

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 24 August 1983

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

RACING: CLUBS

Amalgamation: Petition

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [2.17 p.m.]: I have a petition to present from people who are concerned at moves to amalgamate the Mt. Barker and the Albany Turf Clubs. The petition has been signed by 1 436 people and I have certified that it 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. 19.)

BILLS (6): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. State Government Insurance Office Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Brian Burke (Premier), and read a first time.
2. Liquor Amendment Bill.
3. Acts Amendment (Trade Promotion Lotteries) Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Parker (Minister for Employment and Administrative Services), and read a first time.
4. Education Amendment Bill.
5. Acts Amendment (Student Guilds and Associations) Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Pearce (Minister for Education), and read a first time.
6. Friendly Societies Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Tonkin (Leader of the House), and read a first time.

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from 23 August. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Barnett) in the Chair; Mr Tonkin (Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after clause 6 had been agreed to.

Clause 7: Section 42A inserted—

Mr HASSELL: The provisions of clause 7 are to incorporate a new section 42A in the Electoral Act and when inserted under that new section, to require that all the names of people on the Commonwealth electoral roll who are not on the State electoral roll should be transferred onto the State electoral roll. By this means the Minister and the Government propose to bring the State and Commonwealth rolls substantially into line in one blow, so to speak, and from there to continue the parallel system of enrolments which is provided in other places in the Act.

A period of six months is allowed for the administrative work to be done for this transfer to be effective. The name of every person has to be checked by the registrar as required by proposed subsection (3), but the basic qualifications are not required to be checked. As I said at the second reading stage, this provision is a retrospective alteration to the law. However, with some considerable reservations, the Opposition gives its support to it.

I ask the Minister to give us information or his estimates on three things; firstly, the number of names which will have to be individually checked by the Electoral Department; secondly, the number of people who will be required to be employed on a temporary basis to carry out the work in addition to the usual staff; and, thirdly, the cost of the exercise.

Mr TONKIN: In response to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, it is not possible to give an accurate assessment of the number of names. As he pointed out yesterday, the number of names may be in excess of the net difference in enrolment between the two. Unfortunately, at the moment, despite our belief that, after the recent election, because of the number of people getting on the roll often discovering they were not on the roll, and filling in a card on election day or shortly thereafter, our roll would have been brought closer to that of the Commonwealth as far as numbers are concerned. An equally strong or perhaps stronger process was in operation at the same time; that is, the process by which the Chief Electoral Officer is deemed to be the automaton. He writes to people who appear not to have voted and if he does not receive a reply, he must, under the Statute, strike them off the roll. I say that it treats the Chief Electoral Officer and his officers as automatons because they are not permitted under the Act to check to see whether people are really resident at the addresses indicated, so they act like blind men in going through the process of striking people off the rolls instead of, as will happen under our amendment,

satisfying themselves that they no longer reside at the addresses.

We have what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has called the cleansing of the roll, but this is more properly defined as the improper stripping of the roll of people who are entitled to be on it and who live at the address stated, but because they have not replied, for whatever reason, they are deemed automatically not to be on the roll and not to have the right to be on the roll. The problem is that, while enrolments have been made since State election day, this unnecessary stripping has occurred. We acknowledge, of course, that there has been some acceptable stripping; in other words, to use the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's term, cleansing. We certainly do not want anyone who should not be on the roll to be on it.

This is a very complex picture. For a while the two rolls became closer in numbers and then, because of this stripping, they started to move apart again. It is impossible to estimate how many names will be thrown up by this. It may be that, for a period, temporary people will have to be employed by the electoral office in order to check the people who are on the Commonwealth roll and not on the State roll. They have to check them, in terms of this Bill, in only two ways—they shall be checked to see that they are not disqualified, and that they are residing at the addresses. They do not have to be checked for the other qualifications. So there will be checking. However, because the enrolment cards will not be processed by the State, there may be a substantial saving and so in fact the extra work to be done in checking those lists may be partially or completely offset by the saving on the processing of the claims. I emphasise that, if there is an additional cost, it is because of the dereliction of duty by the previous Government which allowed our rolls to get into a shocking state and are no longer accurate. Any active member of Parliament who went around his electorate before the election would know of the astounding number of people who were not on the roll. I experienced that, and so did other members, no doubt, on both sides of the Chamber.

Our rolls are in a very poor state. That is no reflection on the Chief Electoral Officer or his staff, but rather on the starvation of Electoral Department funds. For example, the Electoral Department does not have a single staff member in the field in the whole of this State of one million square miles. There is no-one to go around and check to see that people reside at certain addresses and should be on the roll.

Mr O'Connor: How many staff would they need to do it properly?

Mr TONKIN: I have always believed half a loaf is better than none. Some staff would be better than none. I do not know how many would be needed. It depends on what the Leader of the Opposition means by "properly".

Under this Bill, we will be using the work of the Commonwealth in that regard. I do not know how many staff the Commonwealth has, but on the face of it a need would appear to exist for the staff the Commonwealth uses. We would need the same number it has if we operated separately. Under this Bill, however, we will use the Commonwealth's facilities.

Mr O'Connor: Would 50 staff be reasonable?

Mr TONKIN: I cannot make an estimate, but the fact is the previous Government would not enter into a co-operative agreement with the Commonwealth about the roll. The reason it could not do so was the ridiculous provisions of our roll with respect to the witnessing of signatures, the 14-day rule, and the 31-day rule which were impediments to a co-operative agreement.

Our rolls are in a pretty bad state and I believe they will be put into much better shape. There will perhaps be an increase in cost in the short term, but the reason for that is the present state of the rolls. Once they are in a reasonable state and are being maintained under this co-operative agreement we will have accurate rolls. We will also be able to stop the trauma that occurs at each election when people believe they are on the roll and then find that they are not.

I point out that in one electorate in this State at the last election nearly 3 000 section 122A votes were taken. Once the new arrangements are in place and 12 months have elapsed and the process has been gone through, our rolls will be in a satisfactory condition.

I know that is a long way to reply to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but I cannot say how much the new arrangement will cost because we do not know what savings will be made in the other area. We do not know to what degree the two rolls will contain discrepancies.

Mr HASSELL: Perhaps we should not have encouraged the Minister last night to adjourn the Committee because he seems to have come back full of words, but unfortunately not with answers.

Mr Tonkin: I cannot give answers.

Mr HASSELL: I do not accept the Minister could not have given a better answer than he did. I believe his department would be able to make some estimate of the number of checks which will have to be made. It would be fairly easy to make

some sort of calculation as to the number of people who will have to be employed to do the job, for what period, and at what cost. The Minister's answer is less than satisfactory in that respect.

However, I do not want to labour the point. The Minister does not have the information and I think he should have it and should be able to present it to the Chamber. I do not believe the department or its officers have not given some consideration to the issue. In the usual processes of Government, a department is intimately involved in the preparation of legislation. On that basis, departments work out the practicalities of completing what is required under the legislation, and they sometimes make suggestions about it. I would guess some advice has been given to Treasury or to the department, or has emanated from the Electoral Department as to the number of people who will be needed to do this work and over what period.

The other point I want to make is that I do not accept the Minister's statement which he keeps repeating, that the last Government and its predecessors were in dereliction of duty in relation to the electoral rolls. It does not matter how much we argue back and forth about the matter, a State Electoral Act exists and an obligation is expressed in that Act. People who are qualified to be enrolled are obliged to make application for enrolment. In many cases and for a variety of reasons, people have not fulfilled their legal obligations and have not applied for enrolment.

Among the reasons are the inconvenience of having to make two applications for enrolment—the Commonwealth and State claims—and people simply have not done it twice. In some cases they undoubtedly have thought they had fulfilled their obligations after completing one application and did not need to take it further. Secondly, there is a simple matter of perspective: Many people think Commonwealth enrolment is important and State enrolment is not. There is also the matter of the field staff to which the Minister referred. It is true the Commonwealth employs field staff and as a result of that and their undertaking house-to-house canvassing throughout the State, they produce more enrolments than do the State authorities who wait for people to fulfil their obligations, or who otherwise follow up what information becomes available through the usual channels.

It simply is not true that because the State has not been prepared to make a substantial commitment of money and manpower for the conducting of a continuous canvass throughout the State the predecessors of the present Government can be blamed for all the deficiencies of the electoral

rolls. I do not believe the process of cleansing which has been carried out by the State Electoral Department has been anything but proper.

Mr Tonkin: You really do see people as dross. You keep using the term "cleansing".

Mr HASSELL: The department is never involved in political interference. It has been a matter of carrying out the law as required by legislation.

Mr Bryce: Robespierre would have been proud of you.

Mr HASSELL: It helps to keep our rolls up to date. It may be that, if proper investigations were made, one would find many people on the Commonwealth roll who should not be there at all. Far from that difference in numbers being entirely reflected in the outcome of the process of cleansing, the real failure may be in the Commonwealth's not keeping its rolls up to date.

I turn now to the matter raised by the Minister of the many thousands of section votes cast in the last State election. It is my understanding that those votes were put forward in most electorates as a matter of deliberate policy and encouragement by the ALP which hoped that, if the election result was close and a lot of disputes arose about section votes, it would provide a vehicle for the ALP to upset the election result.

Mr Davies: That is another flight of fancy.

Mr HASSELL: The result was that of the thousands of section votes cast, very few were admitted. In my electorate, for example—and I am relying on memory—of the order of 1 800 to 2 000 section votes were cast, of which 25 were admitted.

Mr Parker: That shows how many people should have been on the roll.

Mr HASSELL: It may show how many people were not on the roll.

Mr Parker: Most people who cast section votes went to the polling booths, thought they were on the roll, and found to their surprise that they were not.

Mr HASSELL: That is the very point I am making.

Mr Parker: Perhaps they have not gone through the cleansing process. That is their problem.

Mr HASSELL: They were not told they had been removed from the roll by the cleansing process.

Mr Parker: Many of them were, especially in my own electorate where there had been a by-election in the year before.

Mr HASSELL: In many cases, the people who were not enrolled had not fulfilled their obligations to claim enrolment, for reasons to which I have already referred.

The Minister continues to raise this point. Every time he raises it, I will speak against it because he should not be allowed, by repetition, to establish as a truth that which is not accurate.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8: Section 43 repealed—

Mr HASSELL: The Opposition is opposed to this clause. Section 43 provides that when a claim is received, the registrar must insert the date of its receipt and to file the claim provisionally. It then provides that claims should be open for public inspection without fee at the registrar's office on any weekday during the hours that the office is open. That is the basis upon which enrolments are made under section 46.

This is to allow people to inspect applications for enrolment and to say that they are in order or to raise objections to them if they wish to do so. It is at this point that we come to the nub of our concern about some of the provisions.

The sole purpose of the Government's proposal to remove the right of elector objection to applications for enrolments is to allow a period of time for people to enrol after the process of calling a general election has been put in train. I have indicated on behalf of the Opposition that we support provisions which give the people an opportunity of enrolling after the process of putting a general election in train has begun; but we are opposed to extending the minimum period in which a general election may be called; and we are opposed to the removal of the right of elector objection to applications for enrolment.

I said last night—the Premier took up the point, argued it across the Chamber, and acknowledged its substance—that this will leave the way open for a substantial abuse of the system by people who have an evil or criminal intent—

Mr Tonkin: I dealt with that last night. That is nonsense.

Mr HASSELL: The Premier was involved in the discussion, as the *Hansard* record shows.

The result of allowing this to occur will be that the outcome of a general election could be put in jeopardy and in doubt.

Mr Tonkin: You are speaking nonsense. You do not know the Act.

Mr HASSELL: If the Minister believes that, I hope he will explain it—

Mr Tonkin: I explained it to you last night. You just do not listen.

Mr HASSELL: —in terms that can be understood clearly.

The repeal of section 43 is aimed at the removal of the right of objection to a claim by anyone except the Chief Electoral Officer or one of his departmental officers. It is not necessary to do this to extend the period for enrolments after an election is announced. In our view, the right of elector objection to an application for enrolment should be maintained.

We face the risk that determined people with nothing but their own interests to serve would be capable of abusing the new provisions and, in so doing, putting in jeopardy the outcome of an election. It would be most unwise for this provision, or some similar provision, to be deleted from the Act without regard for its consequences. I have made it clear that the Opposition supports the idea of giving people a chance of enrolling after an election is announced. If this can be done in a reasonable way, we will give it our full support. However, the repeal of the section, without any replacement, is not a satisfactory way to go about it, and therefore the Opposition opposes clause 8.

Mr TONKIN: I repeat what I said last night. There is no possibility of the abuse of this Act in the way that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition states. He mouths comments, and then does not bother to listen to the rebuttal.

Although it is true that the capacity of the public to object to claims will be removed, the public can still object to enrolments. The comment was made last night that a funny party—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is improving because, once upon a time, he might have said that the ALP was such a party, but he made no attempt to say that last night—may come in at five to six when the rolls are about to close and put in thousands of enrolments; and because the public cannot object to those claims, the result of the general election could hinge upon the spurious, illegal, and criminal enrolments. The fact is that even when the rolls have closed, the registrar will be able to object to enrolments. If he objects to an enrolment, the person whose enrolment is objected to will have to appeal to a magistrate. The magistrate will hear the dispute and decide whether the enrolment should stand. If he decided it should not stand, the person's name would be struck off the roll and he would not vote.

The only other contingency that we can foresee and which is allowed for in the Act is if the magistrate has not been able to hear a dispute at the expiration of the period of two weeks before

the election. If the magistrate has not heard the dispute and the person is still on the roll, following the scenario of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, a distinguishing mark will be placed against that person's name and when he comes to vote, he will have to make a declaration that he is enrolled properly.

The penalty for making a false declaration is 12 months' imprisonment. Therefore, the system is not open to abuse. The registrar or the public can still object to enrolment, even though the public have lost the capacity to object to the claims.

Quite obviously provision exists to prevent the presence on the roll of fictitious names or illegal enrolments. I regret the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has made statements about abuse of the system, suggesting that we are opening the door to this, when this Bill has in fact been constructed carefully and we are convinced that the safeguards are there to prevent any such abuse.

Mr HASSELL: I will be quite happy to acknowledge the position if the Minister can convince me that what I am saying is wrong. However, I shall trace through the situation. It is proposed that section 43, which allows for elector objection, be deleted.

Mr Tonkin: Elector objections to the claim—that is to be deleted.

Mr HASSELL: That is right. It is proposed also that a new section 44A be added.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We shall debate this matter when we come to the next clause. I shall allow a little debate on it now, because I can see need for it; but I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to bear in mind that we shall debate this when we consider the next clause.

Mr HASSELL: I am quite happy to restrict the argument, but it will be really impossible to debate the matter without tracing through the sections.

It is proposed that a new section 44A be added. That section provides that if a claim is in order and not objected to by the registrar, or even if it is not in order, but the registrar can rectify it under some other provisions, "the Registrar shall enrol the claimant by entering his name and the other prescribed particulars on the roll filed in the Registrar's office under section 32 of this Act".

Therefore, under that proposed new section, the registrar has an obligation to enrol the claimant. We have the position that a claim has been made and no provision exists for elector objection to that claim. The registrar has a statutory obligation to complete the enrolment unless he

chooses to object and he is likely to object only if he can see there is something wrong with it.

The type of situation I contemplate is one in which fraud occurs or there is a deliberate and large-scale endeavour to disrupt an election for whatever purpose. We have reached the stage that a claim of the type to which I have referred is enrolled; it has not been held open for anyone to look at; it is enrolled.

The Minister then assures the Committee that an objection to the enrolment can be made by anyone who is qualified to make an objection pursuant to section 48.

Mr Tonkin: That is right.

Mr HASSELL: That objection can be made, but one must then realise that, in the context of an election process, writs have been issued, and a new enrolment has been made and enrolment has been effected. That enrolment is suspected of being defective, along with perhaps thousands of others in the type of situation I contemplate, and objections are made by electors to those enrolments. Those objections are made under section 48.

A process must then be followed and that process may or may not result in a magistrate determining the issue before the election is held.

Mr Tonkin: In most cases, I think the magistrate would. He would realise the urgency of the matter.

Mr HASSELL: The situation I have contemplated is one of a group of people seeking to disrupt an election and, as a result, they have made many false claims. One is then bound to look at section 53 of the Act which restricts the alterations that can be made to the roll between the date of the issue of the writ—that will become the time of the issue of the writ—and the closing of the roll. The basic proposition in section 53 as it stands, and as this Bill seeks to amend, is that no addition to or alteration of the roll shall be made between the time of the issue of the writ and the close of the roll with certain exceptions.

Those exceptions are set out in proposed new paragraphs (a) to (c) which are contained in clause 13(b) of the Bill. The relevant paragraph is proposed new paragraph (c) of clause 13(b), which is set out on page 12 of the Bill.

This is one of the exceptions to the general prohibition of alterations being made and paragraph (c) reads as follows—

alterations may be made after that time—

That is the time of the issue of the writ. To continue—

... pursuant to section 48 (2) (f) ...

That relates to a determination by the magistrate. To continue—

... or section 48 (3) (b) or (e) of this Act;

Section 48(3)(b) and (e) relate to objections by the registrar. Therefore, we are talking only about an objection by an elector to another elector's enrolment, so the only exception that could apply to allow the name to be deleted would be under section 48(2)(f), after a magistrate has heard the matter. If he did not hear the matter in time—if the objection was made quite late in the day towards the date of the holding of an election—it simply could not be heard in time.

