within the portfolios under his

jurisdiction which were not planned by the previous Government and for which there were no specific allowances in the 1982-83 revenue Budget, or in case of an instrumentality not being subject to votes within the revenue Budget items of the budget of the instrumentality?

- (2) Could he also set the amount expended in 1982-83 against that item?
- (3) Could he indicate any votes or part votes in the 1982-83 revenue Budget (or in the case of instrumentalities, in their budgets) within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which have not been expended, and have been used for initiatives as under (1) above?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) to (3) Although I have put in hand a number of new initiatives since assuming office, they have all been in the area of policy development and have not involved expenditure of any significance.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Initiatives: Expenditure

178. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Could the Minister please itemise all the new initiatives within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which were not planned by the previous Government and for which there were no specific allowances in the 1982-83 revenue Budget, or in the case of an instrumentality not being subject to votes within the revenue Budget items of the budget of the instrumentality?
- (2) Could he also set the amount expended in 1982-83 against that item?
- (3) Could he indicate any votes or part votes in the 1982-83 revenue Budget (or in the case of instrumentalities, in their budgets) within the portfolios under his jurisdiction which have not been expended, and have been used for initiatives as under (1) above?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (3) Although the Minister for Industrial Relations has put in hand a number of new initiatives since assuming office, they have all been in the area of policy

development and have not involved expenditure of any significance.

WATER RESOURCES: RATES

Property Valuations

179. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) When did the Valuer General submit all the individual property valuations, to take effect from the 1983-84 financial year, to the Metropolitan Water Authority?
- (2) When did the board of the Metropolitan Water Authority make its first decision about the recommended rates and charges to apply for 1983-84?
- (3) At the time of its first decision—apart from indications of average value increases in various zones—what rough proportion (percentage) of individual property valuations to take effect from 1983-84 have reached the Metropolitan Water Authority?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) About 99.5 per cent of valuations were received by mid-June. Most of the remainder, including corrections and adjustments, were processed by 30 June.
- (2) 9 May 1983.
- (3) Approximately 80 per cent.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION: EXPENDITURE

Checks: New Concept

180. Mr MENSAROS, to the Premier:

- (1) Are the recently announced new checks on Government spending by way of a Cabinet committee the continuation of the method recommended by the architectural division, Public Works Department, about a year or so ago, regarding the General Loan Budget and accepted by the then Government?
- (2) If not, could he please explain the different concepts involved in the "new checks" as opposed to the concept developed earlier, which also required the architectural division, Public Works Department, to provide the Treasury with detailed information which then was to report through the Minister to Cabinet?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The system was developed by Treasury and the Public Works Department over a period of time.
- (2) The new procedures will be introduced by the Government during 1983-84. They will result in greater accountability of departments undertaking building projects, closer scrutiny of proposed expenditure by the Government and regular monitoring of projects from commencement to completion.

WATER RESOURCES, SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE

Rates: Increase

181. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

What were the average percentage increases with the non-Western Australian water supply authorities in Australia for—

- (a) residential water rate or fixed charge;
- (b) residential water price (excess if there is an allowance);
- (c) other than residential water rates and charges;
- (d) sewerage rates (separately, residential and non-residential if there is such a distinction);
- (e) drainage rates (residential and non-residential if there is such a distinction)?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (a) to (e) As implied by my answer to an earlier similar question from the member (question 74 of 26 July 1983) to provide information on Eastern States water charges is not the responsibility of myself as a Minister of the Crown and in fact Standing Orders prevent me from answering such a question.

I suggest that if the member wants this information he writes to the various Eastern States authorities.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS: BUREAU

Prices Commissioner: Staffing

182. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Referring to his answer to my question 9 of 24 March 1983 respecting the Prevention of Excessive Prices Bill, could he

now state the estimated cost for a full year of the increase in staff of the Bureau of Consumer Affairs or any other Government department or instrumentality (whether permanent public servants or ministerial appointments) expected as a direct or indirect result of the provisions of the Prevention of Excessive Prices Act 1983 and, in particular, of its section 5 (2) (c)?

- (2) Could he now say which "other persons" he is going to appoint to the prices advisory committees according to the provisions of section 8 (3) (c) of the Prevention of Excessive Prices Act 1983?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The estimated cost of the additional staff member from April 1983 to December 1983 is \$13 310. This period has been adduced because of the chronological limitation of the Prevention of Excessive Prices Act.
- (2) Apart from the appointment of four members of a prices advisory committee in March 1983 to inquire into the retail petrol industry in this State, no other prices advisory committees are contemplated at this stage.

WATER RESOURCES: NATIONAL SCHEME

Commonwealth Contribution

183. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Referring to his answer to my question 13 of 24 March 1983 respecting the national water resources programme, would he please detail the expected Commonwealth dollar-for-dollar contribution for 1983-84 under the national water resources grant?
- (2) Could he also list the projects for which the contribution will be used?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) In accordance with normal practice appropriate to the present pre-Budget period, the Commonwealth Government has not advised of its intentions in respect to the 1983-84 funding of the National Water Resources Programme.
- (2) Commonwealth financial assistance has been requested for the following projects in 1983-84—
West Pilbara water supply
(Harding Dam project)

Water resources assessment
Collie River salinity control
South-west salinity control
Flood plain mapping
Corrigin flood mitigation
Carnarvon flood protection.

HOSPITAL: ROYAL PERTH

North Block: Construction

184. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Referring to his answer to my question 14 of 24 March 1983, respecting Royal Perth Hospital, could he now state if the construction of the north block of the Royal Perth Hospital will proceed?
- (2) If so, what progress has been made in assessing tenders received for this project?
- (3) What is the type of financing going to be for works to be performed prior to normal capital budget funding?
- (4) If "No" to (1), please give reasons why the project will not proceed?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The Government has re-affirmed its intention to construct the Royal Perth Hospital, north block.
- (2) The Government decided not to accept any of the tenders submitted in mid-January 1983 for the deferred financing and project management of the Royal Perth Hospital, north block.
- (3) The method of financing this project is a matter which will be dealt with as part of the normal capital works budgeting considerations.
- (4) Not applicable.

WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY

Vehicle Fleet

185. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Since he has — obviously inadvertently — given a reply which did not answer my question 15 of 24 March 1983, respecting the Metropolitan Water Authority's vehicle fleet, could he now please state whether his complementary statement in March this year about savings on the ongoing cost of the motor vehicle fleet of the Metropolitan Water Authority mean that he is satisfied with the

efficient working and administration of the reorganised Metropolitan Water Authority, despite the fact that his leader did not withdraw his long-standing demand for a "shakeup from top to bottom of the authority"?

Mr TONKIN replied:

As the member will be very much aware, costs associated with the operation of the MWA's vehicle fleet forms only a small part of the authority's total expenditure.

It is therefore not appropriate nor even possible to make a judgement from this particular minor aspect of the authority's activities as to the general efficiency of the workings and administration of the authority.

WATER RESOURCES

Single Authority: Project Group

186. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Referring to his reply to my question 17 of 24 March 1983, could he now please give information about the names of people comprising the project group which is to report to the steering committee to look at ways of setting up a single water authority?
- (2) (a) Has this project group been given terms of reference, and
(b) if so, can he inform the House about these terms?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The permanent members of the Project Group are Mr R. M. Hillman (Leader), Mr W. J. Wilkin, and Mr P. J. Shaw. Mr R. A. Gregory has worked with the group for a considerable period and others will assist the group from time to time Mr Gregory will re-join the group in September.
- (2) (a) and (b)—The terms of reference for the project team are to examine alternative courses by which the various objectives involved in the establishment of a State water authority could be achieved and step by step to make recommendations to the steering committee as to the means to be adopted.