Mr Tonkin: That is right.

Mr HASSELL: And there would be other cases—

Mr Tonkin: Then the distinguishing mark is put against the person's name.

Mr HASSELL: That is interesting; at least I have run it to earth.

Mr Tonkin: I told you this last night.

Mr HASSELL: We have it clearly on the record that we are talking about a distinguishing mark procedure and, to the best of my knowledge, that is not provided for in the Act, is it?

Mr Tonkin: What do you think I am quoting from? Do you think I am making it up?

Mr HASSELL: I ask the Minister to tell me where that procedure for the use of distinguishing marks and so on is set out.

Mr Tonkin: It is section 48(2)(f).

Mr MENSAROS: Mr Chairman—

Mr Tonkin: This is called filibustering.

Mr Blaikie: You can be a little bit fairer than that.

Mr MENSAROS: I would have risen in any case—

Mr Tonkin: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked you to.

Mr MENSAROS: I would do so in order to enable him to extend his argument; however, I do not think the Minister has explained properly the necessity for the deletion of the provision relating to objections by the public against anyone who makes a claim for enrolment. There will be virtually no objection time available between the presenting of the claim and the closing of the rolls. Therefore, all enrolments might not be according to the provisions of the Act as it is intended to be amended, and he has not said that time will be made available for the public to view the rolls. The rolls could be opened to the public

easily after the closure time as they are open to the registrar to oppose claims.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition expressed the Opposition's objection to this provision. At least we ought to hear from the Minister the necessity for this deletion. No-one would be in a better position than members of the public to object to a claim. The Minister ought to explain the necessity for this provision, and perhaps give an example of his reasoning or philosophy. He might be able to point out what is not obvious to us.

Mr HASSELL: I had hoped the Minister would respond to the important point we have raised.

Mr Tonkin: I responded last night and the other day.

Mr HASSELL: The Premier indicated last night, as I understood him, that he could see the force of the point we made.

Mr Brian Burke: I asked you about the mechanism you were talking about to allow for the seven days before the closure of the roll. That's what I asked you about.

Mr HASSELL: Very well, perhaps the Premier was seeking to appear to be co-operative, but was being unco-operative.

Mr Brian Burke: You seemed to be genuinely seeking some advice—

Mr HASSELL: I was genuinely providing the Premier with an answer to the effect that we would be happy to see a provision included to allow people time to enrol after the issue of the writ, but we did not believe it should be done in a way to put the whole electoral system and elections at risk.

Mr Tonkin: It does not, and I explained that the other night and the other day.

Mr HASSELL: It does, and I want to go over this point clearly.

Mr Tonkin: You don't listen.

Mr HASSELL: I was listening.

Mr Tonkin: To yourself.

Mr HASSELL: I have listened carefully to everything said by the Minister, but I am not satisfied. Once the person to whom we refer becomes enrolled—a person not strictly entitled to be enrolled—the only way his name can be taken off the roll is by an elector objection to the enrolment.

Mr Tonkin: Or by the registrar.

Mr HASSELL: No, the Minister has gone off the point. The registrar is directed by the proposed new section 44A in the Minister's Bill to enrol the claimant. If he cannot find anything

wrong with the claim on the surface of it, he has an obligation to enrol the claimant.

Mr Tonkin: Of course he does, if there is nothing wrong.

Mr HASSELL: Therefore the claimant is enrolled, and there does not appear to be anything wrong, but it might be discovered that there are all sorts of false enrolments put in. We are talking about a situation of a group—a crazy party, which was the reference the Minister made—

Mr Tonkin: I was referring to you.

Mr HASSELL: I know that, and that is okay. A party could be deliberately setting out to disrupt the election.

Mr Tonkin: What, reds under the beds?

Mr HASSELL: The Minister is not showing good sense by trying to be smart about this matter.

Mr Tonkin: I explained it last night and last week, and if you can't understand, you should read the Bill.

Mr HASSELL: The Minister's explanation did not answer the point I raised. I intend to put it on the record no matter how silly he wants to act, because its implications will fall back on him and his department if he does not sort this matter out. The situation I contemplate is that in which a claim has been accepted and an enrolment is made. An objection can then be taken by an elector under section 48. The objection in the circumstances I contemplate cannot be dealt with within the time which occurs before the election, and, pursuant to the provisions of the Act, the roll cannot be altered because it can be altered only pursuant to a determination under section 48(2)(f). In those circumstances the Minister says, "Well, a mark will then be made against the enrolment, and if the person votes, the matter can go into issue in a Court of Disputed Returns". Presumably that is what the Minister would envisage, but there is no provision in the Act to which the Minister has pointed which provides for a mark to be made against the enrolment.

When I asked him about which provision pointed to a mark against an enrolment, he referred me back to section 48(2)(f). There is no provision in that section for any mark to be made against an enrolment.

Mr Tonkin: What?

Mr HASSELL: Well, I ask the Minister to read it out.

Mr Tonkin: It states—

Provided that the Registrar shall place a mark in the prescribed manner against the

elector's name on the roll, and no person whose name is so marked shall be entitled at any election to obtain a ballot paper and record his vote unless he has delivered to the presiding officer a declaration duly made by himself in the prescribed form.

Mr HASSELL: That provision is not in section 48(2)(f); it is in section 48(3)(f).

Mr Tonkin: I am sorry, it is section 48(3)(f).

Mr HASSELL: It is a proviso to paragraph (f), and section 48(3) deals with objections by the registrar, it does not deal with objections by an elector. The Minister has made the point I have been trying to get to him for two days. The point is that we do not have a protective provision to prevent this abuse which we have contemplated as capable of occurring from being carried through to fulfilment, and that all arises because we are to remove the right of an elector objection to an application for enrolment. I say again—I will not go on and on because I have made the point clearly—that the provisions introduced by the Minister, and the Government, will allow people with criminal intent, because this would be a criminal act, or people with political malice, to completely disrupt the outcome of an election by enrolling multiple names of people not entitled to be enrolled. That is a very good reason for our opposition to the repeal of section 43 of the Act.

Mr TONKIN: I am sorry I misled the Committee by giving the wrong reference. I was referring to the registrar.

It does not alter the Government's position at all. The position is that once a person is enrolled—and there has been a large number of illegal enrolments which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has mentioned could determine the outcome of an election—two provisions exist in the Bill, even after the rolls have closed, for objections to be made to the enrolment.

One provision is that, if an objection is made by an elector, the magistrate hears and determines the case and orders the registrar either to retain the name on the roll or to strike it off the roll, or take the necessary steps according to his determination. There is no doubt that, if the objection is made by an elector, the provision allows for a magistrate to hear and cleanse the roll. By the way, I suggest that this is the proper use of the word "cleanse" because those people have no right to be on the roll.

Mr Hassell: That is what it is about.

Mr TONKIN: Is it? The Opposition takes people off the roll for its benefit and calls it "cleansing".

I have said already that in respect of an objection by the registrar, the magistrate determines the case and strikes the name off or leaves it on the roll. If there is not enough time to hear the case, the registrar inserts a mark against the elector's name in order that, if he should vote he is required to fill in the necessary declaration. A false declaration results in heavy penalties which are provided for under the Act.

If criminal people put spurious names on the roll, there is provision for an elector to object, in which case the magistrate hears and determines the objection, makes a decision, and orders the registrar accordingly.

If the registrar objects, the magistrate once again hears and determines the issue and orders the registrar accordingly. Therefore, there are two avenues whereby a person, who does not have the right to be on the roll, can be struck off.

Mr COWAN: I have listened with interest to the debate from both sides of the Chamber and I find the Minister's explanation satisfactory. I would like him to advise whether the provisions the Government intends to introduce have any parallel to the provisions included in Commonwealth enrolment procedures.

I do not think there is any great objection to the procedure we use for enrolment in relation to the Commonwealth roll. If this method exists and is practised in Australia, I am afraid it adds very little weight to the argument put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MENSAROS: I cannot accept the Minister's explanation in relation to the provision regarding objections by electors against an enrolment.

If someone makes an application to be appointed as a justice of the peace, it would be the most incorrect procedure to appoint him first and after he has been appointed to start to question the applicant's qualifications. We should not find out afterwards that an applicant has convictions which would render him ineligible to serve as a JP. What the Minister is saying is that we should let people enrol first and then leave it to a magistrate to determine whether a person is eligible for enrolment following an objection.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said that this provision will enable those people who want to enrol non-eligible persons or fictitious persons, to wait until the last minute to do so—the time being short between that moment and the closing of the rolls.

If a large number of fictitious enrolments are received, of course, there will be a physical need for a magistrate to hear objections quite apart

from the fact that it is up to the registrar to object first. Fictitious claims should be scrutinised thoroughly on their receipt and should not be allowed to go on the roll. The public, if they have the right to object, could be aware that this is occurring and alert even suitable media reaction to ensure that this sort of thing does not happen.

In the past, elections have been held with fictitious names being included on the roll. If fictitious names are included on the rolls for two or three fringe electorates, it could easily decide the result of an election of the Government and the irregularities would not be determined until the election was over.

I am not suggesting this will happen. However, it has happened in other countries and Governments have taken office because of fictitious enrolments. If a Government is so inclined it could interfere with the process of the law by passing relevant legislation which would result in a dictatorship. These arguments cannot be dismissed and I suggest that the Minister reply accordingly.

Mr TONKIN: In reply to the member for Merredin in so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, a similar provision is made as under this Bill for objections to enrolments. As far as objections to claims are concerned, I understand that, when this Bill is changed, it will be in line with that of the Commonwealth.

I wonder at members of the Opposition—at least they have not said that this party is a "red party", but it appears they spend a large part of their time looking fearfully under their beds. Really, the Opposition is worried about some nefarious group suddenly putting people on the Subiaco roll or something like that and I cannot understand their excessive concern.

If a large number of people were put unexpectedly on the Subiaco roll, I would have thought it would be done by the Liberal Party rather than by somebody else, simply to get rid of the present member. There is no evidence that that will occur. We will be coming into line with the Commonwealth.

The practice in the Electoral Department, when a member of the public goes in and there is the slightest hint of difficulty about a matter, is for the registrar himself to take it over, and it becomes a registrar's objection.

Mr Rushton: You specialise in bringing dead people back.

Mr TONKIN: There is still a provision for registrars' objections to claims of enrolments. If a member of the public goes into the Electoral Department, the officers do not wash their hands of the matter and say, "That is your problem. You

are a member of the public. You object". If they perceive some problem, they act on it. I would say that in practice, some 99 per cent of objections are by the registrar. In fact, the Government is rather concerned about this, because we charge 25c if an elector objects and we are not getting much revenue. I understand the Treasurer is looking at this aspect and considering making it compulsory for members of the public to object, and to pay \$1 a time. I can say that with impunity, because the Treasurer is not in his seat.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9: Section 44 amended—

Mr HASSELL: I make it quite clear we do not accept what is being done in this respect; it is an unsatisfactory way to deal with the matter. Clause 9 contains a proposal for a person who does not know his date of birth to make an application for enrolment and to have a witness certify he is satisfied the person is not under the age of 18 years. The Act already contains a provision which allows for this situation, and there is no need for the amendment. Although I believe this will affect very few cases, our concern, again, is that this is simply opening the way for abuse of the system.

Section 44(4) of the Act provides that where a claimant is unable to insert in his claim the date of his birth because that date is not known to him, it shall be sufficient compliance with paragraph (c) of subsection (1) of the section if there is inserted in the claim the year of birth of the claimant and so establish that the claimant is not under 18 years of age. That appears to be adequate to deal with the position. There is no need to open the way for witnesses to be put in the position of having to certify the age of people they do not know. Once more, we do not see any proper basis upon which this should be done. The proposed provision is simply that the person who witnesses a claim should certify in writing that he is satisfied the claimant is not under the age of 18 years. That is quite unsatisfactory and is not necessary and we are therefore opposed to that part of the clause.

We are also opposed to the deletion of existing subsection (1)(a) which related to a matter we have already discussed; namely, the fact that a claim, when made, should be lodged within 31 days. I do not intend to go over the whole of that ground again; I simply indicate it is one of the provisions of the Bill with which we do not agree.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10: Section 44A inserted—

Mr HASSELL: It seems to me to be most odd that in section 47 of the Act, which deals with ob-

jections to claims, there is a provision in subsection (2)(h) similar to that repeatedly referred to by the Minister in answer to the point I was making earlier; namely, a provision which says that where an objection is not dealt with 14 days before an election is to be held, the name is to be marked. The same proviso appears in section 47(3) dealing with a registrar's objection to a claim for enrolment. In section 48(3), which deals with the registrar's objection to an enrolment, a similar proviso exists. However, it does not appear in section 48(2). It seems to me that, if the proviso which has been referred to by the Minister and which appears in all those other places were to be included in section 48(2), the problem to which we have referred would be considerably lessened.

In relation to proposed section 44A, I record our objection to the provision which requires a registrar to effect enrolments when there is no opportunity for voter objection to enrolment. One way or another, we believe this problem should be dealt with, and one way would be to include in section 48(2) the proviso to which I have already referred; another way would be to make some amendment to proposed section 44A.

I refer also to proposed subsection (5), which appears on page 10 of the Bill, the effect of which when read in conjunction with proposed subsection (2) of proposed section 44A is to require the registrar to enrol people who clearly have not complied with the law in relation to an application for enrolment.

No time limit is expressed. Once again, we believe the procedure being followed in this area puts in doubt the accuracy of the roll. We believe that these provisions are simply and clearly completely unsatisfactory.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 put and passed.

Clause 13: Section 53 amended—

Mr HASSELL: This clause contains the new provisions which allow for alterations to be made in the manner we have described and debated. Quite frankly, the clause is an unnecessary amendment and I record our opposition to it.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 27

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Mr Bateman | Mr Tom Jones |
| Mrs Beggs | Mr McIver |
| Mr Bridge | Mr Parker |
| Mrs Buchanan | Mr Pearce |
| Mr Brian Burke | Mr Read |
| Mr Terry Burke | Mr D. L. Smith |
| Mr Burkett | Mr P. J. Smith |
| Mr Carr | Mr A. D. Taylor |
| Mr Cowan | Mr Tonkin |
| Mr Davies | Mr Troy |
| Mr Evans | Mrs Watkins |
| Mr Grill | Mr Wilson |
| Mrs Henderson | Mr Gordon Hill |
| Mr Hodge | |

(Teller)

Noes 18

| | |
|----------------|--------------|
| Mr Clarko | Mr Mensaros |
| Mr Court | Mr O'Connor |
| Mr Coyne | Mr Old |
| Mr Crane | Mr Rushton |
| Dr Dadour | Mr Thompson |
| Mr Hassell | Mr Trethowan |
| Mr Peter Jones | Mr Tubby |
| Mr Laurance | Mr Watt |
| Mr MacKinnon | Mr Williams |

(Teller)

Pairs

Noes

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Ayes | |
| Mr I. F. Taylor | Mr Grayden |
| Mr Bertram | Mr Spriggs |
| Mr Jamieson | Mr McNee |
| Mr Bryce | Mr Bradshaw |

Clause thus passed.

Clause 14: Section 65 amended—

Mr HASSELL: I would like the Minister to explain the precise reason for this clause.

Mr TONKIN: We felt that the courtesy we were extending to voters at general elections to give them 14 days' notice so they can get on the roll should be extended to people who will have to vote at a by-election.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 15 put and passed.

Clause 16: Section 70 amended—

Mr HASSELL: I assume that this amendment is part of the group of amendments required to keep the rolls open for 14 days after the issue of writs for an election and that the direct effect of the introduction of this clause is to extend by one week the minimum period required for the conduct of an election. I ask the Minister to indicate whether that is so and whether it is the clear intention of the Government that the minimum period required for the conduct of an election is to be extended by another seven days so that in this State the minimum period for the conduct of elections will be seven weeks instead of the present six weeks, which is itself quite extensive.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 17 put and passed.

Clause 18: Section 90 amended—

Mr HASSELL: I do not know whether it was a deliberate act by the Minister, but he did not make any attempt to answer my queries on clause 16. Perhaps he is embarrassed—

Mr Tonkin: About giving people 14 days' notice?

Mr HASSELL: —about having introduced provisions which extend the already lengthy period for the conduct of an election in Western Australia.

Mr Tonkin: We make no apology. It is interesting that the only clause you divided on was one to give people decent notice.

Mr HASSELL: No, the Minister has picked the wrong clause; he has made a mistake. The clause on which we divided was the vital clause relating to the deficiency in the drafting of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Perhaps we could get back to a debate on the clause in question.

Mr HASSELL: But it was necessary for me to put on record the fact that the Minister did not answer my queries and the fact that we saw a deficiency in one of a group of clauses and so divided on that. It is very appropriate that I should make the record clear.

Will the Minister explain the purpose of clause 18? Perhaps, Mr Chairman, if you would allow him to stray a little, he might be able to respond to the questions I asked about clause 16 as well.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that would be possible.

Mr TONKIN: Mr Chairman, the member wants to know the purpose of clause 18? The answer to that is that we just want to be a little more accurate in our use of the language. With respect to clause 16 there is no ability to give people 14 days' notice before the rolls close.