WATER RESOURCES

Single Authority: Western Australian Water Resources Council

187. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Referring to his reply to my question 18 of 24 March 1983 respecting water resources, could he now inform the House: Did it seem desirable to him to seek the advice of the WA Water Resources Council regarding a single water authority for Western Australia?
- (2) Has the council of its own notion tendered such advice?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

ROAD

Coalfields Highway

188. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

With the increased traffic on the Coalfields Highway between Roelands and Collie, does he not consider that a "slow traffic" lane should be constructed on the highway from Roelands to Collie?

Mr GRILL replied:

A continuous "slow traffic lane" is not warranted. A number of "slow traffic lane" sections already exist to provide passing opportunities.

HOUSING: PENSIONERS

Collie

189. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Housing:

In view of the extreme shortage of State Housing Commission homes and pensioner flats in Collie, will he give urgent consideration to an immediate building programme to overcome the problem?

Mr WILSON replied:

The State Housing Commission construction programme for 1983-84 cannot be finalised until the State Budget is brought down when total funding arrangements will then be known. Every consideration will be given to the special housing needs at Collie when the programme is established.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

Natural: Electricity Generation

190. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Before leaving office, did the former Government commit the Labor Government to the use of natural gas in Western Australia?
- (2) If "Yes", would the Minister please give details of the agreement?
- (3) What amount of gas is to be used for power generation in Western Australia and for what period?
- (4) What effect will this have on the Collie coalfield?
- (5) What is the current price of power per kilowatt hour using coal?
- (6) What is the anticipated price per kilowatt hour using natural gas?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) The former Government, through the State Energy Commission, contracted to buy gas from the North-West Shelf and Woodada joint venture participants to provide for the needs of Western Australia as the Dongara field depleted. Certain commitments were made also under the North West Gas Development (Woodside) Agreement Act, 1979.
- (2) Contract details are confidential for the sale and purchase of gas.
- (3) Quantities of gas will be used for power generation at the Kwinana power station. Exact quantities will depend on load and various contractual obligations.
- (4) The total quantity of coal produced annually from Collie is likely to remain stable for several years.
- (5) and (6) Costs of power depends on a variety of complex matters including capital costs, load size, geographic location, voltage level, time of day, etc. It is not possible to give a simplified answer to this question.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

Charges: Increase

191. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is it fact that in *Government Gazette* No. 44 increases in gas charges for business operations for the periods from

1 July 1983, 1 October 1983, 1 January 1984 and 1 April 1984 were prescribed?

- (2) Is it a fact that as applied to a business operation the rates applicable from 1 April 1984 will represent an increase of 41.5 per cent over those applicable prior to 1 July 1983, based on a 70 000 unit consumption?
- (3) If so, is this in accordance with Government policy in relation to business operations?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Gas charges are consistent with the Government's policy to supply energy at the lowest possible cost to Western Australian industry.

FISHERIES: LESCHENAULT INLET

Effluent Spillage

192. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What surveys were carried out by his department following an effluent spillage in Leschenault Inlet during February this year to ascertain whether there were any effects on marine life?
- (2) Would he table all reports?
- (3) If "No" to (1) and (2), what Government departments were involved, and would any reports be tabled?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) None.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) I do not have the information to answer this question.

COMMUNITY WELFARE: DEPARTMENT

Woman with Children: Assistance

193. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Youth and Community Services:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Department for Community Welfare has resumed a policy of being prepared to underwrite the expenses of women with children who leave their homes because of matrimonial difficulties and wish to leave Western Australia without the knowledge or consent of their husbands?
- (2) If so, when was the policy instituted?

- (3) Was the policy instituted with the direct authority of the Minister?
- (4) What is the policy statement governing the conduct of departmental officers in relation to this matter?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.
- (4) Administrative instruction No. 222. A copy is tabled herewith.

The instruction was tabled (see paper No. 183).

ECONOMY: CAMPBELL REPORT

Implementation: Committee

194. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is there in existence a committee of the Government or the Treasury Department in relation to the attitude of the Western Australian Government to the implementation of the recommendations of the Campbell Report on the Australian financial system?
- (2) If so, what is the progress of the work of that committee?
- (3) What is the membership of the committee?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Reports on a number of issues were prepared for consideration by the previous Government.
- (3) Membership of the committee comprises representatives of the Treasury and agriculture departments, the Corporate Affairs Office, the Rural and Industries Bank, and the Registrar of Building Societies and credit unions.

ECONOMY: CAMPBELL REPORT

Review: Committee

195. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is the Western Australian Government concerned to make an input to the committee of review appointed by the Commonwealth Government and comprised of a Mr Martin, a Professor Hancock and Mr Beaton, which committee is concerned to report further on the recommendations of the Campbell Report into the Australian financial system?

- (2) Has the Western Australian Government been invited to make any submission to the review committee?
- (3) Is the Western Australian Government concerned to ensure that the needs of the Western Australian economy, as distinct from the economies of the Eastern States, are regarded in any recommendations of the review committee?
- (4) If it has not already done so will the Government establish some advisory committee to examine the matter and ensure that a Western Australian submission is made?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The WA Government will make an input to the Martin committee because its terms of reference cover matters of vital importance to this state. These include the need for a nature of special arrangements for the channelling and regulation of funds to finance capital works, and the provision of assistance for the housing, rural and small business sectors.
- (2) The WA Government does not need an invitation to contribute to an inquiry which affects the interests of its citizens.
- (3) Answered by (1).
- (4) The Government has the matter in hand.

LAND: AGRICULTURAL

Release: Esperance

196. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the reason for the delay in the completion of new land release in the Esperance region?
- (2) When will the release of the land be finalised?
- (3) What obstacles are there, if any, to the completion of preparation for the release of the land?
- (4) Is it a fact that arrangements for release of the land were completed months ago and then again delayed by a Government decision?
- (5) What was that decision, and what was the reason for it?
- (6) What studies are being carried out, and by whom?
- (7) What Ministers are involved?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (7) Upon taking office, the Government considered that a review of agricultural land release was desirable. To this end, a committee of review was formed comprising the Minister for Lands and Surveys, the Minister for Agriculture, the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Minister for Environment.

This review committee is being assisted by the respective departmental permanent heads and by a working party of officers.

The terms of reference include a requirement for the committee to review the adequacy of the current system of assessing the suitability of Crown lands for release for agriculture and the impact of such release on the environment.

It was decided that, apart from two releases in the Ravensthorpe area, all other release proposals would be deferred pending the results of the review. This decision affects any further land release in the Esperance region, including the Beaumont stage 2 proposal which it is assumed the member is referring to. This particular proposal had not been completed in so far as final clearances are concerned.

The review committee hopes to complete its task by the end of the year and will shortly be inviting written submissions from relevant organisations and the public.

STATE FINANCE: GOVERNMENT TRUST FUNDS

Credit Balance

197. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

Would he list the credit balance of each governmental trust fund as at 19 February 1983?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

It is not possible to produce a list of balances of governmental trust funds at a particular date historically, other than at the end of month.

The end of month balances are not printed from the computer system except on a quarterly basis. However, if information at the end of January or the end of February would satisfy the member, I will arrange to have it compiled and given to him. It would take about two days to obtain the report.

MEDIA STUDIO

Establishment

198. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) (a) Has the Government established an elaborate media studio, and
(b) if so, where is it located?
- (2) What was the cost of establishing the studio?
- (3) For what purpose is it to be used?
- (4) How many persons are associated with its operation?
- (5) What are their designations?
- (6) What is the estimated annual cost of operating the studio?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) (a) No;
(b) not applicable.
- (2) to (6) Not applicable.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: DEPUTY PREMIER

Office: Renovation

199. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Deputy Premier:

Would he provide a detailed breakdown of the publicly announced \$200 000 cost of refurbishing his office earlier this year, listing in particular, costs related to—

- (a) floor and wall coverings;
- (b) equipment;
- (c) furniture?

Mr BRYCE replied:

My office has not been refurbished.

- (a) to (c) Not applicable.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Office: Renovation

200. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

Would he provide a detailed breakdown of the publicly announced \$55 000 cost of refurbishing his office earlier this year, listing in particular, costs relating to—

- (a) floor and wall coverings;
- (b) equipment;
- (c) furniture?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (a) to (c) The need for ministerial accommodation varies with the rearrangements of portfolios after the re-election, or after the election, of a Government. The Premier has announced already action he has taken to impose restrictions on alterations to ministerial accommodation. I wish to add nothing further to that statement. Should the member have a specific point or criticism, I will be happy to consider it.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: CABINET

Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet: New Appointments

201. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he advise the number of new appointments to the office of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet since February 1983?
- (2) What was the size of the department's establishment prior to his assuming office?
- (3) What is it now?
- (4) What is the additional annual cost of wages, overheads and contingent items resulting from the increased establishment?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) I refer the member to the answer to question 125 of Tuesday, 26 July 1983.

MINISTER OF THE CROWN: MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Appointments: Additional

202. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Will the Minister please advise the number of new appointments to his office since February 1983?
- (2) Will the Minister list the occupations of these staff, stating whether regular civil servants or otherwise?
- (3) Will the Minister list the wages for this staff?
- (4) Will the Minister advise the cost of any additional equipment purchased, hired or obtained for this office since February 1983?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (4) The Premier will be making a statement to the Legislative Assembly in the near future which will canvass the matters referred to in the member's question.

MINISTER OF THE CROWN: MINISTER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

Appointments: Additional

203. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology:

- (1) Will he advise the number of new appointments to his office since February 1983?
- (2) Will he list the occupations of these staff, stating whether regular civil servants or otherwise?
- (3) Will he list the wages for this staff?
- (4) Will he advise the cost of any additional equipment purchased, hired or obtained for this office since February 1983?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) to (4) The Premier will be making a statement to the Legislative Assembly in the near future which will canvass the matters referred to in the member's question.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: MINISTERIAL ADVISERS

Appointments: Additional

204. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Will he detail each ministerial adviser appointed since his Government took office?
- (2) What qualifications does each have that fits him for the position to which he has been appointed?
- (3) What salaries are being paid to these advisers?
- (4) What additional costs to the taxpayer are involved in each of these appointments?
- (5) Where is the extra money coming from?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (5) I refer the member to the answer to question 125 of Tuesday, 26 July 1983.

TOWN PLANNING: COTTESLOE HOTEL

Redevelopment

205. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Did the advice he received from his department support the decision made by him to allow the appeal in the form it was allowed to permit redevelopment of the Cottesloe Hotel?
- (2) In view of remarks made by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burke, as reported in the *Daily News* on 22 April 1982 is his decision consistent with Labor policy?
- (3) What factors influenced his decision?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Advice is not normally received on appeals from the Town Planning Department. In fact, my predecessors have felt (and I agree with them) that it was important that advice on appeals be seen to be from a different source than from the department, bearing in mind that the department is involved in advising the MRPA, the Town Planning Board and the Minister in other capacities. On this occasion, a member of the town planning appeal committee (set up under the Act) provided a comprehensive report, which advised in support of the decision I eventually made.
- (2) The proposed Cottesloe Hotel redevelopment does not approach the scale of the two 20-storey development proposals for the Scarborough beachfront referred to in the *Daily News* of 22 April 1982. The foreshore development zone of the Cottesloe Town Council's scheme provides for this type of development.
- (3) The zoning, location, size, and present use of the land together with the fact that the council's expert building advisory committee commended the architects on the high standard of design of the development.

ROADS: LAKES AREA

Heavy Transport Operation

206. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Were tenders called in respect of the heavy transport road traffic operation in

the Lakes area (Lake King, Varley and surrounding districts)?

- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) Has a contract been let?
- (4) If so, for how long?
- (5) To which company was the contract let?
- (6) When was it let?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) I must assume the term "heavy transport road traffic operations" refers to the carriage of grain and fertilizer both to and from Esperance. If so, tenders are to be called for the cartage of grain from the Munglinup off-rail CBH facility prior to the 1983-84 grain harvest, and for the remaining bins of the Lakes area immediately prior to the 1985-86 harvest.
- (2) to (6) Not applicable.

HEALTH: INSURANCE

Medicare: Retrenchments

207. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware that private health funds estimate that 386 health fund staff in Western Australia will lose their jobs when Medicare is introduced and that only a portion of these will find employment with Medibank Private which expects to recruit only 16 extra staff?
- (2) Is the State Government in favour of the proposed Medicare arrangements which will leave some 250 people unemployed with no cost savings?
- (3) Did the Federal Minister for Health approach the State Government with a request that it take on staff from the health funds?
- (4) Is the Western Australian Government making arrangements to employ retrenched staff?
- (5) Has any estimate been made of the expected levels of the Western Australian population that will remain insured for hospital benefits after the introduction of Medicare next year?
- (6) What extra funds did Western Australia receive to compensate for the loss of revenue expected as a result of the introduction of Medicare?
- (7) Upon what basis was the extra funding calculated?

- (8) As it has been estimated by the private hospitals that a 10 per cent decline in their occupancy, as a consequence of the introduction of Medicare, will require 120 beds per day in the public hospitals, what capacity has the public hospital system got to accommodate a shift from the private hospitals?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The employment consequences of the introduction of Medicare on private health funds cannot be accurately determined at this time. Much will depend upon the numbers of people who continue to hold private hospital insurance after 1 February 1984, and the impact of expansion of insurance coverage by the health funds into new areas. Precise statistics are not yet available.

It is anticipated that the Health Insurance Commission will engage in the order of 160 additional staff and not the 16 quoted by the member and preference will be given to suitable staff displaced from other private funds.

- (2) The State Government fully supports the Federal Government's election mandate for the introduction of Medicare. The programme will result in considerable cost savings to low and middle income earners and remove the financial necessity for many Australians to gamble with their future health and the possible disastrous consequences which can and do occur.

With respect to the employment consequences, see answer to (1). With the high staff turnover rate in the health insurance industry of 20 per cent, the final impact on unemployment is expected to be considerably less than the figure quoted.

- (4) Yes. The State Government, along with the Federal Government, has agreed to give employment preference to suitable staff displaced from the private health funds.

- (5) All Western Australians will automatically be covered for hospital insurance following the introduction of Medicare.

- (6) \$63.6 million

- (7) (a) Abolition of outpatient fees and the professional service charge for inpatients.

- (b) A reduction in the shared private patient fee in public hospitals to \$80 per day.

- (c) Expected changes in status within public hospitals from private to public patients.

- (8) A major shift from private to public hospitals is not foreshadowed as a result of Medicare. Sufficient capacity exists within public hospitals to accommodate any increase in demand which may occur.

LAND: YILGARN

Special Lease

208. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

Further to question 61 of Tuesday, 26 July, respecting "special lease land", would the Minister please answer those parts of the question not referred to in his original answer (parts (1), (7), (8) and (9))?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) I am aware that my predecessor visited the area and discussed the matter with the shire and also that the decision undertaken by the then Minister was against all advice provided by the Mines Department.

- (7) All relevant local members were consulted.

- (8) I was advised of the department's review of departmental procedures and its recommendations to the previous Minister and his decision on the matter.

- (9) As the member would be aware, the Leader of the Opposition wrote to the Premier concerning this matter and a copy of his reply was forwarded to the member recently. If the member has any further specific points to make, the Minister for Mines would be more than happy to respond upon receipt of further correspondence.

GRAIN: CARTAGE

Tenders

209. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Transport:

In connection with the Government's decision to call tenders for the cartage of grain from off-rail bins in Lakes and Albany areas, will he please provide—

- (a) details of the proposal, including dates and areas to be covered;
- (b) details of the surveys carried out by the Transport Commission, including the precise questions asked and an analysis of the replies to each question;
- (c) details of the criteria to be used in awarding a new contract and, in particular, will price alone be the determining factor?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (a) In respect to the Lakes area, tenders will be called for the cartage of grain from the Munglinup off-rail bin prior to the 1983-84 harvest, and tenders will be called for the cartage of grain from the seven remaining off-line bins immediately prior to the 1985-86 grain harvest.