Clause put and passed.

New clause 19—

Mr HASSELL: I am not quite sure of the reason this new clause is being dealt with now, but I take it is because it affects section 100 of the Act, and therefore should be taken first.

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

Mr HASSELL: However, the substance of the matter is that it is the first of the amendments which we have put forward.

Mr Tonkin: Yours comes before mine, does it?

Mr HASSELL: Yes, I gather so.

The CHAIRMAN: Just in explanation, what we have endeavoured to do is to put them in the order in which they will appear if they are passed.

I hope members are clear about what we will be debating from now on.

Mr HASSELL: I had better start my explanation of this amendment by referring to section 100 of the Act, which provides that the Minister may, by notice in the *Government Gazette* appoint polling places. That is the broad description of it. Specifically section 100 (1)(c) provides that the Minister may, by notice in the *Government Gazette*, appoint such other polling places as he thinks fit in any institution or hospital, or both.

If he simply does that he appoints a polling place in a hospital or an institution. It is an ordinary polling place. For example, at the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre or Royal Perth Hospital, polling places are established on polling day for the centre's and hospital's use. As an alternative, the Minister additionally has power under section 100 (1) (d) to declare any institution, hospital, or both, as appointed, or in the terms of the Act, shall appoint, to be a special institution or hospital, or both, for the purposes of this Act. The consequence of his declaring it to be a special institution is that it then does not have a polling place in the foyer of the institution or hospital on polling day, but instead, it has a visit during the period of two weeks prior to an election, from a mobile polling booth. Some few institutions in the past have in fact been declared as special institutions, but despite the insertion of this provision for mobile polling booths to visit institutions and hospitals prior to an election, they have not been much use and the majority of nursing homes and hospitals are not visited by a mobile polling booth prior to an election. The result of that, quite simply, is that people go to those hospitals and institutions and seek postal votes for the patients or inmates.

In the second reading stage, I have already explained that, except in the case of very small hospitals or institutions, our proposal is that the Minister should have a general obligation to appoint all hospitals and institutions as special hospitals or institutions and to allow a particular procedure to be followed which excludes political canvassing, but allows the political candidates to know when the visit of the mobile polling booth will be made. In addition, it allows the political parties to have electoral material distributed in sealed envelopes or in individual envelopes to the inmates of these institutions. Hence the first of our amendments to section 100, which provides the following addition to subsection (1)(c)—

"but where, on the date upon which the writ for the election is issued, such institution or hospital contains ten or more electors (other than staff members), who are resident

for the time being therein, he shall appoint a polling place in that institution or hospital".

The Minister has already said that he believes the idea we have put forward is a good one and I hope he will accept the amendment. If it requires some further explanation, I will be pleased to give it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member who has just resumed his seat has not moved his amendment.

Mr HASSELL: Can I move the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: I believe it will need somebody to rise to speak on the amendment to enable the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to speak again.

Mr TONKIN: I will speak and thus enable the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to move his amendment shortly. Of course, as I have said in this Chamber before, this Government intends to take a very different attitude to amendments from that taken by the previous Government when in a period of nine years we would have been lucky if it accepted three or four amendments. In fact, this Government, young as it is, has already accepted more amendments than the previous Government did during that whole period.

Mr Clarko: What about last year? Would you agree there were many more amendments accepted than had been accepted for some time?

Mr TONKIN: Last year there was an indication of the change, yes, and I think the previous Premier (Mr O'Connor) had quite a different attitude from that of his predecessor who believed that wisdom could come from only one place. There was a very marked difference, and I accept that. However, I believe we should accept amendments in this place if we possibly can. I would dearly love to accept all three amendments, but I regret that I cannot do so because although the ideas are good, the proposed amendments are technically deficient.

One reason suggested for my not accepting these amendments was that we are dealing here in isolation with the taking of votes at institutions, and really the Bill is not about that. This would be more appropriate in a Bill which dealt with that aspect of electoral procedures. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows, our Bill really deals, in the main, only with enrolment procedures, but I reject that as a reason for my not accepting the amendments because even though they are in isolation and even though they both make part of the picture, they would be better off in a whole package dealing with this process. I think that the benefits to those institutions caused by resisting amendments from the Opposition outweigh the disadvantages that I have mentioned,

but there is a far more serious reason for our not accepting the amendments, and that lies in problems associated with them.

As members will know, we already have a position where institutions can be declared. When we have a requirement in the Act which enables someone to provide polling at an institution, we do not have to define "institution". The Minister just says, "In my opinion that is an institution and we will have one there"; that is, if the Act allows him to do so.

When we say "the Minister shall declare an institution or hospital", we put upon him a statutory duty which it would be illegal for him to ignore. Then we get onto real problems of definition. What is an institution? What is a hospital? No definition of them is in the Act. Already it is provided to do that. Presently the Minister can say, "I want one there", and there is no argument as to whether it is a hospital because he has the power to do so. If he says it will go through, it will go through. The Act puts a mandatory requirement upon him. The Act must then stipulate exactly what is an institution, and because that is there, I am unable to accept the amendment in the absence of a definition of an institution or hospital.

As I said before, the idea is a really good one and I am very pleased that the Opposition has come forward with this constructive suggestion, but I would like to know more about the costs, the number of institutions there would be, etc. It costs about double for each vote that is taken in an institution compared with the cost of a vote at a normal polling booth. Of course, cost is not the most important factor here. We have the humanitarian factor; the need to have accurate elections reflecting the will of the people is very important. Nevertheless, cost is a factor and I would like to have more information as to how many institutions and hospitals are likely to be proclaimed.

I undertake to do some research on this matter and to confer with my colleague, the Minister for Health, so as to determine how we could define them and establish how many institutions would be thrown up by such a definition; so quite a bit of work needs to be done before we can accept this amendment. I thank the Opposition for the suggestion. I think I can assure the Opposition that it is a good idea, but it will require research. I am not being critical of the Opposition for not giving it to us in its final form because I am well aware, perhaps more aware than members of the present Opposition, that Oppositions do not have the resources available to Governments. So I am not being critical at all of the fact that the

amendment is not expressed as precisely as would be necessary to place it in the Statutes of the State. I undertake to do that research into a definition and to have drafting prepared so that at some future date it might be included. I want to assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that although, as I said yesterday, we do not have the legislation for an electoral commission here, that does not mean we do not like the idea. We cannot do everything at once and we will be coming forward to the Parliament with a provision for an electoral commission. Perhaps then we will look at the whole question of postal voting and absentee voting and we will incorporate the Opposition's ideas in that Bill.

Mr HASSELL: I thank the Minister for some, but not all, of his remarks. I move—

Page 13—Insert after clause 18 the following new clause to stand as clause 19—

19. Section 100 of the principal Act is amended as to subsection (1) by inserting at the end of paragraph (c) the following—

"but where, on the date upon which the writ for the election is issued, such institution or hospital contains ten or more electors (other than staff members), who are resident for the time being therein, he shall appoint a polling place in that institution or hospital".

To continue my remarks: While the Leader of the House and the Minister responsible for this Bill has expressed himself very well and has explained all the reasons for his not accepting the amendment, in fact, he is rejecting the amendment on exactly the same sort of grounds as the previous Government rejected other amendments in the past.

Mr Tonkin: Do you mean to say you didn't draft a single decent one?

Mr HASSELL: It is decently drafted. It was drafted by the parliamentary private members' draftsman. The problem the Minister has raised about the lack of definition of institution or hospital may be a real one, but there has been plenty of time available for that situation to have been rectified since the amendments were put on the notice paper, and the Government has the facilities to do that. So, while I accept what the Minister is saying, I do not think it really alters the position. The Government is refusing to accept the amendment.

I am sorry the Government is refusing to accept the Opposition's suggestion even though the Minister has said it is a good idea. It is a pretty futile

exercise if the amendment is not accepted, even though the Government accepts that it is a good one. The amendment could be made in another place.

Mr Tonkin: You know our attitude to making amendments in an undemocratic House like that. Were you not aware of that?

Mr HASSELL: It is interesting for the Minister to say that because in relation to the salaries Bill the Premier has allowed for amendments to be moved in the upper House.

Mr Tonkin: Our attitude—

Mr HASSELL: The Minister said, "our attitude"—

Mr Brian Burke: You know that that was a different matter because the legislation was due to start on 1 September—that is the operative date.

Mr HASSELL: What is the date—

Mr Tonkin: It was because of the time factor.

Mr Brian Burke: It was explained in debate.

Mr HASSELL: I was in the Chamber during that debate, but it was still not a valid explanation. The Government suits its own convenience and is now making amendments in another place. If the Minister is dinkum about accepting amendments, he could make further amendments in this place, or have them made in another place.

Mr Tonkin: When that Chamber reflects the will of the people, we will listen to the Opposition's amendments.

Mr HASSELL: What a ridiculous statement.

Several members interjected.

Mr Thompson: If the Government gets its own way regarding electoral reform, it will have nothing to talk about.

Mr Tonkin: I would like to talk about constructive things, but, while there are burglars in the place, you cannot ignore them.

Mr HASSELL: We have before the Committee an amendment which the Minister says is a good amendment and is acceptable to the Government, but he says it has a technical deficiency. The Minister says also that he will not introduce an amendment in the upper House because he does not like the upper House.

Mr Tonkin: The upper House does not reflect the will of the people in any way. It is a disgrace to the State.

Mr HASSELL: What the Minister is saying is that a measure agreed upon by everyone in Parliament cannot be introduced in the upper House. How ridiculous can one be. The Minister really is very silly because the Government is introducing

legislation in the upper House every day which is its own legislation and its own Ministers are introducing it.

Mr Tonkin: Do you mind if I go and have a cup of tea?

Mr HASSELL: I do mind if the Minister goes and has a cup of tea. He can sit down and finish the Bill so that I can have one also.

This really is a silly situation and the Minister is not dinkum. The reality is he has rejected our amendment and is trying to give excuses and reasons which, when boiled down, are not dinkum.

Mr COURT: I support the amendment. In my electorate there is a high proportion of elderly people.

Mr Tonkin: Have you just discovered them? You have had nine years in Government and you have had the numbers in both Chambers, where you could have done this.

Mr COURT: I have been through two elections in the last year and this is something that really showed up in those elections. In the electorate there are a number of homes for the elderly and they include the Hollywood Village in which some 800 people reside. The Premier visited this village recently. Also there are a number of "C"-class hospitals and in the weeks prior to elections we have nothing but problems from elderly people who are concerned as to whether they are on the roll and when the election will be held.

Mr Tonkin: You may not be aware of this, but I do have the power as Minister to send postal boxes there and being a different person from my predecessor, I will probably do that.

Mr COURT: These amendments have been drafted to make it easier for those people. It would appear that we have an aging population and that more and more of these homes and "C"-class hospitals are being established. A lot of them are divided into sections according to the physical fitness of the patients. We believe these amendmetns are required.

Mr Tonkin: It is a good idea, but it must be knocked into shape.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes 21

| | |
|----------------|--------------|
| Mr Blaikie | Mr Mensaros |
| Mr Clarko | Mr O'Connor |
| Mr Court | Mr Old |
| Mr Cowan | Mr Rushton |
| Mr Coyne | Mr Stephens |
| Mr Crane | Mr Thompson |
| Dr Dadour | Mr Trethowan |
| Mr Hassell | Mr Tubby |
| Mr Peter Jones | Mr Watt |
| Mr Laurance | Mr Williams |
| Mr MacKinnon | |

(Teller)

Noes 25

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Mr Bateman | Mr McIver |
| Mrs Beggs | Mr Parker |
| Mr Bridge | Mr Pearce |
| Mrs Buchanan | Mr Read |
| Mr Brian Burke | Mr D. L. Smith |
| Mr Terry Burke | Mr P. J. Smith |
| Mr Burkett | Mr A. D. Taylor |
| Mr Carr | Mr Tonkin |
| Mr Davies | Mr Troy |
| Mr Evans | Mrs Watkins |
| Mrs Henderson | Mr Wilson |
| Mr Hodge | Mr Gordon Hill |
| Mr Tom Jones | |

(Teller)

Ayes

Mr Grayden
Mr Spriggs
Mr McNee
Mr Bradshaw

Pairs Noes

Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Bertram
Mr Jamieson
Mr Bryce

New clause thus negatived.

New clause 20—

Mr HASSELL: I move—

Page 13—Insert after clause 19 the following new clause to stand as clause 20—

20. Section 100A of the principal Act is amended by adding a new subsection (5) as follows—

(5) The Chief Electoral Officer shall give not less than 48 hours notice in writing to each candidate for the Province and District in which the institution or hospital is situated of the time or times at which the Presiding Officer and another officer will be in attendance by virtue of a declaration under paragraph (d) of subsection (1) of section 100 of this Act.

Point of Order

Mr TONKIN: Should I move my amendments which deal with clause 19 before the Deputy Leader of the Opposition proceeds with this new clause 20?

The CHAIRMAN: I will answer the question and the Chamber can make its own decision. Were the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's amendment to succeed, it would precede the Min-

ister's amendment, and the clauses would then be renumbered automatically. The Chamber may proceed with the Minister's amendment first if it wishes.

Mr Tonkin: I do not mind; I just wanted to make sure there was no problem.

Committee Resumed

Mr HASSELL: I am not going to divide the Committee again over my amendments. The point has been made and the Government has rejected our amendments. I would like to point out to the Minister, however, that this amendment stands on its own. Although the Minister for technical or other reasons—and I do not think they were good ones—was unable to accept the amendment to section 100, he can still accept the amendment to section 100A.

Subsection (4) of section 100A includes a right for the scrutineers of a candidate to represent him at the mobile portable ballot box when it moves into one of the proclaimed institutions. The silly part is that no provision exists to give the candidates a right to know when the portable ballot box will be visiting a hospital or institution. This amendment seeks to give candidates that right. It does not alter the substance of the law as it stands and does not give rise to any of the problems which the Minister claimed would arise in relation to the previous amendment. It gives rights to candidates which are consistent with their usual rights to be involved in scrutinising the conduct of the ballot and the count. I ask the Minister to consider seriously accepting this amendment.

Mr TONKIN: I seriously considered accepting the last amendment, but we could not do so for obvious reasons. It was not a question of altering the legislation, but rather one of doing some research and seeing what was the position.

I am advised some deficiencies exist in this amendment. They are technical, although there is a more substantive objection which is that where problems arise of distance or the impassability of roads during the wet season in the northern parts of the State, it might be quite difficult to inform people pursuant to this subsection. No doubt if the attempt were made, it would satisfy the Act.

It is unfortunate in a sense that I am accepting this amendment and not the preceding one because it may seem I am more concerned with the rights of candidates than of ill people in hospitals. I hasten to add that that is untrue.

Mr Hassell: We would not accuse you of that if you accepted this amendment.

Mr TONKIN: This amendment is in a more acceptable form. It is not true that we think elections are for the convenience of candidates. As I

have said before, they are for the convenience of the people. They enable people to choose a Government and it is our intention to make it as easy as possible for sick and infirm people to vote. That is why we were attracted to the previous amendment although we could not accept it for the reasons given.

I indicate that in accepting this amendment I will need to make some changes pursuant to the advice I have received. In matters of drafting, one is in the hands of the people who are technically expert in that area. I seek your guidance, Mr Chairman. Is it possible for me to seek now to insert words in the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: It is possible to amend the amendment.

Mr TONKIN: I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "Officer" in line 1 the words "or the returning officer as the case may require".

Mr Hassell: We accept that.

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Mr TONKIN: My further amendment on the amendment is of a technical nature. I move—

That the amendment be further amended by deleting the passage after the word "attendance" in line 13 and substituting the passage "pursuant to subsection (2), paragraph (a) of this section".

Perhaps members can see the logic of that.

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: So that members of the Committee know the stage we have reached, I indicate that we are about to vote on the new clause 20 moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which has been amended twice on motions by the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform.

Mr HASSELL: I thank the Minister for accepting the amendment.

New clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 19: Section 119 amended—

Mr TONKIN: Now we come to my amendment to clause 19. We are making a two-part change. We have the question, "Are you a British subject?" so that the joint enrolment procedures can be followed in the months ahead; and later—perhaps from 26 January—the other question, "Are you an Australian citizen?" will be used.

In answer to a query last night from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Floreat as to whether "Are you a British subject?" is a sufficient provision, reference was made to the Commonwealth Electoral Act and the fact that it referred to what I presume is a Commonwealth Interpretation Act. The suggestion was that perhaps that is not sufficient. Section 4A(2) of our Interpretation Act provides—

(2) A reference in any law of the State to a British subject or to a natural born or naturalized subject of Her Majesty or to any other like expression, shall be read as a reference to an Australian citizen and to any other person who, under the Commonwealth Act, has the status of a British subject or has the status of a British subject without citizenship.

I think that answers the query made last night.

Mr Hassell: It solves the problem.

Mr TONKIN: I move an amendment—

Page 13, lines 9 to 22—Delete paragraph (h) and substitute the following paragraph—

" (h) Are you a British subject? "

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 20 put and passed.

Clause 21: Section 156 amended—

Mr COURT: I would like clarification from the Minister. He said that he is amending this provision because people have been taken off the rolls incorrectly under the old procedures. What evidence has he of this? When the "please explain" letters were sent out, has he evidence to show that the people who were taken off the rolls should have been left on them?