Tenders will be called for the cartage of grain from the Albany off-rail bins immediately prior to the 1986-87 harvest.

- (b) Both surveys were undertaken during the period 21 February to 14 March 1983. The Albany survey obtained responses from 502 individual farmers, 57 per cent supported an extension of contract to the existing carrier. The Lakes survey obtained responses from 312 farmers, with 52 per cent preferring an extension of contract to the existing carrier.

These responses were provided in answer to the question "are you in favour of calling new tenders for the transport of grain in the survey area?" The responses to the other questions of the surveys are generally not capable of being provided in an aggregated form.

I will send a copy of both questionnaire forms to the member.

- (c) The conditions of tender have not as yet been finalised. However, while price is a primary consideration in awarding a contract, a normal condition of tender provides that the Commissioner of Transport will take into account the suitability of equipment and that the lowest, or any tender, will not necessarily be accepted.

210. *This question was postponed.*

HOUSING: BUSSELTON, CAPEL AND MARGARET RIVER

Construction Programme

211. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the State Housing Commission's building programme at Margaret River, Busselton and Capel for the year ending 30 June 1984?
- (2) What will be the number of units to be built in each town in single, two, three-bedroom etc.?
- (3) What is the method of funding housing, and are any to be built for a specific purpose or project?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) to (3) The State Housing Commission's building programme for 1983-84 cannot be finalised until the State Budget is brought down when total funding arrangements will then be known. Every consideration will be given to the special housing needs at Margaret River, Busselton and Capel, when the programme is established.

STATE FORESTS: RESERVES

Ministerial: Cancellation

212. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

Following the cancellation of temporary ministerial reserves in State forests, can he give any assurance that forest hygiene and management will not be deleteriously affected by the Government's decision?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Yes.

STATE FORESTS: RESERVES

Ministerial: Cancellation

213. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

Would the Minister table maps and relevant papers showing the extent of ministerial reserves in State forests and those locations that were recently cancelled by him?

Mr BRYCE replied:

There are currently no ministerial reserves in State forests. A plan will be prepared and made available to the member shortly.

FISHERIES: ROCK LOBSTER

Rottnest: Illegal Sales

214. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) Has his department made investigations of assertions of illegal crayfish sales on Rottnest Island?
- (2) (a) When did inquiries commence;
- (b) who were the officers involved with the inquiry; and
- (c) would the Minister table any report of the committee?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) As the investigations will result in prosecution action, I cannot provide further details at this stage.

FISHERIES: HERRING AND SALMON

Annual Catch

215. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What is the amount of—
 - (a) herring;
 - (b) salmon,
 caught by professional fishermen in each year since 1978?
- (2) Further to (1), can he give any estimate of the quantities caught by amateur fishermen?
- (3) What is the quantity of—
 - (a) herring; and
 - (b) salmon,
 sold in each year since 1978 as bait?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) (a) Australian Herring

1977-78	811 tonnes
1978-79	913 tonnes
1979-80	776 tonnes
1980-81	740 tonnes
1981-82	788 tonnes
- (b) Australian Salmon

1977-78	755 tonnes
1978-79	1 191 tonnes
1979-80	1 260 tonnes
1980-81	1 374 tonnes
1981-82	1 547 tonnes
- (2) Salmon tagging experiments in the 1970's indicated that amateur fishermen recovered at least one-third of the tags

which were returned. No estimate is available on the amateur catch of Australian herring.

- (3) (a) and (b) This information is not known.

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Shannon River: Area

216. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What is the size of the forest area involved in the Government's proposal to create Shannon River National Park?
- (2) (a) Does the Government intend to include "buffer" areas around the proposed park; and
- (b) if so, what is the size of the area concerned?
- (3) Will he table maps showing areas of State Forest and other Crown land that will form the area as in questions (1) and (2)?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Areas involved are—

State Forest	44 433 hectares
National Park	357 hectares
Other Crown land	4 244 hectares
- (2) (a) No.
- (b) Answered by 2(a).
- (3) Yes. With permission, the attached map is tabled.

The map was tabled (see paper No. 184).

STATE FORESTS: CONSERVATOR

Appointment

217. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) (a) Does the Government intend to appoint a conservator; and
- (b) if so, when will that announcement be made?
- (2) (a) If "No" to (1), is the Government proposing an alternative position or positions to that of conservator; and
- (b) if so, what are the proposals?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) (a) No. Mr G. McNamara will continue as Acting Conservator of Forests until Government has considered the report of the south-west land resource task force;
- (b) answered by (a).
- (2) (a) and (b) Answered by 1 (a).

STATE FORESTS: ADVISERS

Appointments

218. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Has he appointed any forestry advisers to either the Forests or Premier's portfolios?
- (2) (a) If "Yes", what are the names of persons concerned;
- (b) date of appointment;
- (c) method of selection, qualification, term of appointment, remuneration, special or additional benefits of employment?
- (3) Are the advisers subject to the Government's proposed 10 per cent senior Government officers' salary cut?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) I refer the member to the answer to question 125 of Tuesday, 26 July 1983.

SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

Ministers: Singapore Trip

219. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Was he aware that the information he stated he was seeking regarding public transport and shipping in Singapore during his recent trip, was already available to him in his own portfolio?
- (2) Will he please table details of any information he obtained which he considered was not already held in Western Australia or his portfolio?
- (3) Will he please say who recommended that he and the Minister for Works should make the trip?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (3) Among other things, the 5-day Singapore visit gave an opportunity to meet with the principals of South-East Asian shipping companies and to discuss present and future sea connections between the west coast of Australia and the ASEAN region. It was important to reassure these people that the Burke Government's awareness of the economic and strategic importance of the ASEAN region and that the level of its participation in the economic growth of the Indian Ocean area are both

significantly higher than those of the previous Government. The decision to visit Singapore was mine, with the approval of the Premier, and I invite the member to judge its success by the progressive improvements which will be brought to Western Australia's transport.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Mundijong

220. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Government decided to renege on the previous Government's commitment to commence a district high school at Mundijong for the start of the 1985 school year?
- (2) If "Yes", is he aware of the people of Serpentine-Jarrahdale district being up-in-arms at the disadvantage to their children from what is seen as a decision based on the Minister advantaging his own electorate?
- (3) Will he reconsider his decision and reinstate the commitment to build the Mundijong District High School for the start of the 1985 school year?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (3) No. I understand the previous Government made some form of promise with regard to the Mundijong school at the last election, but no funds were allocated for this purpose.

The construction of a district high school at Mundijong would prevent the establishment of a high school at Byford for many years to come.

The Government would prefer to have a high school rather than a district high school in the Serpentine-Jarrahdale shire.

I will be having talks with the shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale on the location and timing of high school facilities in its area.

BUSINESSES

Taxes and Charges: Increase

221. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology:

Further to question 62 of Tuesday, 26 July respecting increases in Government

taxes and charges, would he please detail those bodies with which consultations were held, and from which submissions were received?

Mr BRYCE replied:

Groups consulted were—

Federated Chambers of Commerce
Confederation of Western
Australia Industry
Chamber of Mines
Mines and Metals Association
Primary Industry Association of WA
Pastoralists and Graziers Association
Local Government Association
Country Shire Councils Association
Representatives from welfare
organisations nominated by the WA
Council of Social Services.
Trades and Labor Council Executive.

Submissions were received from—

Federated Chamber of Commerce
Confederation of WA Industry
Primary Industry Association
Pastoralists and Graziers Association.

TAXATION: PAYROLL

Abolition or Reduction

222. Mr COWAN, to the Treasurer:

Can he inform the House of any initiatives he has taken to abolish or at least ease the burden of payroll tax upon small businesses?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The member will be aware that when the Government assumed office it faced a severe budgetary deficit. The Government since assuming office successfully reduced the forecasted Budget deficit of \$21m. to \$14.2m.

The consequent framing of this year's Budget is a difficult one and any concessions to be granted will be considered in the overall Budget context.

ROADS

Funds: Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Receival Points

223. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to make funds available to local authorities specifically for the purpose of upgrading and sealing roads servicing Co-operative Bulk Handling off-rail receival points?

(2) (a) If "Yes", what funds will be provided to the Narembeen Shire for Cramphorne and Mt. Walker roads;

(b) the Yilgarn Shire for—

(i) Moorine Rock/Marvel Loch road;

(ii) Moorine Rock/Dulyabbin Road;

(iii) Cramphorne Road;

(c) the Kondinin/Kulin Shires for the south-east Hyden bin road?

(3) When can residents in the eastern portion of the Kondinin and Kulin Shires expect the Lake Varley section of the Armadale/Lake King road to be realigned and sealed?

Mr GRILL replied:

(1) Under a policy developed recently by the Main Roads Department special financial assistance which is subject to local authorities also contributing, can be provided for the improvement of unclassified roads used for the cartage of grain from off-rail receival bins. Improvements can include sealing of these roads, but this would depend on various factors including the amount of traffic. In addition, the normal level of maintenance allocations to assist local authorities in maintaining these roads has been increased.

(2) (a) to (c) The intention is that local authorities will make submissions seeking special financial assistance for the improvement of unclassified roads used for cartage of grain from off-rail receival bins, indicating their preparedness to contribute towards the work. The provision of special assistance will depend on an assessed priority of the work compared to the many other requests that are received.

Following an approach from the Narembeen Shire Council an amount of \$40 000 has been provided in the 1983-84 programme for work on Cramphorne Road. Of this amount, \$24 000 represents special financial assistance over and above that which would normally be made to the local authority.

The provision of special financial assistance for the roads detailed in 2(b) and (c) will depend on consideration of any detailed submissions the local authorities concerned may make.

- (3) Current planning is to upgrade the unsealed section between Hyden and Holt Rock to a good gravel road standard over the next four years. An amount of \$660 000 has been provided in 1983-84 to enable a start to be made on this work. No date has been set for sealing of the section.

RAILWAYS: FREIGHT

Grain: Contractual Agreement

224. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will the Government review the contractual grain freight agreement entered into by Westrail, representatives of grain growers, handlers and commodity groups?
- (2) If "Yes", will grain grower representatives be given an opportunity to take part in the review?
- (3) Will they have access to information on freight charges made by Westrail for other bulk commodities?
- (4) If a review is undertaken, will it be completed before the 1983-84 harvest?
- (5) Does the Government intend to regulate grain onto rail for the coming harvest?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The grain freight agreement will be reviewed.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No. Freight charges for other bulk commodities are the subject of commercial agreements and are confidential between the parties.
- (4) There is provision in the existing agreement for the parties to declare their intention as to the negotiation of a new agreement prior to 31 October 1983 and to settle the terms of any new agreement prior to 30 June 1984.
- (5) The transport of grain will continue to be regulated under existing conditions.

HEALTH

Alzheimer's Disease

225. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Approximately how many Western Australians suffer from Alzheimer's disease?

- (2) Approximately what percentage of people over 65 are affected by the disease?
- (3) What social support and specialist facilities are available to sufferers in Western Australia?
- (4) What additional State Government aid, if any, is planned for those afflicted with the disease?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The disease is not notifiable and indeed there is no agreed definition so it is impossible to estimate how many people suffer from this disease.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) Western Australia has an extended care service which is more extensive and comprehensive than that in any other Australian State. These services which provide home, hostel and hospital services are provided by medical nursing and allied health professionals and are available to sufferers of Alzheimer's disease, as well as to all other people with continuing disabilities.
- (4) The future development of extended care services in metropolitan Perth are being reviewed by C. M. Campbell and Associates Pty. Ltd.

The aim of this review is to ensure that the services provided are appropriate to the needs of the patients concerned. The particular problems which Alzheimer's disease present will be taken into account when the results of this review are implemented.

TELEVISION: FITZROY CROSSING

Satellite Service

226. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Regional Development and the North West:

- (1) Is he aware of a petition from residents at Fitzroy Crossing seeking a remote area TV service via satellite?
- (2) Has the State Government made representations to the Commonwealth seeking a TV service for Fitzroy Crossing?
- (3) When is it anticipated that a TV service will be provided for this community?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.

- (3) There are no current plans for Fitzroy Crossing to be provided with a TV service. A new remote area TV scheme is being considered by the Department of Communications. Submissions are being made to the Commonwealth Government to support Fitzroy Crossing and other remote communities currently not receiving TV.

TRANSPORT

Withholding Tax: Effect on Industry

227. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What effect will the Federal Government's new withholding tax have on the transport industry in Western Australia when it commences on 1 September 1983?
- (2) Has the State Government provided any information or assistance to transport operators in this State in order to help them minimise the effects of this new tax?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) I am not aware of any new withholding tax which the Federal Government may be introducing on 1 September 1983. However, the Federal Government is introducing a prescribed payments system on this date which does not impose any new taxation. The system will require that income tax for which subcontractors in the road transport industry are liable will now be collected in a PAYE fashion via the prime contractor.
- (2) An explanation of the prescribed payments system will be included in the next update of the appropriate "Cab Contact" booklet for small road transport operators. The Commonwealth is understood to be issuing information on the new system in August.
- (3) Not applicable.

ROADS: BICENTENNIAL PROGRAMME

Local Authorities: Entitlements

228. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) On what date were local authorities in Western Australia requested to provide details regarding funds requested under

the Australian bicentennial road development programme?

- (2) On what date did the Federal Government approve the grants to Western Australian local authorities?
- (3) What will be the entitlement under this programme for Western Australia in the 1983-84 financial year?
- (4) When can individual local authorities expect to receive these funds?
- (5) Where is it anticipated that the additional 370 jobs (as announced by the Minister) will be created in Western Australia under this programme?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) 5 January 1983.
- (2) The Federal Minister for Transport's approval for the first 60 councils was received on 23 June 1983 and the next 46 councils on 21 July 1983. Thirty-three councils' programmes are still being processed.
- (3) \$9.04 million for all the 139 local authorities.
- (4) On submission of progress claims by the local authority after programme approval has been received.
- (5) Amongst the local authorities concerned.

FUEL LEVY AND MOTOR VEHICLE LICENCE FEES

Increase: Percentage

229. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) By how much has the Western Australian Government increased the fuel levy in 1983?
- (2) What has been the percentage increase in motor vehicle licence fees in 1983?
- (3) As the increase to local authorities for statutory road funds has been restricted to 6 per cent for the 1983-84 financial year, why has it been necessary for the Government to increase its own charges in excess of this amount?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Diesel 0.45 cents per litre.
Petrol 0.25 cents per litre.
- (2) 7.5 per cent.
- (3) To obtain the maximum funds available to the State from the Commonwealth under the terms of the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Trust Fund

Act each State has to meet certain matching requirements from its own sources otherwise the Commonwealth could transfer funds, that would have been available for Western Australian roads, to another State. In setting the increases for road user charges applicable in 1983-84, the Government had this matching requirement as a primary target. This required increases of the above order.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT: ROADS

"Jobs on Local Roads" Programme

230. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

- (1) When was the Commonwealth scheme to provide jobs on local roads (JOLOR) programme first announced?
- (2) Have local authorities in Western Australia received any guidelines as yet for the appointment of employees under this programme?
- (3) When is it anticipated that people will be able to be employed under this programme in Western Australia?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Announced by Commonwealth Government in May 1983.
- (2) No—the Federal Minister for Transport wrote to local government authorities Australiawide on 29 May 1983, providing general information on the programme.
- (3) As soon as practicable after finalisation of guidelines and projects approved.