Following the by-election last year, I had a little experience in this field. No doubt the member for Helena had the same experience. After the election, the department did what the Minister calls "stripping" of the rolls, or "cleansing" of the rolls, or whatever is done. Many people were removed at the time. In *The West Australian* of 24 July 1982, the headline was, "Electors struck off rolls", and the article read as follows—

They say that many of the people who have been struck off the rolls will still be living in the electorate and will try to vote, only to find that they cannot do so.

The article continued—

The MLA for Melville, Mr Barry Hodge, who receives a computer print-out of the rolls, said that 1 251 had been struck off in

his electorate for failing to respond to the department's letters.

Normally, fewer than 100 people a month would be removed from the roll because of job transfers and other reasons.

He was certain that a big percentage of the 1 251 still lived in the electorate.

He and volunteers were trying to trace these people through the telephone directory to re-enrol as many as possible.

The Electoral Department did not have enough staff to do the work.

Later in the article the following appeared—

The Electoral Department has struck off 1 740 names from the Swan roll and about 1 250 from the Nedlands roll.

I would be interested to hear from the member for Melville about the result of his work. As a result of those people being struck off the rolls, I became worried. Being new to the game, I thought I would take the matter further, so a group of people decided to contact those who had been struck off the rolls. We sent a letter to some 1 000 people on the list; and members can imagine that would be quite a job. We had to go through the deletions from the computer print-out—

Mr Tonkin: That kind of activity has been condemned by some of your members.

Mr COURT: I will just explain the letter and the result we received. The letter read as follows—

Dear Elector,

It has come to our notice that your name has been deleted from the Electoral Roll.

This concerns us, as perhaps at the time of the last election you were away, and were unaware your name would be removed. What this means is that when you go to vote at the next election, your name will not be registered and you will be unable to exercise your right to vote.

Please contact this office if you wish to re-enroll, as we have the forms available for your convenience.

Mr Tonkin: Very commendable.

Mr COURT: We sent that letter to all the people who had been deleted from the roll.

The response was quite interesting. Many of the letters were simply returned marked, "Not known at this address". Many of the people at the places where the letters were received rang our office, because they thought it was a pretty official sort of letter. They gave us the reason the person was not in the electorate any more. They

said that the person had gone to live out of the electorate, that he was living overseas, or that he was living in another State. There was always a reason that the persons were living in the electorate no longer.

To my knowledge, we did not receive a response from anyone who said that he had been taken off the roll incorrectly, although we received phone calls, and letters were returned.

At the end of the exercise, I thought that the cleansing process had been fair and accurate. It will never be super-accurate; but the fact is that there has been a large movement of people from the electorate, and the department had good reason for removing them from the roll.

Mr Thompson: What percentage of response did you get to the letters you sent out?

Mr COURT: Not one of them had been removed improperly. The member for Melville might have done a similar exercise. The great majority of letters were returned and marked, "Not known at this address", or something like that.

Mr Thompson: Did you get a 90 per cent response?

Mr COURT: I could not say exactly.

The important thing is that the people who rang up—there were many of them, and the phones were pretty busy for a few days after the letters went out—told us that the person had now shifted.

What evidence has the Minister that it is necessary to change the procedure used at present?

I would like to hear the results of the survey conducted by the member for Melville.

Mr TONKIN: I thank the member for his contribution; and I commend him for the activity he has shown in his electorate. I am pleased that not all of the members on his side of the Committee have the kind of myopic attitude that if one is enrolling people, one is manipulating them. I know that the member for Karrinyup has said that on many occasions.

Mr Clarko: That is not true. It depends on how you do it. It is quite different.

Mr TONKIN: Many suggestions have been made that it is somehow reprehensible to act in that way—to enrol people, or to collect cards, or to put in the claim cards for other people.

It is a worthy service made doubly necessary by the starvation of the State Electoral Department of the necessary funds for field staff to do that work. The names of many people are taken off the roll, but should not be. We know this because

people come to us after they have found that their names are not on the roll, but that occurs only after the next election.

I know people who have lived in my area for 30 years, but have found suddenly that they are not listed on the roll. Some error has occurred, and this amendment will assist the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff to find out whether a person should be listed on the roll. The Chief Electoral Officer will write to them to advise them that he should take their names off the roll, but he will now have the discretion to determine whether their names should be taken off the roll.

It may be that a neighbour of a person whose name is to be taken off the roll works in the Electoral Department, and knows that the person still resides at the same address. The officer may say, "I saw her watering the garden this morning". As the Act stands, the name would have to be removed from the roll, even though the person was properly enrolled. Under our proposal the Chief Electoral Officer will have to be satisfied that a person's name should be taken off the list, although a name will be taken off the list if the person cannot be found. The Chief Electoral Officer will be able to use his initiative to satisfy himself that a person is no longer living at the listed address.

We do not have statistical evidence of these matters, but as a result of discussions we have had with officers who have said that many times a person is incorrectly taken off the roll, we know that these errors occur. As I have already said, from my experience I know that some people in Bayswater who have lived there for 30 years and may have gone overseas during the last election have found at the next election that they are not enrolled. Perhaps the letter was not given to them by Aunt Flo or was taken by the cat, but the fact has been that their names were taken off the roll and should not have been.

In one electorate, as I may have said, under section 122A of the Act, 3 000 people were found to have not been listed on the roll. The Commonwealth canvasser had been active, and many people thought they were listed on the State roll because they had filled in a card. Many people do not understand the system. We should not be judgmental of them and say that they are not on the roll because they do not care or are not good citizens. We must remember that we have a special interest in politics. Some people are good citizens and want to vote, but do not take as much interest in politics as others; it is not the most pressing thing on their minds. I am sure members opposite have many friends—I hope they do, anyway—who do not think politics is the most im-

portant activity, and they would prefer to watch football, but that does not mean they do not want to vote. If their names were taken off the roll by mistake, they would not check because they would not know. If a person had lived in an area for 30 years, he would not go to the electoral office to check whether his name was on the roll.

At every election my workers have said to me that they have found many people not listed on the roll, and have found it difficult to check why. This situation does not occur all the time, but it does happen on enough occasions to necessitate our ensuring that a person is not taken off the roll by mistake.

We should treat the Chief Electoral Officer and his staff as capable human beings who can find out whether a person should be listed; we should not treat them as the slaves of some letter that may not reach its intended destination. We all know what can happen with mail.

Mr MENSAROS: I experienced a similar situation to that mentioned by the member for Nedlands. I know of occasions when a person's name has been struck in error from the roll. I mentioned during my second reading speech that I have a card system of every place of residence in my electorate, a system I have maintained for 16 years. Various people have been enrolled and re-enrolled, and obviously some of them are cases of a couple taking up residence and enrolling, but the names of the previous residents are still listed on the roll because they have omitted to disenroll.

After an election, we have this cleansing of the roll. The computer print-out is available, which obviates the necessity to go to the electoral office to compare the various notations. It is often easy to understand how these errors can be made, but there have been very few indeed.

I am not aware of any statistics. On occasions a man and a woman are listed on the roll for quite some time, but suddenly one name is taken off the roll. The suspicion might be that the couple have separated or divorced, but often the person has ignored the notice, and I have found that in such circumstances the response to a letter is high. Often the reply has been, "Yes, we are still living here and want to be enrolled".

I have made these remarks to add to those made by the member for Nedlands.

Mr COURT: I ask the Minister to clarify the existing procedures. He said that after the last State election the electoral office sent out "please explain" letters. Were the names of the people who did not reply after that election taken off the roll?

Mr Tonkin: Yes, the Chief Electoral Officer has no discretion. He must take their names off the roll.

Mr HASSELL: The Opposition is opposed to this clause. It is one of a number of amendments directed to allowing names to stay on the roll even when the people listed have not voted, or have failed to respond to a "please explain" notice. The general principle is bad and the provision is worse; it contains no time limit, and the Chief Electoral Officer will keep on the roll the names of many people which should be removed.

Mr Tonkin: That is a reflection on him and his staff.

Mr HASSELL: No, it is a reflection on the administrative capacity of that position to deal with everyone.

The second reason for our identifying the deficiencies in this provision is that the Chief Electoral Officer will not be able to inquire into all cases. Notwithstanding he will not be able to do that, he will be required to leave the names on the roll because the provision requires him to satisfy himself, and the only way he can do that is to conduct an inquiry. As a matter of administrative practice, he will not be able to cause inquiries to be made in all cases. Apart from anything else, the Commonwealth field staff, on whom he must rely, cannot operate in all areas of the State. Clearly there will be quite a number of cases of names maintained on the roll which ought to be removed, but which will not be removed as a result of this provision.

This provision, in particular, is bad, as are the other attempts of the Minister to keep the rolls up to date.

Mr Tonkin: They will be up to date as a result of this measure.

Mr HODGE: I will comment briefly following on from the remarks of the member for Nedlands. I commend him for taking the action he did, following the lead I set. I do not have the statistics with me and I will not comment off the cuff the results of the survey I undertook, but they were largely similar to those which the member for Nedlands outlined.

I wrote to several hundred people, and we telephoned several hundred more. A large number of people in my electorate had their names taken off the roll after a Legislative Council by-election in the area. An unusually high number of people did not vote in that by-election, which was mainly because of their lack of knowledge about the Council. Many people I contacted had a limited understanding of what it is; they were confused between the Legislative Council and the municipal council.

They did not understand it was compulsory for them to vote at that by-election, even if they realised it was a parliamentary by-election. Many people ignored the "please explain" letters, and their names were removed from the roll. I found that some people had moved and the circumstances of others had changed. The names of many people were removed from the roll quite properly, but many others had their names removed unnecessarily.

Some elderly people were unable to vote and others were away for the day. Some people had moved within the electorate. A whole range of reasons were given for people not having voted when they should have. We helped many of these people to re-enrol, but the task was complex, mainly because of the provision that a justice of the peace must witness the signatures. I found it was difficult to have everyone re-enrolled, particularly elderly people who could not get to a courthouse or police station to have their signatures witnessed. All this made the job unnecessarily difficult.

I regret not having the statistics with me to quote, as did the member for Nedlands, but I do know that this clause will improve the electoral system. If we must err, I would rather we erred on the side of leaving people enrolled who may not need to be enrolled as against taking the names of people off the roll which should be on it.

Mr COWAN: Once again we have had a debate which demonstrates the differences of opinion between the two major parties. One party has wanted to make it extremely difficult for people to be enrolled and, when they are enrolled, to make it simple for their names to be struck off the roll. The other party has given the people the benefit of the doubt and has shown an act of faith in those people who for some reason or another have omitted to ensure their names remain on the roll.

We are prepared to support the provisions in this clause because they facilitate again the ability of an individual to be re-enrolled or to remain enrolled.

Clause put and a division taken, with the following result—

Ayes 30

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Mr Bateman | Mr Jamieson |
| Mrs Beggs | Mr Tom Jones |
| Mr Bertram | Mr McIver |
| Mr Bridge | Mr Parker |
| Mrs Buchanan | Mr Pearce |
| Mr Brian Burke | Mr Read |
| Mr Terry Burke | Mr D. L. Smith |
| Mr Burkett | Mr P. J. Smith |
| Mr Carr | Mr Stephens |
| Mr Cowan | Mr A. D. Taylor |
| Mr Davies | Mr Tonkin |
| Mr Evans | Mr Troy |
| Mr Grill | Mrs Watkins |
| Mrs Henderson | Mr Wilson |
| Mr Hodge | Mr Gordon Hill |

(Teller)

Noes 21

| | |
|----------------|--------------|
| Mr Blaikie | Mr McNee |
| Mr Bradshaw | Mr Mensaros |
| Mr Clarko | Mr O'Connor |
| Mr Court | Mr Old |
| Mr Coyne | Mr Rushton |
| Mr Crane | Mr Spriggs |
| Dr Dadour | Mr Thompson |
| Mr Hassell | Mr Trethowan |
| Mr Peter Jones | Mr Watt |
| Mr Laurance | Mr Williams |
| Mr MacKinnon | |

(Teller)

Pairs

| Ayes | Noes |
|-----------------|------------|
| Mr I. F. Taylor | Mr Grayden |
| Mr Bryce | Mr Tubby |

Clause thus passed.

Clause 22: Section 190 amended—

Mr MENSAROS: The Minister may recall that during the second reading debate I asked a question concerning clause 22 (c). The other paragraph relates to the deletion of various offences, but there these are substituted by other offences. Paragraph (c) reads as follows—

(c) by deleting the following—

" Wilfully making a false insertion or alteration in any claim. Penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars. "

Wilfully inserting in a claim a date other than the date on which the claim was made. Penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars. "

There is only deletion here, no substitution of another offence.

I cannot understand why paragraph (c) has been included. I have tried to relate it to the provisions of the existing Act, but have not been successful. I cannot see the reason for this amendment. Nothing really is substituted for these deleted offences. Even if paragraph (b) covers most of the requirements on a claim, it would not make paragraph (c) superfluous, as altering a document falsely should remain an offence unless the argument was that provisions exist under criminal law to impose penalties where false claims are made.

Mr TONKIN: I refer the member to the essential parts of a claim which have been altered and this penalty, of course, relates to that.

Clause put and passed.

New clause 23.

Mr HASSELL: I move—

Page 16—Insert after clause 22 the following new clause to stand as clause 23—

23. Section 192 of the principal Act is amended by repealing subsection (3) and substituting the following—

(3) In the period of 21 days up to and including polling day, literature relating to political parties and candidates may be left in individual envelopes at the general office of an institution or hospital referred to in subsection (2) of this section and the management or person in charge of that institution or hospital shall, to the extent that the number of envelopes supplied allows, cause one envelope from each such political party or candidate to be handed to each elector who is for the time being resident in the institution or hospital wherein the polling place is appointed to be by reason of illness or infirmity or in the case of a woman, by reason of approaching maternity.

I ask the Minister to consider the amendment independently of the original amendment which was moved. The present provision under section 192(3) of the Act reads as follows—

(3) Literature relating to political parties may be left at the general office of an institution or hospital referred to in subsection (2) of this section so that such literature may be available on request by any elector who is for the time being resident in the institution or hospital wherein the polling place is appointed to be.

It is not a satisfactory provision, in practice, for anybody in relation to those hospitals and institutions which are declared. What happens is that political parties take along to those hospitals or institutions literature which may relate to the local electorate or to the entire State.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The level of background noise is becoming unacceptably high.

There are members desirous of listening to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I suggest that, if members must talk, they do so at acceptable levels.

Mr HASSELL: The political parties leave electoral material at the office of the hospitals or institutions. Generally the offices regard the material as a damned nuisance, and, of course, no-one asks for it, and yet political canvassing is prohibited within these organisations. The fact is that people who live in the hospitals or institutions do not know that the material is available. I am referring only to those hospitals or institutions which have been declared. The people in these organisations are suddenly confronted with a mobile ballot box without receiving the how-to-vote cards. No-one from political parties has visited them because the Act prohibits canvassing in these institutions. The people do not know how to vote and they are unable to obtain information. The existing provision does not work.

I am proposing that this clause be amended by allowing political parties to leave material in separate envelopes at the general office of the institution or hospital. It would require only the management of those organisations to deliver the envelopes to the patients. Each envelope would contain political material from each party and candidate for that electorate. Most people in nursing homes are enrolled on the local roll, but patients in hospitals would need to be supplied with electoral material for the entire State.

My amendment appears to be a reasonable proposition because under the present system certain people in hospitals and institutions who are interested in the political process are effectively denied, by reason of their own infirmity or illness, the opportunity to take part in that process. It is an important amendment, although it is not critical from the point of view of the conduct of elections, and I hope the Minister will accept it.

Mr TONKIN: As with the other amendments put forward in this debate by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I find a lot of merit in this one. It seems that the Opposition's attitude has altered somewhat from that of a few years ago when it suggested that people who went to institutions trying to inform people of the political process were inflicting themselves on people who wanted to die in peace and who did not want to belong to the community. Many of these people want to be part of the community and it occurred to me when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition moved this amendment that the name of the political party should be shown after the candidate's name on ballot papers because most people vote for the party and not for the candidate. I look forward to

the Opposition's support in this regard in the future.

With respect to this amendment—I hope the Opposition does not think I am being pedantic, but I used to be a school teacher, though I am trying to overcome that situation—it is deficient in its present form and I ask the Committee not to accept it. The idea is excellent and I hope it will be incorporated in a Bill dealing with postal voting and absentee voting which may come before the Parliament. Perhaps we could introduce it in a Bill next year in conjunction with the idea of an electoral commission.

The problem I see with this amendment is that we would impose legal requirements upon the management of a hospital or an institution.

Mr Hassell: It is already in the existing section 192(3). The idea refers to an institution or a hospital.

Mr TONKIN: That is not mandatory, is it?

Whatever the Minister says is an institution, would be an institution. If he says that a mobile ballot box is required at an institution, I see no problem.

Mr Hassell: We are not altering that.

Mr TONKIN: Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition see the difference?

However, there are more weighty problems and one is that we would be imposing upon the management of hospitals and institutions. Of course, there would be a philosophical argument as to whether we would impose on the duty of management. That does not worry me and I would be happy to do that—it is not a great problem. Some people would find that it is an imposition. The term "management" is too vague. When one requires something to be done, one must state who is to do it. Is it the owner-manager, sister-in-charge, or one of the attendants who would undertake this work? Who would be responsible for it? This would need to be tidied up.