ROAD

Nanutarra: Tom Price

231. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it intended to re-route the road between Nanutarra and Tom Price?
- (2) If "Yes", is it intended that the new alignment will by-pass the town of Paraburdoo?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The alignment of the section from the junction with the Paraburdoo access road to Tom Price is currently being investigated. While the route is expected to generally follow the existing road, re-

alignment of the section approaching and in the vicinity of Tom Price is likely.

- (2) The existing shortest route between Nanutarra and Tom Price already by-passes Paraburdoo. Paraburdoo will continue to be served by existing access roads from the Nanutarra-Wittenoom Road and Tom Price.

BRIDGE: BURSWOOD

Construction

232. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Was he aware the previous Government agreed with the Perth City Council to discuss the implications of resiting Burswood Island bridge after the appropriate Government departments had considered and reported upon the consultant's report prior to proceeding with the decision to proceed this year with the sand fill for the bridge approaches?
- (2) Is he also aware the stated Burke Government's proposal for the city northern by-pass road has obviously the same detail as prepared by the previous Government and the difference of approach is that the Government is to allow home construction on the regional road reserve, and the construction phase, after the two-way road system is in place, is deferred indefinitely?
- (3) Will he please confirm the Government's endorsement to commence construction of Burswood Bridge in 1986?
- (4) If the answer to (3) is "No", will he say to which works the identified road funds for the Burswood Bridge have been allocated?
- (5) Is he aware the previous Government amended the regional scheme to reduce the status of Riverside Drive to limit the development of Riverside Drive?
- (6) Is he aware the Perth City Council has strongly supported the earliest construction of the city northern by-pass road including Burswood Bridge?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) I am not aware of the details of the previous Government's agreement with Perth City Council, but I have had discussion with council on the matter raised in the question.

- (2) Details of the first stage of the proposal are the same. While construction of a freeway from the proposed Burswood Bridge to the Hamilton interchange on the Mitchell Freeway has been deferred indefinitely, no decision has yet been made concerning the use of the controlled access reservation. It is intended, however, to study its use and management to ensure that the land is utilised to the best advantage.
- (3) It is intended that the main work commence in the financial year 1986-87.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) I understand the councillors have indicated support for the early construction of this project in the past.

CO-OPERATIVE BULK HANDLING LTD.

Deficit

233. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Referring to question 104 of 1983, item (3), respecting transport of grain, what was the amount owing by Co-operative Bulk Handling to Westrail on 30 June 1983 and 1 July 1983?
- (2) Will he let me have the detail as soon as practicable of the over and under run of items in 1982-83 Budget making up the Westrail deficit as at 30 June 1983?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The amount owing by Co-operative Bulk Handling to Westrail on 30 June 1983 was \$1 060 000. This amount was taken into account as earnings for 1982-83. The amount owing on 1 July 1983 was \$1 060 000.
- (2) Details of the variation from budgeted deficit will be provided when final figures are available.

NATURAL DISASTER: DROUGHT

Assistance

234. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) With respect to drought assistance given during the 1982 and 1983 seasons, what was the total amount given for subsidies in—
 - (a) fodder;

- (b) agistment;
- (c) freight;
- (d) interest?

- (2) In each of the above cases what was the amount advanced by the Commonwealth?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The total amount of drought subsidies paid to date since the drought was declared from 30 June 1982 is—

Agricultural Areas		\$
(a) Fodder subsidy		841 207.00
(b) Agistment subsidy		497 996.00
(c) Freight for agistment		990 859.00
Freight for fodder		213 479.00
Freight for restocking		2 244.00
Pastoral Areas		
(a) Fodder subsidy		3 715.00
(b) Agistment subsidy		53 103.00
(c) Freight for agistment		31 485.00
Freight for fodder		4 289.00

Total interest rate subsidy paid is \$90 499 (three months behind in claim processing).

Total carry-on loans (to 30 June only) \$10 700 000 already funded. An additional \$358 000 approved but not yet funded.

N.B. Disaster relief is funded on the basis of the State meeting the first \$3 000 000 and the remainder \$3 from the Commonwealth and \$1 from the States.

The fodder subsidy and the interest rate subsidy are fully funded by the Commonwealth Government.

All other measures are funded under disaster relief arrangements.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOLS

"Peace and Disarmament" Course

235. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he directed the Education Department to prepare, for subsequent introduction, a new course titled "Peace and Disarmament", for students in years 7 and 10?
- (2) If "Yes", why has he taken this course?
- (3) Was this matter included in the policy of the Australian Labor Party at the 1983 State elections?
- (4) If the answer to (1) is "No", does he intend to introduce to our schools any courses on peace and disarmament?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable
- (3) No.
- (4) This topic is currently dealt with in the new social studies K-10 syllabus in two areas.

Year 7 Theme: *Society and Culture.*

Unit Title: *Co-operation and Conflict.*

Understanding: Resolution of conflict can be achieved by several forms of co-operation.

Focus: In what ways can people co-operate?

Year 10 *Decision-Making.*

Theme:

Unit Title: *International Co-operation and Conflict.*

Understanding: There are agencies which work to foster international co-operation.

Focus: In what ways can countries co-operate?

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME: MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Channel 7 News Report

40. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware that at 6.30 p.m. yesterday the Channel 7 news quoted a report of the Premier's statement to Parliament made in the House at approximately 8.15 last night?
- (2) Is the Premier also aware that the report was quoted on the basis that the Premier had already delivered his address to the House?
- (3) In view of the fact that the Leader of the House specifically refused a request from the Opposition for any copy of the Premier's remarks to be given to the Opposition, in advance of the Premier's making his speech, even though the Leader of the Opposition was to reply to that speech immediately after the Premier spoke, does the Premier acknowledge his act of gross discourtesy in dealing with this matter?
- (4) Did the Premier arrange or cause to be arranged the advance release of copies of his speech to the media at the same

time as having refused any advance copy to the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (4) It is interesting to see the petulance of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not changed.

I am not aware of the report to which the Leader of the Opposition refers. All I can say is that the Leader of the Opposition was contacted and offered the opportunity to adjourn the debate on the Address-in-Reply to enable him to consider this statement or to have the right of reply to the statement immediately. I would have thought that was anything but gross discourtesy.

Mr O'Connor: It was given to someone before us.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition was given the right of reply to the statement prior to tonight's—

Mr O'Connor: You know Channel 7 had a copy.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am sorry if the Leader of the Opposition feels that he has been the subject of gross discourtesy—it was not intentional. I was unaware that Channel 7 had quoted the report in the manner in which the Leader of the Opposition says it was quoted.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: OVERSEAS TRIPS

Soviet Union

41. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

Yesterday the Premier refused to answer a question I asked him about possible trip activities of his Ministers in the past. He confused the difference between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I mentioned yesterday, the purpose of questions without notice is for members to ask questions. I do not wish to hear members give a lengthy preamble. I ask the member to ask his question.

Mr HASSELL: Will the Premier seek the co-operation of the Prime Minister in regard to having referred to the Hope Royal Commission consideration of the question of whether any one or more of the Premier's Ministers some time ago visited the Soviet Union as a guest of the

Soviet Union at Soviet expense, and if so, whether any security issues should be considered?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition consistently tries to be smart. If he will name the Ministers—because I do not know to whom he is referring—

Mr Old: You know all right!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have no idea.