The second main point I make is that, if we impose this requirement upon management, we must provide for penalties or sanctions of some sort because without them, what happens when they say, "Go jump"? That is a real problem.

Mr Hassell: There is a general penalty where other penalties are not provided.

Mr TONKIN: Yes, but we do not want that general penalty to apply in the case of someone who is running a hospital.

The expression, "to be handed to each elector who is, for the time being, resident" is unclear. What does "for the time being" mean? It is a

rather vague phrase. We need to provide for a specific time.

Mr HASSELL: The expression is used in plenty of legislation.

Mr TONKIN: It is indeed, but it depends on how it is used, and in what context. I believe it needs to be tidied up. Perhaps we could provide that it should be a certain date on which a person is resident. If we are to impose certain duties on management, we must make those duties clear.

For those reasons—because no penalties are provided, because we do not know upon whom the duty would be laid, and because we are not sure who would be entitled to receive this information—we are not prepared to accept the amendment as it stands. However, the idea is a very good one and when we look at it and draft it in a more technically tight manner, it will be worthwhile to include the provision in the Bill next year.

Mr COWAN: Just as I have been giving the benefit of the doubt to the Government for most of the amendments it is seeking to make to the Act, so on this occasion I give the benefit of the doubt to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I do not see the lack of any penalty as an obstacle to the inclusion of this amendment; nor do I see that it will impose an onerous obligation upon the administrator or manager of an institution. Let us agree to the amendment and see how it operates. If, after a time, it is found that too many administrators are not prepared to cause this information to be given to inmates of an institution or a hospital, the legislation can be returned to this Chamber for amendment.

Mr Tonkin: At least let us do it properly.

Mr COWAN: I do not see there is anything improper about the amendment as it stands. If there are practical reasons which make it difficult to administer the provision, the Government can return the legislation to this Chamber for amendment. Everybody knows the majority of legislation we deal with is in the form of amendments to tidy up or simplify existing provisions which are found to be deficient in some respects. There is no reason that the Government should not accept this amendment and allow it to work in practice and, if it is found to be causing problems, to amend the Act.

Mr Tonkin: Certain things become obvious once they are law.

Mr HASSELL: I say only that the reasons given by the Minister in opposing this amendment amounted to gobbledygook. It is simply a brutal, ruthless use of the numbers to oppose it.

New clause put and negatived.

Clauses 23 to 25 put and passed.

Clause 26: Section 208 repealed and substituted—

Mr HASSELL: During the second reading debate I indicated our opposition to this amendment. I believe if we were to include such an amendment, there ought to be a specific provision that the postal address should be included in the electoral roll and that there should be a provision for checking the residential address on a regular basis. It seems to me this provision is quite wrong, and will lead to the growth of inaccuracies in the roll.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 27 put and passed.

New heading—

Mr TONKIN: I move an amendment—

Page 17, after line 27—Insert the following new heading—

“ PART III—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AUSTRALIAN CITIZENSHIP QUALIFICATION”.

New heading put and passed.

New clauses 28, 29, and 30—

The Bill was further amended, on motions by Mr Tonkin, as follows—

Page 17—Add after clause 27 the following new clause to stand as clause 28—

Section 4 amended. 28. Section 4 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by inserting after the definition of “Assistant Chief Electoral Officer” the following definition—

“ “Australian citizen” means a person who is an Australian citizen under the Australian Citizenship Act 1948 of the Commonwealth or any Act amending that Act or substituted therefor; ”; and

(b) by inserting after the definition of “prison” the following definition—

“ “proclaimed day” means the day on which Part III of the Electoral Amendment Act 1983 comes into operation; ”.

Page 17—Add after new clause 28 the following new clause to stand as clause 29—

Section 17 amended. 29. Section 17 of the principal Act, as amended by section 4 of this Act, is further amended in subsection (1) by deleting paragraph (a) and substituting the following paragraph—

“ (a) who is—

- (i) an Australian citizen; or
- (ii) a British subject (other than an Australian citizen) who was, at some time within 3 months immediately preceding the proclaimed day, an elector of the Assembly or an elector, under a Commonwealth Act, of the Commonwealth Parliament; ”.

Page 17—Add after new clause 29 the following new clause to stand as clause 30—

Section
119
amended.

30. Section 119 of the principal Act, as amended by section 19 of this Act, is further amended in subsection (2) by deleting paragraph (h) and substituting the following paragraph—

“ (h) Are you an Australian citizen? (and if the answer to that question is No, the further question, Are you a British subject? and if the answer to this question is Yes, the further question, At some time within 3 months immediately preceding [*here state the date of the proclaimed day*] was your name on any electoral roll kept for the purposes of an election for the Assembly or for the Commonwealth Parliament?) ”.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, with amendments, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

MR TONKIN (Morley-Swan—Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform) [5.12 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR HASSELL (Cottesloe—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.13 p.m.]: The Opposition has dealt with this Bill in a very thorough and, I think, a very responsible way and has pointed out to the Government significant deficiencies in its provisions. The Government has accepted one amendment we put forward relating to a matter

outside the ambit of the legislation, but has not accepted any of the Opposition's serious points concerning the deficiencies of the legislation and the likely effect this legislation will have on the state of the Western Australian electoral rolls. We supported the second reading of the Bill and we have supported the principal provisions of the Bill in so far as they provide for a joint enrolment procedure and for a uniform, Australia-wide system of qualification for enrolments, based on Australian citizenship. In other areas, we have expressed serious reservations on the basis of a thorough and careful consideration of the Bill. I regret the Government has not seen fit to review some of those provisions.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 18 August.

MR McNEE (Mt. Marshall) [5.15 p.m.]: I thank you, Sir, for giving me the opportunity to continue my maiden speech. When the House rose last week, I was in the course of referring to a proposal put forward by the Department of Agriculture to drought-proof farms. I mentioned the fact that the proposal was costing farmers in the order of \$25 per hectare.

Because of the current situation of rural industries, it is absolutely ridiculous to suggest they ought to accept a proposal of that nature. It must be understood that in the area about which we are speaking, while the land is fertile, its water-holding qualities are very poor.

One of the farmers in my area has installed a number of contour banks and the necessary pumping and piping equipment to ensure that, once he has obtained the water, he is able to retain it in his new dam and then distribute it to wherever necessary on his farm.

That man has spent in the order of \$25 per hectare which does not include the cost of surveying and sundry work. Those extra costs must be considered, because if anyone attempted to carry out the exercise this farmer has done, he would have to meet those sundry costs also.

The system is very nice and the purpose of this exercise was to drought-proof the man's farm. That means water will be available at any time. The system sounds very nice, but the holding qualities of the country are poor and it is very difficult to find suitable dam sites.

This system is extremely good, but the problem is that the dam leaks. Having spent all that money, this farmer still faces the problem with which he started out: A dam in poor holding country.

If it were practical to handle the situation in the way proposed by the Department of Agriculture, I can assure you, Sir, that all farmers in those areas would have done so already. These farmers have many years' experience in this regard. The Government is completely avoiding its responsibility to provide these people with a reliable water supply. That is what they need and, if a reliable water supply is not provided, it goes without saying that they are unable to make other decisions which are part and parcel of their farming programmes. They are locked out of the possibility of increasing their stock numbers. They will not be able to increase their pig numbers. Heaven knows the pig industry is going through enough problems at the present time. The cost structure of that industry does not allow farmers in that area to run pigs profitably to augment their declining incomes. This is particularly the case if farmers have to cart water. That is the problem with which they are faced.

The other matter which is causing real concern in my area is the proposed increase in rail freight charges. It is important this matter be examined. An article appeared on page 1 of *The Farmers' Weekly* of 17 August 1983 which is headed, "Westrail screws farmers". In recent months farmers have become increasingly accustomed to being screwed. The article says, in part—

Westrail wants 13.96 per cent increase in grain freight charges for the coming season and will not negotiate below that figure.

Earlier in my remarks, I indicated we did not particularly like the idea of the reopening of the Fremantle-Perth railway line. However, I ask you, Sir, to approach the Agaton water scheme with the same enthusiasm. We are not prepared to pick up the tab for the Government's financial vandalism!

As I pointed out earlier, the Government needs the assistance of farmers, and it is not going the right way about getting it. The Government's proposed increased freight rates will increase costs by approximately \$2 000 in some areas of my electorate. That does not include the cost of delivery from farms. The imposition of the proposed new freight rates will increase the freight structure of farmers in my electorate by 28 per cent in two years. It is completely unreasonable to ask people to consider meeting cost increases of that order,

particularly bearing in mind the current rural situation after a number of very bad seasons.

Mr Grill: If you would like to ask me about that matter by way of questions, I shall explain the situation. The position is not really as you indicated.

Mr McNEE: I would be only too happy to oblige the Minister by asking questions in relation to this matter. I am sure a number of my electors would like me to do so. I hope the required answers will be forthcoming.

This is an important matter to my electorate. My electors look forward to receiving satisfaction from the Government in that regard.

Wherever I look in this State, regardless of whether I look to the north, the south, the east, or the west, I see the results of the good work of the previous Government. However, I find people say to me continually that, if the American economy improves, perhaps the Australian economy will do likewise. I suggest the only people who can do anything about the Australian economy are Australians and we should be looking at that aspect very closely. We ought to look at what has happened in private enterprise. Companies operating at a profit in this country are criticised; indeed, those companies have been assassinated and, as a result, jobs have been exported. It is time the work force realised that jobs are profit and the two are closely related and will remain so.

Another matter concerning my electorate relates to ABRD funds the provision of which is being criticised. We are being levied and we are not gaining anything. Indeed, the fuel consumed by our tractors is covered by the levy, but we are excluded from bituminising roads which do not carry 50 or more vehicles a day. That figure is based on the fact that the level set in the Eastern States is perhaps 100 vehicles. It has been said also that roads carrying little traffic cost more to maintain, but I understand that is not the experience and my observations would indicate that is not the case.

It does not seem to me to be logical that, if a road carries 10 vehicles a day, it should be twice as costly to maintain as one which carries 20 vehicles. However, in my area dangerous roads need a bitumen surface and the local authorities are denied the opportunity to carry out the work. We would like some relaxation of provisions relating to vehicle numbers. We do not believe we are being unreasonable and we ask the Government to consider this issue.

I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence and also members on both sides of the House.

[Applause.]

MR PETER JONES (Narrogin) [5.25 p.m.]: I join with those who have congratulated you, Sir, on your elevation to the position of Speaker of this House and who have welcomed the new members to this Chamber. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the member for Mt. Marshall to the effect that many opportunities for employment which could have been offered by companies and various business organisations have been destroyed. The member used the word "assassinated", and I agree with that.

Those sentiments are true, because the acid test of public policy should be whether it is for the public good. Unfortunately, we have now a situation in this country where, so far as the Labor Party is concerned, the public good is best served by public intervention by Government; by having Governments which believe in a greater growth of and a greater role being played by the public sector. Not only is that alien to all that we ought to be doing in determining the best future for this country, but also it is alien to the very fabric of Australian society.

Mr Davies: It is alien to what your Government was doing in quite a few areas, too.

Mr PETER JONES: I am coming to that. One thing which is basic to the make-up of each Australian is that he responds to initiative. The individual Australian is associated with enterprise and personal effort; he responds to the incentive to perform. Not only people in remote parts of this State have developed in that way for the betterment of the country, but also those who have moved to the more populous areas of the State fall into this category. I refer here to men who work hard in the cities, who live in the suburbs, who are buying their own homes, who are educating their children, and who are putting aside something for their retirement and future enjoyment when their working lives are over.

Not only has that basic aim been bruised and bashed, but also it has been virtually destroyed, because it does not mesh with the Labor Party's concept of what Australia is all about and the way Australia ought to be managed.

In the few months that State and Federal Labor Governments have been in office, we have seen the objectives of their policies. No-one here would not have felt in some way or other the chill wind of the changes which have been implemented, and those which it is projected will be inflicted on the Australian public in coming months.

Leave to Continue Speech

I seek leave of the House to continue my speech at a later stage.

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.15 p.m.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR PETER JONES (Narrogin) [7.15 p.m.]: I was drawing the House's attention earlier to the fact that the Labor Party at both Federal and State levels was implementing policies which bore no relationship to the needs of the country, and very badly reflected the aspirations and make-up of the Australian people. I think it is fair to say that with Governments of both political persuasions we see at times a situation in which the record of performance does not match the words. Already, at Federal and State level, the performance of the Labor Party not only is not matching the words, but also is clearly moving completely in contradiction to what was promised prior to the election. They are moving away from the policy and platforms to a degree that should not be allowed.

I want to give examples of where the actions of both Governments, particularly the one in Western Australia, are directly in contrast to the public statements made from time to time, particularly prior to the election. I want also to give examples of what we ought to be doing.

A clear indication was given by the Labor Party prior to the State election that it considered it needed to give a lead to the private sector. It went out and very sensibly persuaded the business community of its intentions. One must bear in mind that the private sector employs 75 per cent of people in employment in this State; it provides three-quarters of the jobs. That sector was wooed very strongly with promises of assistance and help and a clear commitment was made.

At the time of the economic summit in Canberra, both the Prime Minister and his Treasurer made it clear that, in the opinion of the Labor Party and of those States in which the Labor Party held a majority, the private sector was needed to lead the economic recovery. That was a clear commitment. It is a matter of public

record and there is no point in my taking the time of the House to refer to it although I could do so if required. A clear acknowledgement was made of the needs, aspirations, and importance of the private sector.

Shortly after this State Government was elected, the Deputy Premier made a speech in Melbourne on 8 March. He spoke to the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association and I notice he dusted off a speech I had made, added a little to it, and fiddled around a bit with it—

Mr Clarko: Did that improve it?

Mr PETER JONES: It was a tested and tried speech. No wonder the Deputy Premier used it. In that speech, he acknowledged that the private sector had to be supported and helped, and he called on the Federal Government which had just been elected to give greater incentives than the Fraser Government had given for mineral and energy exploration, and taxation concessions. A plank of the Labor Party's platform—a quite clear part of it—was that a Labor Government in this State would approach Canberra to seek taxation concessions for the private sector, particularly for mining and energy exploration as well as a range of other areas to which I shall refer.

On 27 July, however, I asked the Premier whether in the light of the statement that had been made the State Government had made any approach to the Federal Government to seek changes to the oil pricing policy, taxation incentives, or energy and oil exploration which the Deputy Premier had called for and to which the Labor Party was committed. The answer was, "Yes". That was promised; that is what the Government said it would do.

A few days later I asked the Premier what changes he had sought in his approach to the Federal Government. The reply was that the Government had not sought changes to either the taxation incentives or energy or mineral exploration; in other words, it was a direct contradiction of the answer given to me four or five days previously. It indicated clearly that confusion existed among the people in the Premier's office. More particularly, it indicated that the Government had not done anything at all. Having wooed industry with promises of what would be done, and having identified what it was seeking—with which I agreed, because we were asking often enough for the same things—the Government did precisely nothing.

The Premier misled this House in a statement he made. He untruthfully said that an approach had been made and three or four days later on 2 August he completely reversed that statement.

When confronted with the question he admitted there had been no approach.

Mr O'Connor: What a dreadful thing.

Mr PETER JONES: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. How can industry accept that kind of behaviour from the man who is Premier of this State.

Mr Clarko: It is a pity he is not here.

Mr Wilson: Mock horror.

Mr O'Connor: You do not seem to mind going back on promises. You would have a bigger list of broken promises than kept ones.

Mr Wilson: Mock horror.

Mr PETER JONES: The Deputy Premier has been trumpeting, both when in Opposition and since he has been in Government, and in various parts of the world, about the great advances that have been made in high technology and what these advances offer Western Australia. I would be misleading the House if I said I understood what he was talking about all the time, because I do not.

Mr Stephens: Tell us what you know about—tell us how to run a store into bankruptcy.

Mr PETER JONES: I do not fully understand the Deputy Premier when he talks about the number of jobs high technology will bring to this State and the opportunities it will offer. On the information I have obtained and from the people with whom I have spoken, I understand that these marvellous sunrise industries are going to be much further down the track and will not fulfil the promises made by the Deputy Premier.

Mr Barnett: Tell us about Mr Fabulous.

Mr PETER JONES: I agree that the new advances in technology already coming into this State represent greater efficiency, performance, and opportunity to those using new equipment which takes advantage of higher technological processing. However, these advances do not represent jobs in the short term.

For example, a few weeks ago I went to the Pilbara to the inauguration of a new piece of equipment. I might add that the Government was invited to send a representative but no-one attended on its behalf, not even the local member, despite the fact that the demonstration took place just two miles outside Port Hedland. This new equipment is capable of regrinding the railway lines over which the ore trains run, when the profile gets out of camber, particularly on the curves, due to the movement of the ore trains. The lines can be rehabilitated more cheaply and efficiently and the equipment is operated by only two men. The union has moved in, saying the equipment

cannot operate unless six men are used; it should be reclassified as a train and would then fall within the ambit of a particular award which, it has been previously determined, would require the use of six men on the equipment. Needless to say, this proposal was rejected by the company or subcontractor concerned, and it is to their credit that they withstood the pressure and are proceeding with the new equipment.