Mr Hassell: And you are not concerned.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have no idea. I know that the Leader of the Government in another place, when he was Secretary of the Seaman's Union of Australia about 25 years ago, once said he went to Moscow or somewhere else. I really do not know. All the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has to do is to stand up and ask, "Did the Minister for Education, or Minister for Agriculture . . ." and I will ask them. If he thinks I will make an investigation of the Ministry on the basis that he thinks someone has made such a visit, without providing any further details, that is a faint hope.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Sales: Licensing Board

42. Mr BURKETT, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Why did the Government remove the facility of policing the sale of motor vehicles by persons other than dealers registered with the Motor Vehicle Dealers' Licensing Board from the Bureau of Consumer Affairs?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Police officers were appointed by Cabinet to take over the policing of unlicensed dealing which had reached epidemic proportions under the previous conservative Government causing unfair competition to properly licensed dealers. Police officers have the inherent authority to investigate, search and obtain evidence. As well, police access to vehicle registration and transfer information is more readily available. Such transfer has been a response to the requests of many dealers and their organisations and has met with the approval of the Western Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce.

Under the previous Government this matter degenerated into a bad situation where unlicensed dealers proliferated. The previous Government stands condemned for its inactivity in this important matter.

UNION: TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL

Nuclear-powered Vessels: Ban

43. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

Will the Premier give an undertaking to dissociate his Government from the Trades and Labor Council's decision to ban nuclear-powered ships from Western Australia?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Government's decision has been made clear on this matter on a number of occasions. We welcome visiting warships representing navies of allied nations on the basis that the national policy of the party to which we belong is that those visits are part of our treaty obligations.

It does not seem to sink through to members on the opposite side of this House that because we are at variance, as a State branch, with a national policy—

Mr Blaikie: What has it to do with the policy?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —that means nothing in respect of some dramatic step within the Labor Party, if indeed that were true.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is true the State ALP policy takes a point of view that conflicts with my own about the visits of warships of nations which are allied to us.

All I can say is that if the Trades and Labor Council's position is one of opposition to these visits, my position is one of welcoming those visits while the policy of the party to which I belong is as it is now.

If it is not possible for the member to draw his own conclusion from this information, it is as a result of his lack of ability in that respect.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME: MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Leader of the Opposition: Provision of Copy

44. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Premier:

Has the Premier been able to ascertain when the Leader of the Opposition was given a copy of his ministerial statement of yesterday?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Yes. Mr Speaker, you will recall that a moment ago the Leader of the Opposition said that Channel 7 was broadcasting details of the statement at a time before the statement had been delivered, and the Opposition had not been given a copy. That was about 6.35 p.m.

I am informed by my staff that a copy was delivered to the Leader of the Opposition at 3.50 p.m. yesterday.

Mr O'Connor: I never saw it. You had better check with your staff.

FUEL AND ENERGY: PETROL

Price: Inquiry

45. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Can the Minister advise when he will receive the report of the petrol prices inquiry in Western Australia and advise if he is aware that one or two small country outlets which were selling petrol have had their supplies discontinued because the price control, which has been imposed, has resulted in the supplier to those small outlets having to supply fuel at less than its cost?

Mr TONKIN replied:

I hope to receive the report in the next few days.

I am aware that particular problems exist in some country areas because of the very low throughput. We are taking account of all this in our efforts to ensure that the country consumer obtains a fair deal on the price for petrol. I am not aware that supplies have been discontinued to any retailer, and I would certainly be interested to hear the details.

ELECTORAL: ROLLS

Federal and State: Discrepancies

46. Mr GORDON HILL, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

(1) What were the discrepancies between the Commonwealth and State electoral rolls at the time of the last State election?

(2) What were the reasons for the discrepancies?

Mr TONKIN replied:

(1) At the time of the last State election there were 43 356 more people enrolled for the Commonwealth than for the State. The totals were State 754 225 and Commonwealth 797 581; 43 356 fewer people on the State roll.

(2) (a) Field work performed by the Commonwealth but not by the State.

(b) The Commonwealth has more simple enrolment procedures.

Members will be aware that the previous Government did make it much more difficult for voters to get on the roll by introducing a whole lot of unnecessary procedures such as requiring signatures to be witnessed by a Justice of the Peace and that type of thing. When the Act was changed in that way, in no way did it show that the change was necessary or that there had been any untoward practices that made it necessary.

(c) The State law governing the removal of names from the roll is far more arbitrary than is the position under the Commonwealth.

This is something we will be altering as soon as we bring the Bill to Parliament.

(d) There is no doubt that the previous Government added to its shocking record in electoral matters by starving the Electoral Department of funds and also refused to enter into a co-operative agreement with the Commonwealth. This resulted in our rolls being in a shocking state at the last State election.

**WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN
WATER AUTHORITY**

Police Investigations

47. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Following the Minister's answer last night to the member for Floreat regarding possible irregularities in the Metropolitan Water Authority, to which he answered that he had no knowledge of the allegations, I ask—

- (1) Did the Minister confer with the Metropolitan Water Authority members, or a member of the Metropolitan Water Authority, while the Premier was in Japan?
- (2) Did he then contact and confer on the matter with the Deputy Premier?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter of the inquiry into the alleged graft and corruption by employees of the Metropolitan Water Authority was referred to me by the managing director of the authority. I did immediately suggest that it should be a matter for police inquiry, the reason being that any other inquiry would be regarded as a whitewash job and we did not wish the authority to inquire into itself. Therefore, I asked for the police to conduct the inquiry.

While the Premier was in Japan the Acting Premier and I had a number of discussions on the subject, but we left the matter in the hands of the police because I believed that was the proper course of action to take. As I explained yesterday, the police have now written to the managing director of the authority stating that the investigation indicated that there was no evidence to suggest that corruption, or anything of that nature, occurred.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS: BUREAU

Port Hedland

48. Mrs BUCHANAN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Has the Government been able to improve the access of people in Port Hedland to the Bureau of Consumer Affairs?

- (2) If "yes", what is proposed?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Government has already acted to improve consumer access in Port Hedland by having Mr D. Langley, the Assistant Regional Administrator located in that centre, resume his former role of an authorised consumer affairs officer. The Assistant Regional Administrator thus has full legal power to accept and investigate complaints made under the Consumer Affairs Act and Motor Vehicle Dealers Act. This indicates the Government's commitment to see that country people receive a better service than they have had in the past.

**WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN
WATER AUTHORITY**

Police Investigations

49. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

How does the Minister reconcile the statement he just made with the statement he made last night that he had no knowledge of the allegations?

Mr TONKIN replied:

I certainly did not have knowledge of specific allegations, but nevertheless I did not mean to indicate last night that I had no knowledge of it at all.

I understand that the news media indicated at the time that I had called in the police, so obviously if I had done that, I did have knowledge that allegations had been made. However, I certainly did not have knowledge of any specific allegations and, indeed, I believe the proper course to be taken by the Government was to go to the police, because that is their job.

Mr Rushton: What are you hiding?

Mr TONKIN: I am satisfied the police have done a thorough job.

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY

Nuclear-powered Vessels: Ban

50. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

I remind the Premier of a number of statements in his election policy documents—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MacKINNON: It is only brief.

The SPEAKER: It seems to me the member might get some instruction on how to pose such a question so that it meets the requirements of Standing Orders. Please ask the question.

Mr MacKINNON: I refer to the decision of the ALP in Western Australia to seek to ban all US nuclear-powered ships from visiting Western Australian ports and ask—

- (1) Will he support this move by the State ALP?
- (2) If not, will he oppose such a proposal as does his colleague, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Hayden?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) I have indicated publicly already that I support the position put by Mr Hayden. I do so again.

EDUCATION: TEACHERS

Additional: Australian Labor Party Policy

51. Mr CLARKO, to the Premier:

In the 1983 ALP State election policy speech it was stated by the Premier in the education section, and I quote—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have just explained the situation in relation to questions. When a member rises to ask a question without notice he must ask a question without notice.

Mr CLARKO: I am asking a question. I ask—

- (1) As the Premier's policy stated "Fifty addition year 1 teachers . . ."—and as he has made a lot of mistakes lately he may perhaps need an addition teacher; I think it was meant to be "additional"—". . . will be appointed immediately to reduce year 1 classes in selected schools to 25 or less as a pilot project", why has this not been done?
- (2) What does the word "immediate" mean to the Premier?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government is in the process of considering the 1983-84 Budget, during which process consideration will

be given to the means by which we will honour that undertaking.