If that kind of mentality prevails, we will not be able to take advantage of high technological and industrial advances in equipment. It ill-behoves the Deputy Premier to be trumpeting about short-term promises and the use of this technology. I do not deny that it will create some benefits, but it will not create jobs in the short term.

Downstream it has much to offer, particularly in the extension of areas such as mineral processing, a whole range of manufacturing and processing options, and value-added processing, where entire treatment and processing techniques can be applied and where they can be used towards the extension of our existing operations. That is a tremendous advantage which must be pursued. However, to suggest Welshpool may become another silicone valley in the short term is simply pie in the sky.

I was interested to read that the Industries Assistance Commission also did not support the line followed by the Deputy Premier and his Federal counterpart, the Minister for Science and Technology. It seems the Federal Cabinet did not support it either, because in last night's Budget the Department of Science and Technology was allocated less money in real terms than in the previous year. The allocation to the department was a four per cent increase in cash terms which represents a loss in real terms.

Despite what was said earlier about the kind of commitment being made, I do not see how we can say a big commitment has been given. If we put it nicely, the allocation for new projects in high technology industry has increased by 100 per cent, from \$5 million to \$10 million. In other words, this financial year, the Commonwealth Government has budgeted on an allocation of \$10 million for new projects in the high technology industry. That is hardly the kind of commitment which the Federal Minister said was required and which he foreshadowed he would be seeking.

The Federal Budget already is being greeted as the great Australian "con".

It is very interesting that someone like Mr Rissstrom from the Australian Taxpayers' Association gave his initial reaction last night and then this morning, when he had pushed his sums

through the computer and read all the little bits and pieces within the Budget—all the curly ones which were not referred to by the Treasurer in his speech last night and which do not appear in his announcement—he took a different attitude. He still says it is a dull Budget.

Mr Burkett: The share market really rejected it!

Mr PETER JONES: I am not commenting on the share market at the moment. Mr Speaker, you would be aware, because you are interested in these matters, of what Mr Rissstrom had to say today compared with what he said last night. He said that the effect of the financial statement issued in May, which we now call the "mini-Budget", and the current Federal Budget, will be that an Australian worker with a mortgage and earning \$15 000 a year will pay some 16 per cent more in income tax than he paid in the last financial year.

After looking at that, how can we say that is a fair situation, bearing in mind the promises made by the Labor Government?

Mr Bertram: Very easily.

Mr PETER JONES: Members opposite are able to say that easily, but where is the proof of what was promised by the Labor Government when it went to the people? It said it would do all sorts of things to ease the burden on people in this country—the burden which it said the previous Government had imposed, and which it did. Where were all those promises in last night's Budget or in the May financial statement?

As I have said, we have been confronted with the great Australian con; but worse, it is founded entirely on the fact that the Prime Minister hopes, prays, and wishes that the trade union movement will toe the line and honour, as it said it would, the prices and incomes accord, which has already been broken.

We have a situation at the present time where the building industry unions, the oil industry unions, and the food processors' unions have destroyed the prices and incomes policy. Federal and State Governments have allowed them to enter into arrangements which have destroyed the income opportunities and the expansion potential of those industries.

In the last two days we have seen the situation in which H. J. Heinz has been forced to capitulate and it is to the eternal shame of the Victorian Labor Government that it stood by and allowed one union, the Food Processors' Union, to virtually rape H. J. Heinz and bring that company to its knees.

We have the same situation where sections of the building industry are involved and that seems to be ongoing. However, this attitude is reflected also in a wide range of other little, pinpricking areas that do not get much publicity. Indeed, we are seeing this action on the part of the unions at the present time. I wonder how the member for Pilbara is taking the situation in her electorate. I am told that at least four and possibly five vessels loaded with iron ore have been turned away from Port Hedland because of the action of the unions. How does that add up with all the promises made by the Government about industrial peace? How does that add up with the statement on iron ore negotiations released last October by the now Government when it said that it recognised the damage done by industrial disputation in the Pilbara and that it would seek co-operation from unions? What has it done? It has allowed the problems being experienced by Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. to continue to some extent. The situation has improved slightly now.

The Government has allowed the problems at Mt. Newman Mining Co. Pty. Ltd. to continue to some extent, although the apprenticeship situation has been resolved. Yet the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services interjected and said, "Look at the figures on the number of man days lost". I have done so as far as I have been able.

The Minister for Industrial Relations has refused to give the figures both by way of a private approach and in answer to questions asked in this House. Indeed, in answer to a question I asked yesterday as to the nature of the figures of which the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services seemed to be aware, the Minister for Industrial Relations said, "The figures are not known and are not available".

Mr Blaikie: That's interesting!

Mr PETER JONES: I do not know on what basis the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services said the number of man days lost is falling and virtually no industrial disputation has occurred since the election. I cannot obtain the figures. The Minister in another place says they are not available and the Minister for Employment and Administrative Services has indicated they have decreased markedly. I do not know on what he bases his comments.

When one talks to industry representatives now, one begins to understand why they are concerned. We have reached a position where, despite everything the Government has said, few jobs have been created in Western Australia this year. I cannot obtain the exact figure on that, either.

Mr Spriggs: There are 5 000 fewer people in jobs than there were six months ago.

Mr PETER JONES: I have been told no gain has been made in this area, but it appears jobs have been lost. No wonder the Minister for Industrial Relations wants to keep his figures to himself.

The Government really is not being allowed to do what it promised prior to the election, despite the fact that some of its promises would have been welcomed by industry. Indeed, they were welcomed when they were made, but now that it is in office, the Government gets its orders elsewhere.

Mr Gordon Hill: What a load of nonsense!

Mr PETER JONES: The Minister for Transport got his orders on Monday night, did he not? One does not have to be here all that long—

Several members interjected.

Mr Gordon Hill: Reds under the bed!

Mr PETER JONES: The Government had not been in office very long before Mr Butler, that \$34 752 man, came up and gave a few orders in this regard. The Minister for Fuel and Energy has been given his orders by the TLC about the Mulvey report.

Whatever was promised by the Government, not only does the reality fall far short, but also the Government has adopted a completely new line of operation and, as a result, the Burke promises have not matched up with reality.

One of the facts is this: The Labor Party has become the refuge for single issue fanatics. All kinds of groups which are pushing one issue or one aspect of protection, development, or whatever, find a refuge in the Labor Party.

Mr Wilson: That's rich coming from the Country Party!

Mr Bertram: It doesn't exist; it is bankrupt!

Mr PETER JONES: The policies and actions of these single issue groups are reflected not only in the policies and platform of the Labor Party, but also in the decisions it makes. This occurred last year at the State Conference of the Labor Party where various policy issues were determined and became part of the platform of the Labor Party, despite the wishes of the more pragmatic members who knew particular actions and ambitions should not be pursued at any cost.

You, Sir, were involved in this conference and you would have seen that the member for Warren was prepared to consider resigning from the Labor Party as a result of the policy platform forced on him and the party by a small, radical group led by Mr Bartholomaeus.

We have seen that occur and that same issue is now working its way through whatever decisions the Government makes. A group such as that could not care less about lost job opportunities or the future of thousands of Western Australians. These single issue fanatics could not care less about such matters and they find a refuge in the Labor Party.

Mr Bertram: John Tonkin was the leading single issue man, are you aware of that? He was the most highly regarded Premier in recent years.

Mr PETER JONES: I shall refer to another of these situations. Not only do these single issue groups work through the Labor Party, but also the United Nations has been discredited as a result of their activities. The same situation applies to the World Council of Churches. When one reads what has come out of that council's recent conference in Vancouver, one sees the World Council of Churches is a disgraceful and discredited organisation.

Several members interjected.

Mr PETER JONES: I repeat, because it appears members did not hear me, that the World Council of Churches is a disgraceful and discredited organisation and the United Nations is nearly as bad. I have been part of a delegation to a United Nations conference, and I know they way it operates. The manner in which it conducts its affairs is disgraceful. It is disgraceful when one bears in mind the kinds of issues pursued by the UN, the kinds of decisions made, and the kinds of declarations passed which Governments such as the Federal Government in this country then ratify. The previous Federal Government was as bad as the present one in that regard. The Federal Government imposes requirements on the people of this country which bear no relationship to the motions moved in some far remote place by delegates from countries which have no interest whatsoever in Australia.

Members ask about what the previous Federal Government did in this regard and I acknowledge that it was as bad as the present one.

Mr Wilson: But you never criticised it when you were in Government.

Mr PETER JONES: The former Government in this State criticised the Fraser Government loud and long on a whole range of issues. We did not just do what the Premier said he did tonight; that is, speak to the Prime Minister, Ministers should look at their files. I know what is in the Deputy Premier's file. However, if the Minister looks on his file, he will see the protests and criticisms levelled at the Federal Government on a range of matters.

Mr Wilson: Did you publicly criticise Mr Anthony?

Mr PETER JONES: Yes, I did.

Mr Bertram: With what result?

Mr Wilson: We have not heard much about the results.

Mr PETER JONES: Firstly, the State Government must be prepared to stand up publicly for Western Australia. We have not seen the present Government doing that. It has paid lip service to what it said it would do. We have established already that the Premier did not do what he said he had done.

Mr Bertram: He certainly did.

Mr PETER JONES: The present Government said it would stand up and give Western Australia a better deal. It made that promise, but it has not protested against what has been inflicted on the people of this State. It has not protested to the Federal Government about the insidious movement towards a centralist system which the previous Government maintained and which we fought against; but now it is creeping ahead much faster.

The Deputy Premier said on a radio interview—he told me this and I supported him—that the Government of Western Australia would oppose the imposition of a resources rent tax. He said the Government would not permit such an imposition. However, the present Government is saying now by way of answers to questions and as a result of any approaches made, "Nothing has yet been developed. We have not yet had to make formal approaches, because we do not have any idea of what is proposed".

It is quite clear what is proposed. The man who devised a formula for the resources rent tax in this country, Mr Ross Garnaut, is the economic adviser to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister took him overseas in June of this year, and at a dinner in his honour at New York on Thursday, 16 June, the Prime Minister said that there would be a resources rent tax in Australia. He made that clear and implied that the States would be overridden.

After some questioning during a discussion after the dinner, he acknowledged, I am advised, that there would have to be some consultation with the States because in States like Western Australia arrangements were fixed by State Acts of Parliament; the Parliament ratified agreements in which royalty arrangements were enshrined. However, he had made it clear, as did Mr Keating at a briefing in New York the following morning, that there would be a resources rent imposed and

that the Labor Party would move towards the centralising of revenue collection from resource industries in this nation. That was as clear as anything could be. What more does this Government want to know before it starts to protest against what is being done by Canberra? But this Government does nothing at all. I have given just one example.

The only sign of protest of any substance I have seen from a Minister of this Government was the sign by the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs, and he gave that sign twice, once in relation to asking the Federal Government to hang off with its Aboriginal land rights legislation, which Mr Holding was trumpeting would be introduced. I notice he is still saying there will be uniform land rights legislation, and hopefully by the end of 1984. The second sign was to seek a deferral of the Federal Government's withholding tax.

When will this Government stand up for this State and firmly say, "Look, enough is enough"? When will the Government stand up against all that Mr Hawke and his people are inflicting on this State? I refer again to the example of the Federal Budget. I was told today by one resource company that the fuel oil excise imposed last night by the Federal Budget will mean that between now and 30 June next year that company will pay in excess of \$30 million, and probably \$40 million, in additional revenue to the Commonwealth. That will be before the 20 per cent sales tax on oil and lubricants. That employer is the second or third biggest employer in this State. Where is the Government complaining about that measure imposed by the Federal Government?

On these matters of policy, rather than political attitudes, which are financial imposts on this State, we have this Government supporting the Federal Government, probably because it has been required to do so, in the redundancy test case being heard in the Federal arbitration court.

Mr MacKinnon: That's disgraceful.

Mr PETER JONES: The Minister for Industrial Relations confirmed today that a 60-year-old person after 40 years of working with one firm—this is after the original claim was modified—will receive 198 weeks of pay, plus sick leave, annual leave, and long service leave entitlements.

Mr MacKinnon: How many weeks?

Mr PETER JONES: It will be 198 weeks. No nation can afford such payments, yet this Government, on the one hand, has said it will create jobs and invite people to establish employment-creating industries in this State, but, on the other

hand, it supports the kind of madness to which I have referred. How can the Premier support that madness?

Mr MacKinnon: We certainly can't.

Mr PETER JONES: The Minister for Industrial Relations publicly denied today that the proposed legislation will cost jobs. He said it will not cost jobs or interfere at all with employment. Members should have no doubt about the fact that no one can afford to start an industry in this State or this nation with the kind of madness we have witnessed, which has been projected not only by last night's Federal Budget, but also by the statements made with the Federal Budget presented in May. The risk is too great; no-one will know what will come next.

Last October, the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions said at a shipping conference in Sydney that he supported, and that the ACTU would support, the maritime unions in their campaign to ensure that 40 per cent of Australian exports left the nation in Australian shipping bottoms. At present no more than three per cent of Australian resources go overseas in Australian bottoms because the exporters and the purchasers cannot afford more. Mr Dolan's remarks were followed by the Deputy Premier of New South Wales who said that he hoped a Federal Labor Government would legislate to enforce the proposition that at least 40 per cent of Australian exports went out in Australia bottoms, which would raise our freight rates above the small margin of competitiveness we still have—our competitiveness would disappear altogether.

We are reaching the situation of realising that the ALP is a Government of intervention and bureaucracy. We have been told that the withholding tax alone will mean an immediate employment of 800 people in the taxation department to try to process the applications for exemptions. It is a Government for further regulation and it is particularly a Government which has betrayed the people who supported it. The Labor Party has made promises at the Federal and the State level in Western Australia, and has betrayed the people who supported it by denying them the job opportunities they were originally offered.

One of the projects that must concern this Premier is the Yeelirrie project, and his concern must have arisen following the last conference of the Labor Party.

Mr Beazley, the member for Swan, wrote to various people, and headed his letter, "Dear friend". He said how all sorts of things would be done and that there would be no Yeelirrie, and no

mining of uranium, because the Labor Party would not permit it. We had a debate in this Chamber on 13 May 1982 when the member for Yilgarn-Dundas made it quite clear that the Labor Party would prevent the Yeelirrie project from going ahead. He made it quite clear that the Labor Party would stand in the way of that project, but we had an amusing interjection from the now Minister for Education who said that the Federal policy of the Labor Party did not matter. That remark was reported on page 1947 of *Hansard* of 13 May 1982. He said further that the Labor Party in Western Australia would do what it wanted. His exact words were, "We are our own selves".

When the election arrived, the Labor Party said that, as the Government, it would allow the project to go ahead, but would favour Esperance as the port to be used to export the yellowcake. The ALP policy was to prevent the project from proceeding, but this Labor Government said it supported the project and welcomed the opportunities it would provide in the eastern goldfields. Mr Grill said that the yellowcake would be safe to handle. On 26 July, the Deputy Premier, who is responsible for this project approved by the Parliament, said that the future of the project was dependent upon the Commonwealth Government's review of its policies. We then had a statement from this Premier, which must be to his eternal shame. He admitted that he must check with the Federal Labor Government to be certain that the project would go ahead; he had to find out whether it would support the principles it supported before the election, but which were reversed when the Labor Party was elected. It made all sorts of promises about projects elsewhere, and the then member for Yilgarn-Dundas said things which meant nothing to the people of Esperance, who were promised the port for the project. Now the Premier must publicly take back what he has said because he has to find out whether he can allow the Yeelirrie project to go ahead, a project approved by this Parliament.

Amendment to Motion

I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

But we regret to advise Your Excellency that the platform and policies of the Australian Labor Party and State and Federal Labor Governments will inhibit economic development and the growth of employment in Western Australia; and in particular, those platform

provisions, policies and Federal Budget decisions relating to—

- (1) resource development;
- (2) environmental management;
- (3) government taxes, rates and charges;
- (4) centralist Canberra controls of economic development;
- (5) Aboriginal land rights; and
- (6) government intervention in public ownership and overseas investment.

MR BRIAN BURKE (Balga—Premier) [7.56 p.m.]: The Government naturally expects the Opposition to move amendments of this sort, and the Opposition naturally expects we will not accept them. In briefly rebutting some of the points made by the last speaker, I will take up one of the final points he made, which was at the outset of my contribution.

I guess I understand politics as well as that member, but for him to masquerade in the way he did behind what is a constitutional requirement of a State Government, and to claim that somehow or other compliance with that constitutional requirement is the tugging of the forelock in the direction of Canberra, is less than worthy of the member for Narrogin. We all heard him say that the State Government would have to check with Canberra.

Mr Peter Jones: No, I said that you said that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Very well, the member said that we said the Government would have to check with Canberra. The member for Narrogin is a former Minister. He must know that export licences are issued by the national Government.