RAILWAY: FREMANTLE-PERTH

Reopening: Safety Measures

52. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

My question relates to the re-opening of the Perth-Fremantle rail service on Friday, 29 July. The Minister would be aware that the date of the re-opening has been altered because of the significance of the intended date of 31 July in that a young child was killed when crossing the line. That was one of the reasons the date was changed to Friday, 29 July. I remind him that many people living along the line are not used to a regular service.

In addition to the arrangements that are being made—very grandiose arrangements for festivities including clowns and bands and all sorts of things—will he give an assurance that adequate public warning will be given to people, particularly children, to take care when crossing the Fremantle-Perth railway line when that service re-commences?

Mr GRILL replied:

Yes. More than adequate publicity has been given to the re-opening. All safety precautions are being taken. I indicate to the House the entertainments to which the member for Gascoyne referred are by and large, if not totally, to be supplied free.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: CABINET

Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet: Political Adviser

53. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it correct that the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet has been provided with a political adviser at the expense of the taxpayer?
- (2) What part of the duties of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet require appropriately the appointment of a political adviser?
- (3) Has the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet been provided with any other special staff, research officer, or political adviser?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) As has been indicated in answer to several other questions along the same lines, I will in due course be making a statement to Parliament covering all those areas to which the member's question refers, and I ask that he wait until the statement is made.

Mr Hassell: Why not answer the question?

BUILDING INDUSTRY: BUILDERS REGISTRATION BOARD

Operations

54. Mrs BEGGS, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Will the Builders Registration Board have to close its doors later this year?

Mr TONKIN replied:

When I became Minister for Consumer Affairs, a serious situation had developed with the Builders Registration Board in that its fees had not been altered for eight years. As a consequence, it was clear that it was faced with having to close its doors later this year. I can only assume that the previous Government had not cared whether or not it could carry on and had decided to starve it of funds. As a result of swift action by the Government, it is hoped that the dramatic curtailment of the activities of the board will have been avoided.

REVIEWS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Initiation

55. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

On Tuesday, 26 July I asked the Premier question No. 103 which asked what reviews or investigations have been initiated by his Government since 19 February 1983. He answered "Thirty", but did not give me the list. Today he has given me a list which has 30 inquiries on it, headed "Preliminary list of inquiries". I was seeking a complete list because I understand that 40 or 50 inquiries are being held. One which I notice is not on the list is the taxi inquiry. Will the Premier check again and let me have the complete list tomorrow?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

It is a little difficult to define "inquiry" in the manner the member may define it himself. I will refer the matter to my department and see if there are some further reviews or inquiries which may appropriately be added to the list he has been given.

LIQUOR: BEER

Reduced Alcohol

56. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Did the Minister attend the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. function which was held earlier today for the purpose of launching the brewery's new reduced alcohol beer?
- (2) If so, does he agree that the new product appears to have tremendous potential for reducing the consumption of alcohol in Western Australia?
- (3) If so, will he ensure that his department keeps abreast of public acceptance and other developments in respect of the new beer in order to help maximise its undoubted potential for reducing the consumption of alcohol in Western Australia?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes.

BANK: WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT

Establishment

57. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

The Premier in his address yesterday said that a Western Australian development bank would be established in conjunction with the private sector. Will any foreign banks be involved in this bank and, if so, from what countries.

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

I cannot answer the question because the decisions have not been taken in the areas to which the member referred. Every possible avenue and option is being explored in order to make the WA development bank a viable and valued contributor to what we hope will be an accumulation of capital for industry and resource development in this State.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Vehicle

58. Mr THOMPSON, to the Premier:

Mr Speaker, as I served for six years in the office you now hold and I have a pretty fair idea of how this House runs and the jobs done by various officers, and having also served as Chairman of Committees for three years, I am prompted to ask the Premier, bearing in mind the stringent financial position confronting the Government, what changes have been made with respect to the duties of the Chairman of Committees that justify that person being provided with a Government motor car?

Mr Clarko: And a fridge.

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The question presumes that changed duties require to be the justification for changed circumstances. That is not the case. As the member for Kalamunda and former Speaker will know, the Chairmen of Committees in other States already have been granted the right to motor vehicles.

Mr Clarko: In the upper House as well?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We are not wont to restrict members in this place in an unwarranted fashion, and we do not want to deprive members who take on additional and onerous duties of those facilities they might legitimately be entitled to.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That applies even to those who purchased motor vehicles they previously had, or decided not to purchase them. We are trying to accommodate everybody's wishes as best we can.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Tobacco: Advertising Ban

59. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

What action is being taken to deal with the loss of jobs which will occur with the introduction of the Government's proposed legislation to ban the advertising of tobacco products?

Mr PARKER replied:

I have had a number of representations from members of the advertising indus-

try or representatives of the advertising industry in relation to the possible introduction of such legislation and the campaign that is being waged by the advertising industry against that legislation. That information is being collated for me and if the matter comes before Cabinet I will be in a position to assess the problem.

I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would not be of the view that simply because something creates jobs it is therefore something that people should support. The Government has to weigh in the balance the question of the jobs that may be involved—and I stress the word "may" because none of the information that has come to me to date has convinced me there are any jobs to be lost by the introduction or possible introduction of such legislation. We must also take into account the benefits to the community which may be obtained in the loss of such jobs—the advantages and disadvantages—in terms of the overall health of the community and the amount of money that is involved in the health care of people who smoke such cigarettes.

ROADS: GREAT SOUTHERN

Road Trains

60. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

Are any officers under the Minister's responsibility currently having discussions with local government authorities in the Great Southern regarding an extension to road train services?

Mr GRILL replied:

I think the question was covered by and large in a question on notice.

Mr Peter Jones: You did not answer that particular point.

Mr GRILL: An inquiry is underway. It is almost completed; some discussions are going on and I understand they are probably with local government authorities. Those authorities will be kept well informed of what is happening. Once the report is available it will be made public.

**MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT: MEMBER
FOR ALBANY**

Meetings in Electorate: Invitation

61. Mr WATT, to the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services:

With reference to the brief letter from the Minister's private secretary of 7 July 1983 advising that he would be in my electorate on 19 July and saying "The purpose of the visit is to attend a meeting of local authorities in Mt Barker", which is not in my electorate, I ask—

- (1) Will he advise if I was intentionally or unintentionally misled in view of the fact that he attended a number of meetings in my electorate without my knowledge.
- (2) Will he also ensure that a similar situation is not repeated in the future for either myself or other Opposition members in country electorates?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) and (2) It is my intention to keep all members of the Opposition and other members of Parliament advised if I visit their electorates. It will not be my intention to invite all Opposition members to all meetings I go to in their electorates for obvious reasons. I remind the member for Albany that was the position his ministerial colleagues adopted

when his party was in Government. There will be occasions on which it will be appropriate that local members be advised and be able to be present at meetings held with organisations within their constituencies. Occasions will arise when such invitations will not be appropriate.

Mr Peter Jones: Give us an example.

Mr PARKER: If I am undertaking negotiations with an organisation in the electorate which are of a financial nature, no doubt would exist at all that Opposition members would not be invited to be present at those sorts of negotiations.

Mr Watt: Your letter said the purpose of the visit was to meet local authorities in Mt. Barker.

Mr PARKER: That was the purpose of the visit and the bulk of the day was taken up with the meeting I attended in Mt Barker with representatives of shires in the area, including the Town of Albany and the Shire of Albany which I think is in the member's electorate.

Mr Watt: No, it isn't.

Mr PARKER: The Town of Albany was represented. I might say that the member for Stirling and the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth both apologised for not being able to attend the meeting. No such apology was received from the member for Albany.