Mr Peter Jones: You said it in relation to the Labor Party policy.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What does he expect us to do? Does he expect us to contravene the Constitution, and to somehow or other smuggle yellowcake out through Esperance and not check to determine whether the constitutional authority in respect of the issuing of export permits agrees with our smuggling activities? That is how silly the member for Narrogin is. When he was a Minister he caused the State Energy Commission to be instructed to hasten its negotiations in respect of the North-West Shelf project so that this State was left with a lesser arrangement and a worse deal than might otherwise have been the case. He stands before us now to attempt to tell us—

Point of Order

Mr PETER JONES: I seek a retraction of that statement. It is untrue.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, my attention was distracted when the Premier made the remark to which the member has objected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am happy to withdraw it.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is faintly strange that this man could stand here and say whatever he liked and state whatever falsehoods he cared to mention, yet, when someone turned up the same sorts of remarks to him, he was on his feet asking for a withdrawal.

Mr Peter Jones: That's not true at all.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I repeat that during the time he was a responsible Minister, this State was forced to do a worse deal than it might have done in respect of a contract for the purchase of gas from the North-West Shelf. That was the situation.

Mr Stephens: Be fair to him, he was only carrying out instructions from his masters.

Mr Peter Jones: That is untrue.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not sure whether the instructions given by the Opposition are that we accept the sort of nonsense that the member for Narrogin carries on with when that is his record. One is his failing to acknowledge what are the constitutional requirements of a State Government in respect of any export activities which it would prevent; that is, that it must seek permission and that permission must be granted by the national Government. So, that is a twisting of the fact and we should check and find out whether we can proceed. We have the same member saying that somehow or other we are not acting responsibly in the interests of this State. When his Government entered into a contract that involved putting pressure on the State Energy Commission to settle for arrangements, it is said it was not given ample time when ample time should have been provided.

Mr Hassell: What are you saying is the problem with the policy? The export policy operates from Canberra.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The national Government has a policy and I do not think it will start legislating contrary to the declared policy. The policy is that export licences shall not be issued in respect of uranium ore that has not previously been subject to a written contract.

I do not know what is relevant in that situation. If it is in the policy of the Government, of course it is relevant.

Mr Hassell: It would be relevant if you stood up for the interests of Western Australia.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If we stood up for the interests of Western Australia! The greatest centralist in this nation's history was Malcom Fraser and members opposite stood up not in support of him, but in opposition to him and he drew all the financial power in this country to Canberra and, with a series of harsh and oppressive arrangements with State Premiers, he effectively took an arm and a leg off the people of this State while the Opposition was in Government. Now, after five months, the Opposition has the gall to say we should be standing up to a Government that has been there for some period of time.

Mr O'Connor: And taken another arm and leg.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will stand behind Hawke's Budget with much more—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE:—support than members opposite stood behind their Prime Ministers. When members of the Opposition realised it was gone for all money after having failed to stand up to a Government led by Malcolm Fraser, in the final analysis they stood up all right! They said that they did not want Malcolm Fraser here during the election campaign.

It would have been a fine thing for the interests of this State if someone had stood up earlier than that, and I do not blame the present Leader of the Opposition, but his predecessor. He kowtowed to the Fraser Government to the extent that this State was sold up the river.

Mr Hassell: What nonsense!

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: With respect to new federalism, it was the Opposition's former leader and Malcolm Fraser who were the joint architects of the greatest economic disaster this State has seen—new federalism!

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Had we given them a gun it would have been armed robbery!

The crocodile tears about the interests of the State are comfortably flowing from the benches of the Opposition, but, in Government for nine years, that Opposition did nothing.

Mr Hassell: What nonsense!

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Hundreds of millions of dollars of the State's funds were confiscated, and

let the Leader of the Opposition deny that is the truth.

Mr Clarko: They never had a deficit of \$8.5 billion.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Leader of the Opposition cannot deny the truth of that because he said publicly that the Fraser Government's economic packages took hundreds of millions of dollars from this State.

Mr Clarko: The Grants Commission took as much.

Mr O'Connor: I came out firmly and said it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Fraser Government was a centralist Government. What did Malcolm Fraser do about the Grants Commission?

Mr Clarko: What has this to do with the debate?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not worried about the member for Karrinyup because there is not much there. The Opposition knows the truth and that is that Malcolm Fraser consistently deprived this State of the financial resources to which it was entitled and that action received quite severe criticism from the Opposition.

Mr O'Connor: You should refer to the Grants Commission which was set up and of which I am critical.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The case rests as far as this leader's predecessor is concerned. The contradiction of the Fraser Government's policy is absolutely absent. During the eight years Sir Charles Court led what is now the Opposition on a series of submissions to the Fraser Federal Government, that pales in comparison with the strength of the arguments used by this member to support an amendment after five months compared with nine years of the delinquency of the responsibility for which responsibility the now Opposition was culpable. It is simply not convincing.

Mr Blaikie: Don't you remember Sir Charles Court demanding a better deal for Western Australians? Don't you remember your comments at that time?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The amendment contains many absurdities. It talks about Government taxes and charges and our failure to stand up to the Federal Government in this matter. The Opposition must have been out to lunch. I think we have raised more money in taxes and charges in the five months in which we have been the Government of Western Australia.

As far as we are concerned the Budget brought down by Mr Paul Keating last night stands in stark contrast to Budgets brought down year after year by the Fraser Government.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Members talk about a record deficit. It is not a record deficit. It is a deficit of the size it is because it was left in place by the Federal Liberal Government and it was worse than that.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Fraser Government chose to lie to the public of this country about the size of the deficit it left.

Mr Evans: Didn't it happen in this State?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Narrogin said he did not release the details of the projected deficit because people misinterpret it.

Mr Peter Jones: I did not say that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Narrogin says, "No" and says he did not know. It is much like the amendment before the House tonight.

I want to take the opportunity in reference to this particular part of the amendment to touch upon something the Leader of the Opposition said today when he said the Budget will not help Western Australia. I suppose that is the converse of our failure as seen by the member for Narrogin to stand up to the Fraser Government's centralism. This is how wrong the Leader of the Opposition was.

Mr O'Connor: I am talking about the overall Budget.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This is what the Leader of the Opposition said regarding the Budget and its effect on Western Australians. It reads—

work to start early in 1984 on the \$48 million international terminal at Perth Airport.

\$3 million for navy housing at Rockingham.

construction to proceed on the \$54 million Derby airfield for the RAAF.

a \$7.5 million programme to construct operating theatres and wards at the Hollywood Repatriation Hospital, creating 200 jobs.

housing funds totalling \$53.4 million.

a capital works programme of \$49.3 million.

a 49 per cent increase in road funds, much of which will be spent in country areas.

a \$12 million improvement programme for the Port Hedland and Karratha Airports.

Aboriginal advancement programmes worth \$23 million.

new and upgraded radars at the Bureau of Meteorology's Geraldton and Carnarvon offices, improving the bureau's capacity to detect and track tropical cyclones off the W.A. coast.

the extension of multicultural television to Perth in 1985-86.

another contribution to the cost of the Woodman Point to Cape Peron pipeline.

\$23 million for community employment programmes.

I know the Leader of the Opposition may well have been shooting from the hip in saying there was nothing in the Budget for Western Australians, but, gosh, it was a misstatement—those comments at least.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As far as that is concerned, it is a bit off the mark in the same way—

Mr O'Connor: You do not care if you leave people in hospitals without care.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —as is the amendment moved by the member for Narrogin.

The amendment also talks about land rights. I will tell members a story about land rights and this indicates how detailed the knowledge of the Opposition is about land rights. At the recent State Conference of the Liberal Party, one smiling "R. G." Bob Pike was occasioned to say in respect of land rights in the Northern Territory that this is what the Whitlam Labor Government would have done. It legislated to give land rights to the Northern Territory. Whereupon the former Minister in the Fraser Government, Ian Viner, said, "Psst, do not say it again; we gave those land rights". That is all the Opposition knows about it.

Mr O'Connor: How about quoting what I said?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The point about standing by the Federal Government and the question of land rights is that we, at least, differ from the Opposition because we know who is responsible for what changes in what part of the country. The Opposition in this House, it places the blame for the Northern Territory legislation on the Federal Government—the Whitlam Government. In respect of land rights, we have made it clear to the Federal Government that we have a Land Rights Commission and we would expect the commission

to complete its work and for the Federal Government to use it as a part-basis in legislation.

In speaking to the Minister responsible in the Federal Government a week or two ago, I found that he appeared to support that proposition.

Mr O'Connor: I hope it allows me to own a quarter-acre block.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In respect of the Aboriginal land rights part of this motion, I think it joins those comments to which I have referred. The major part of the amendment reveals that the Opposition needs to pay attention to this complex situation. It is incredible that, after five months, it puts forward an amendment like this.

It does not make sense, it does not advance the Opposition's situation, it is not sensible, and as far as we are concerned it is not accurate.

Mr Thompson: Do you think we should ask your advice in the future?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I hope members opposite do not mind my saying that it is not a well thought out amendment.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In fact, it is particularly weak, is not worthy of much attention, and is obviously assigned to the Country Party on that basis. I can understand the Country Party's being preoccupied with its own problems, but that should not be a reason for the Opposition's bringing a shabby amendment like this into the Parliament. The Government will not accept it.

Mr Old: What a shame!

Mr Hassell: We are surprised!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is surprised, it says more about him than about me.

Mr Hassell: What a performer he is. He should still be on television. He should be on the Mavis Bramston Show.

Mr Clarko: As Mavis.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It always seems to resolve itself into this sort of personal abuse, which is also unfashionable these days.

Mr Hassell: It is a compliment to you.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In any case, we are not about to accept the amendment, which is poorly framed and is not founded on fact. I suppose some subjective argument could be advanced in support of it, but most of it would not make much sense. In the Government's view, we have done a reasonably good job.

Mr Clarko: In five months. You have fixed up the civil servants again. Who is going to be next?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Karrinyup has finally latched onto the most important point of the debate; namely, that after only five months, it is very difficult to sustain this sort of amendment with any credibility. The Opposition certainly has not done so to date tonight. I say quite simply that the Government will not be accepting the amendment.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Gordon Hill.

HEALTH: ALCOHOL AND DRUGS

Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed from 3 August.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth) [8.17 p.m.]: I indicate at the outset that the Opposition intends to support this motion to set up a Select Committee to inquire into facilities and services relating to the abuse of alcohol and other drugs in Western Australia. When introducing the motion on 3 August, the member for Helena briefly outlined the history of the Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority. He pointed out that, in 1972, a Select Committee was formed to inquire into this matter; it was subsequently converted to an Honorary Royal Commission, and, in 1973, the commission came forward with a recommendation that the Alcohol and Drug Authority be established.

Since that time, as the member for Helena pointed out, no review of any kind has taken place into the operations, facilities, or services provided by the ADA. He pointed out also the need at this time for such an inquiry and, indeed, of a review of existing legislation to ensure the authority fulfils the purpose for which it was formed, so that the authority is able properly to carry out the functions required of it under the legislation.

I believe that point of view is shared by the ADA itself. In fact, in the 1982 annual report of the Alcohol and Drug Authority, the chairman referred to this issue. In his introductory remarks, he indicated that the philosophy on prevention of drug abuse in Western Australia had changed to some extent since the ADA was formed. The report contains the following observations—

The direction of the Authority's early development was largely influenced by the social and political pressures of the time and emphasis was placed on the provision of facilities and services for the treatment and rehabilitation of the chronic alcoholic. A better understanding of the extent of the alcohol

problem in society has convinced the Authority that government cannot tackle the problem alone; that the main thrust in prevention and treatment must be directed through the general health and welfare services; that there is a growing need for services to be provided in the community by voluntary agencies; and that the Authority should become mainly a second level resource with specialist skills in all aspects of treatment, care, rehabilitation, education and research.

The introduction to the 1982 report of the ADA went on to say—

Because of this changing philosophy, the need for the further development of services by voluntary and other agencies has assumed new significance. While the Authority still intends to maintain treatment facilities for the provision of ongoing education, training and programme developments, its services and those provided by voluntary and other agencies are seen as complementary and not competitive, provided always that the services available at these agencies are effective.

I quoted those remarks simply to indicate that the authority itself accepts that a change in direction is needed at this time which, of course, endorses the need for a Select Committee to inquire into this area.

The drug problem has become extremely serious, not only in Western Australia, but also elsewhere in Australia and throughout the world. On Tuesday, 26 July this year, I asked question on notice 138 of the Minister for Health. Part (1) of the question was as follows—

What percentage of Western Australians died from drug-related causes in the latest year for which statistics are available?

The Minister replied that 18.8 per cent of Western Australians died from drug-related causes in the last year for which statistics are available. Part (2) of the question was as follows—

What percentages of these deaths were caused by—

(a) tobacco co-related diseases;

The Minister replied that the figure was 14.9 per cent. Paragraph (b) sought the percentage of deaths caused by alcohol use, to which the reply was 3.3 per cent. Paragraph (c) referred to deaths caused by other drugs, and the Minister for Health informed me that 0.6 per cent was the figure. He went on to point out that the figures were extracted from Commonwealth Health Department statistics for 1981.

Recently, the National Information Service on Drug Abuse came out with some statistics which indicated a 10 per cent increase in drug-related deaths between 1979 and 1980. *The West Australian* of 18 July 1983 published an article referring to a report of the World Health Organisation to the following effect—

Tobacco smoking causes the premature death of more than one million each year, according to the World Health Organisation.

This is rather disturbing information. All this, of course, underlines the gravity of the situation.

Some drugs are in common use in our society largely because up until relatively recently they were regarded as comparatively harmless. One such drug is tobacco. Possibly, we should consider whether the use of tobacco should come within the province of the ADA, which could be responsible for educating people about the dangers of smoking. I would not suggest any other way but education.

The ADA conducts seminars throughout Western Australia, and is involved in various ways in education relating to the abuse of drugs. Hitherto, of course, the Alcohol and Drug Authority has had nothing to do with the abuse of tobacco. This would seem to be an opportune time for the authority to start disseminating information in respect of this drug. To me, that sort of action is preferable to certain other action contemplated by some.

All Governments are aware of the hazards connected with the smoking of tobacco. However, they differ in their endeavours to prevent tobacco abuse. Certain orthodox methods are available, such as restrictive legislation, education, and cessation activities. Another method which could not be regarded as orthodox is to increase taxation. Recently, the State Government acted to increase a State tax on tobacco products which effectively lifted the price of a packet of cigarettes by 30c. In addition, last night, the Federal Budget contained provisions to increase taxation on tobacco products to the extent of 2c a packet, but which, when it finally gets through to the consumer, will result in an additional cost of 5c a packet, making a total increase over the last few weeks of 35c a packet.

Many people do not agree with that approach because it hits at the person who is already addicted to the use of tobacco and who, according to many people, is not the person to whom the Government should be turning its attention. Rather, the emphasis should be on preventing young people from becoming addicted. Be that as it may, the Government has chosen to approach

the problem in that way, in addition to adopting various other methods including those to which I have already referred.

There is absolutely no doubt that, as a consequence of the type of information which has been disseminated over the last few years, there has been a remarkable drop in cigarette smoking by adults and I believe that trend will continue. Unfortunately, the same situation does not apply to children; apparently about 40 000 children each year take up smoking in Western Australia.

A couple of years ago, when I was Minister for Education, I did three things which I believe will have an effect on the incidence of cigarette smoking. The first was to introduce a health education course with particular emphasis on nutritional awareness. We appointed seven writers to the curriculum branch of the Education Department to draw up a comprehensive kindergarten-to-year-10 syllabus, which was to be trialed in 1982-83 and which was due to come into operation the following year. The object was to ensure that no child left the education system in Western Australia without a sound knowledge of health requirements, with particular emphasis on nutrition; whether the child left at grade 3 or grade 4 or, in fact, at any stage between kindergarten and year 10, he should have this basic, sound knowledge. One of the things that course will deal with is tobacco smoking; in addition, it will deal with the effects of alcohol and other drugs. When the curriculum is fully implemented, it will set a lead to the other States which I hope will follow our example and establish similar courses in their schools.

Every child henceforth will leave the schools of Western Australia with a sound knowledge of health, with the emphasis on nutrition. For that reason alone, I am confident that the trend we are witnessing in Western Australia away from tobacco abuse will continue.

At the same time, I established a canteen advisory committee to help to improve the nutritional value of food sold in schools. I also set up the health education advisory committee to ensure that the health education programmes in schools were as effective as possible; and to advise on all other matters relating to health education. I mention that to indicate the situation in the Education Department because of the introduction of these three things.

Last year in Western Australia we had a smoke-free day, which was highly successful. A few days ago, I asked a question of the Minister for Health to this effect—

- (1) Will he please itemise the results of last year's smoke-free day?

In reply, he said—

- (1) (a) 95 per cent of the combined post-campaign samples were aware of the campaign which reached both smokers and non-smokers equally.
- (b) A total of 37 per cent of smokers attempted to quit smoking on November 10 and almost two-thirds of these people were successful.
- (c) 23 per cent succeeded in quitting for the day—57 000 smokers.
- (d) 2 to 2½ per cent quit for good—5 500 smokers.

(The above figures refer to the metropolitan area only.)

Those are extraordinary results. They indicate that 23 per cent of the people involved succeeded in quitting for the day. That represents 57 000 smokers. A total of 5 500 smokers were able to quit smoking as a consequence of the smoke-free day. The State Government's contribution was a mere \$25 000. In the light of that success, the Government should be concentrating, obviously, on having more smoke-free days. They could not be held too often, but they should be held much more frequently than at present.

I also asked a question of the Minister for Health along these lines—

Although a national smoke-free day is under consideration, has the Government given consideration to initiating a State smoke-free day?

The answer was, "Yes". I asked, "If so, what is proposed?" The Minister replied—

Discussions are being held with the National Heart Foundation about co-ordination of the State smoke-free day with the national smoke-free day, as it would have more impact as a national initiative.

In the light of the success of the last smoke-free day, which was held last November, the Government should think in terms of holding them infinitely more frequently.

Mr Terry Burke: Hear, hear!

Mr GRAYDEN: I have been referring to the abuse of tobacco in Western Australia as one of the drugs which, until recently, was regarded as comparatively harmless. It has now become obvious that that is not the case; and, as a result, increasing numbers of adults are giving up tobacco smoking.

Much the same applies, of course, to the abuse of alcohol. While medical authorities have indicated that, provided alcohol is not abused but is drunk in relatively small quantities only, it is not harmful, the evidence is that all smoking of tobacco is harmful. At the same time, it cannot be doubted that the abuse of alcohol is widespread in Western Australia.

Recently, a seminar was held at the University of Western Australia; and as a consequence of that, certain information was made available. A report, published in the *Sunday Times* of 20 March, was headed "Alcohol costs industry \$2 000 million". The first paragraph of the report read as follows—

Around 30 000 workers in WA industry have alcohol-related problems.

This was revealed at a society and alcohol abuse seminar at the WA University yesterday.

Further, the report indicated—

Mr McCarthy said it was reported at an occupational drug and alcohol programs conference in 1981 that alcohol abuse and the use of other drugs was directly affecting the lives of some 500 000 Australians.

It was indirectly affecting the lives of 1.5 million family members. Some 300 000 people throughout Australia were addicted to alcohol.

They are startling figures.

As a consequence of the type of information being disseminated at present, and as a consequence of the research being done, the consumption of alcohol is falling, to some extent. A good deal of research has been done in Western Australia recently on the harmful effects of alcohol.

A news item in the *Sunday Times* of 22 June highlighted the seriousness of the problem—

Alcohol study shows brain damage traits.

The report continued—

Drinking three glasses of beer or spirits a day on a regular basis can cause memory loss and brain damage.

This is one of the findings of a major research study into alcohol being undertaken by a Western Australian brain specialist, Dr Lesley Cala.

Dr Cala who is a neuroradiologist at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, said moderate and even light social drinkers suffered brain damage from alcohol.

Later in the report, the following appears—

But Dr Cala's findings were not totally anti-alcohol. She said a regular intake of 10 to 20g of alcohol (two glasses of beer, wine or spirits) made no difference to a person's health.

The report was specific and clear. It said that the drinking of even three glasses of beer or spirits a day on a regular basis could cause memory loss and brain damage.

As a consequence of reports of that kind, people are becoming concerned at the excessive consumption of alcohol. Only a few days ago, most members of the House were sent a telex from the Australian Hotels Association in which the association made these points—

Since 1975,

The draught beer market has declined by 19 per cent

The packaged beer market has increased by 33 per cent

In other words, drinking habits are changing. People are taking alcohol home. The telex continued—

Hotels and taverns' share of the total beer market has fallen by 16 per cent

Hotels and taverns' share of the draught beer market has fallen by 3 per cent

The average turnover in liquor sales in hotels and taverns has declined by over 25 per cent and

The per capita consumption of beer in Australia has decreased by 7 per cent

The decreasing consumption is probably a consequence of the type of information being disseminated in respect of drugs, of which alcohol is one.

There are many other drugs, apart from alcohol and tobacco, but they are the two which until recently were regarded as relatively harmless. We have seen a lot of discussion recently about marijuana; and some people have spoken in terms of the possibility of decriminalising the smoking of marijuana. A suggestion of that kind has been rejected absolutely by many health authorities; and even people in the Labor Party, such as the Premier of South Australia, agree with that.

In 1979, Mr Justice Williams concluded an extensive investigation into drug abuse in Australia, and his report ran into many volumes. Mr Justice Williams made it clear, firstly, that marijuana was an intoxicant; and, secondly, that it had the capacity to harm. As a consequence, he did not recommend its decriminalisation.

One other aspect of marijuana is worth mentioning. At present, the police have no practical

way of measuring marijuana intoxication in the same way as alcohol intoxication can be measured by a breathalyser. If the use of marijuana were to be decriminalised, we would have the situation in which people were growing it in their backyards or obtaining it from other sources; and they would be intoxicated on the roads and in industry.

It is absolutely ludicrous to suggest such a thing when we have no practical way of measuring the level of marijuana intoxication. We could expect an upsurge in the carnage on the roads; and we could expect all sorts of accidents in industry because of the marijuana intoxication ensuing from the smoking of it. That intoxication is not compatible with car driving or the use of machinery in industry.

Of course, we have hard drugs also; and there the situation is extremely serious. We have had reports relatively recently about cocaine—which is known in the drug trade as "snow"—sweeping like a blizzard across the United States, Great Britain, and Europe. It is said now that trendy Australians are falling under the apparent spell of this drug. A recent report indicated that, in 1981, Americans spent more than \$32 000 million on cocaine. In Great Britain, the British spent about \$600 million on the drug.

Mr Old: Did you see the bit in the paper today about cannabis, and the encouragement of a girl of 16 years of age to smoke it?

Mr GRAYDEN: Yes, I did. It will probably be the subject of one or two questions in this House.

Mr Old: I should hope so.

Mr GRAYDEN: Australia has had its own drug inquiries and we know that heroin trafficking, murder, money laundering, and other associated matters that go with the hard drug trade are widespread in Australia.

In Western Australia, the Alcohol and Drug Authority at its William Street clinic daily hands out a large number of doses of methadone to people addicted to drugs; we know it is performing a wonderful service.

Another aspect of drugs worthy of mention at this time is the drug taking among Australian sportsmen and among sportsmen throughout the world. The 25 July edition of *The West Australian* contained an article headed, "Drugged sport: shock finding". It stated—

Drug-taking in Australian sport has reached disturbing levels, the Minister for Sport, Mr Brown, said today.

Drug abuse has even been found in children aged between five and ten according to the results of a survey released today.

The report was prepared by the Drug Control Committee of the Australian Sports Medicine Federation who questioned 4 000 people from 31 sports.

It found that five per cent of Australian athletes have used "considerable numbers" of drugs in competitive sport.

It went on to report that Professor Graeme Blackman had said that 10 per cent of 400 Australian rules footballers who responded said they used stimulant drugs. Of course, drug taking is widespread in other sports.

About the same time, another newspaper report dealt with the same survey of drug abuse in Australian sport. It stated—

The survey, by the Australian Sports Medicine Federation, showed that about five per cent of the 4 000 competitors questioned were seriously abusing drugs, including children in the five to 10 years age group.

It found that another 20 per cent of the country's sportsmen relied considerably on drugs.

The survey, which covered 31 sports, said that one member in every VFL team on the average developed a serious dependence on drugs to improve his performance.

Even tonight on television, members who watched the news would have seen a report that American athletes, including some who had won medals in weight-lifting at the Pan American Games in South America, had been disqualified and their wins taken from them. They had been returned to America; in all, about 15 top American sportsmen had been returned to America because tests carried out on them indicated that they had used anabolic steroids. Quite obviously, irrespective of where any other games may be held, we will find in the future, when other sportsmen are tested, that they have taken drugs and they will have to be disqualified.

I mention this just to indicate the way in which drugs are being abused in Western Australia, in Australia, and throughout the world. It is for reasons such as these that it is reasonable at this time for us to be thinking of establishing a Select

Committee to review the facilities available in this State for the prevention of drug abuse and for the treatment of those people who, unfortunately, engage in drug taking. Therefore, the Opposition supports the motion moved by the member for Helena.

MR GORDON HILL (Helena) [8.49 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its support of the motion and I particularly thank the member for South Perth for his contribution to the discussion. As he correctly said and as I mentioned when moving the motion, this is an urgent matter for consideration.

The activities of the Alcohol and Drug Authority have not been reviewed, nor have the non-statutory agencies associated with it or the services and facilities provided by it, since 1973 when the original Select Committee was established in the Legislative Council, which committee was followed by an Honorary Royal Commission.

As I previously indicated, the Alcohol and Drug Authority was established in 1974, and since that time no examination has been made of its ability to meet the purposes for which it was established; nor has there been any consideration of its objectives or of whether the legislative remit is able to meet the objectives of the non-statutory agencies.

The proposed members of the Select Committee to be established met on an informal basis two weeks ago and spoke with members of the Alcohol and Drug Authority. Later that week we toured the facilities of the authority simply to have a look at its services and to meet with its staff. I must say that the courtesy and co-operation extended to the proposed members of the Select Committee were tremendous. Clearly the staff are dedicated to following the objectives of the legislation, but it is really a question of whether those objectives are able fully to be served and to meet the demand necessary today.

Once again, I thank members of the Opposition for their support of the motion.

Question put and passed.

Appointment of Select Committee

MR GORDON HILL (Helena) [8.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the following members be appointed to serve on the Select Committee, together with the mover—The Member for Pilbara (Mrs Buchanan), the Member for Balcatta (Mr Bertram), the Member for South Perth (Mr Grayden), and the Member for Subiaco (Dr Dadour).

Question put and passed.

MR GORDON HILL (Helena) [8.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Committee have power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, to move from place to place, and to report on 16 November 1983.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.53 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

652. *This question was further postponed.*

FUEL AND ENERGY

North-West Shelf: Unused Gas

744. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

When will he implement his election commitment to "lift the veil of secrecy surrounding the cost to consumers of unused gas from the North-West Shelf" by providing answers to question 190 of 1983 asked by the member for Collie, and question 160 of 1983 asked by me?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Under the previous Government the SEC entered into a legal agreement to keep all details about the price of gas secret and thereby bound succeeding Governments with its decision.
- (2) Because of this, the Minister for Fuel and Energy has undertaken a detailed review of the confidentiality provisions.
- (3) A report on this matter can be expected when the review is completed.

TRAFFIC: DRIVERS

Breathalyser: Random Tests

761. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Has the Government any intention of introducing random breath testing?
- (2) Has the Government any intention of reducing the blood alcohol level allowable for driving from 0.08 to 0.05?
- (3) What is Government opinion on the loss of employment and industry sales caused by the introduction of random breath testing?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) It is not intended to change the present system by which the public can be stopped by the police at random to check drivers' licences or vehicle condition and if, at that time, there is evidence they have been drinking, be tested.
- (2) Not at this stage.
- (3) This question is not admissible.

ECONOMY: NATIONAL ECONOMIC PLANNING AND ADVISORY COUNCIL

Western Australian Representation

770. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he expressed his concern to the Prime Minister at the Federal Government's failure to include any direct Western Australian representation on the National Economic Planning and Advisory Council?

- (2) If so, what response has he received?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) See the answer to question 65 of 26 July 1983.
- (2) The Prime Minister has announced his intention to establish an Advisory Council on Prices and Incomes (ACPI). This Government and the other States not represented on the Economic Planning and Advisory Council (EPAC) will be represented on ACPI. Other representatives will be drawn from business and unions. The arrangements for EPAC involve rotation of membership with ACPI.

Regardless of the introduction of EPAC and ACPI, this State's statutory membership of the Loan Council, and the annual Premiers' Conferences, keeps it at the important centres of political and economic decision-making. These will not be upset by the new national councils mentioned above.

STATE FORESTS: PINE

Manea Committee

784. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Ministers for Forests:

- (1) Who are the members, and which bodies or organisations do they represent, on the Government's Manea committee advising on pine planting?
- (2) On what day or days did the committee meet and what members were present?
- (3) What was the date of appointment of—
 - (a) the committee;
 - (b) the chairman?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The members of the Manea committee are—

Dr E. C. Manea, Chairman,
representing the South West Development Authority;

S. J. Quain and D. Spriggins, Forests Department;

C. Krans, timber industry.

Specific nominations for shire representatives have not yet been called for.

(2) 29 July 1983.

Messrs P. Beeson—Acting Chairman, (Senior Executive Officer, South West Development Authority)

P. Omodei—Shire President, Manjimup

M. Jorgensen—Shire Clerk

J. Muir—Shire of Manjimup

F. Nidd—Shire of Manjimup

G. Flanagan—Shire of Manjimup

E. Valom—Shire of Manjimup

R. Stewart—Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes

H. Maloney—Shire of Bridgetown-Greenbushes

D. Jones—Donnybrook-Balingup Shire

F. Haygarth—Donnybrook-Balingup Shire

P. Radford—Donnybrook-Balingup Shire

L. Dickson—Shire of Nannup

R. Mead—Shire of Boyup Brook

C. Krans—Forests Products Association

G. Airey—Shire of Manjimup

S. Quain—Forests Department, Bunbury

D. Spriggins—Forests Department, Bunbury

D. Keene—Forests Department, Manjimup

(3) (a) 10 June 1983;

(b) 10 June 1983.

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES

Phillips-Merredin

799. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Economic Development and Technology:

- (1) Referring to my question 459 of 1983 respecting Phillips-Merredin and the receiver-manager's written reply to my subsequent question without notice on the same matter, what debts have been incurred by the receiver-manager in the course of continuing the operations of Phillips-Merredin?

(2) What amount of funds has been paid by the Treasurer, or any other Government body, to either the receiver-manager or Phillips-Merredin during the course of company operations when in receiver-managership?

(3) How does the Government expect to recover the funds so paid?

(4) What guarantees are there that the money will be paid?

(5) Can he give a specific indication when the money will be repaid?

Mr BRYCE replied:

(1) The debts incurred by the receiver-manager comprise the normal business expenses incurred in the day to day administration and operation of the company.

(2) Funds to the extent of \$420 000 were made available to the receiver-manager by the Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia against the security of a Government guarantee.

(3) The guaranteed funds are expected to be recovered from the sale of the company's assets under the "Contract of Sale".

(4) Answered by 3.

(5) The guaranteed funds are expected to be recovered over the next few months from moneys paid under the "Contract of Sale".

800. *This question was postponed.*

RAILWAYS: SERVICES

Breakdowns and Late Arrivals

801. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

Since 1 August 1983, how many suburban trains have run late and broken down on each of the following lines:

(a) Armadale;

(b) Fremantle;

(c) Midland?

Mr GRILL replied:

| | LATE | BREAKDOWNS |
|---------------|---|---|
| (a) Armadale | 52 representing 2.19% of total services | 13 representing 0.54% of total services |
| (b) Fremantle | 33 representing 1.54% of total services | 6 representing 0.28% of total services |
| (c) Midland | 15 representing 0.62% of total services | 6 representing 0.25% of total services |

My advice is that the incidence of late running is within normal operational limits.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Private and Public Sector

802. Mr MacKINNON, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What is the current percentage of Western Australian employment in—
 - (a) the private sector;
 - (b) the public sector?
- (2) Within the public sector, what percentage of Western Australian employment is employed in—
 - (a) local government;
 - (b) State Government;
 - (c) Commonwealth Government?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) (a) 74.9 per cent;
(b) 25.1 per cent
based on information contained in the Australian Bureau of Statistics publication Catalogue No. 6203 for April 1983.
- (2) (a) 6.5 per cent;
(b) 76.4 per cent;
(c) 17.0 per cent
based on information from the publication mentioned in (1) above. I would refer the member to that publication for the definitions on which the statistics are based because statistics can be misleading unless one is fully aware of the definitions on which they are based.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

37½-hour Week

803. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What has been the estimated cost to the State Energy Commission in 1983 of the introduction of the 37½-hour working week?

Mr BRYCE replied:

Because the 37½-hour week is now part of normal operations, the commission does not explicitly budget for or historically record costs associated with the reduced working hours.

804 to 807. *These questions were postponed.*

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

Sales: Quantity

808. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What quantity of gas did the State Energy Commission sell during the year ended 30 June 1983?
- (2) What quantity of gas does the State Energy Commission estimate that it will sell during the year ending 30 June 1984?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) 1871 GWh.
- (2) 2958 GWh.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY AND GAS

Sales: Revenue

809. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What revenue did the State Energy Commission receive during the year ended 30 June 1983 from the sales of—

- (a) electricity;
- (b) gas?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (a) and (b) These figures are not yet available as they are still to be audited by the Auditor General's Department. When available the details will be forwarded to the member.

810. *This question was postponed.*

FUEL AND ENERGY: COAL

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd.: Coleman-Teckman Report

811. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines, and Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has the State Energy Commission received the Coleman-Teckman engineering report as required under the Griffin coal purchase contract?
- (2) What are the main findings and recommendations of the report?
- (3) Will the report be tabled in the Parliament, or directly made available to all interested persons?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) The Coleman-Teckman report has been received.
- (2) and (3) The question of further use of this report is under consideration.

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL

Elections: Minimum Period

812. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

- (1) With reference to the Electoral Amendment Bill, if the amendment proposed by clause 16 of the Bill were not accepted by the House, would the minimum period required for the holding of a State election stay as it is?
- (2) Would it still be possible to allow seven days after the issue of the writs for enrolment by potential electors?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. The closure of the rolls is not influenced by section 70 of the Electoral Act.

MINISTER OF THE CROWN: STAFF

Additional: Qualifications

813. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What are the academic or other qualifications of his Ministerial officer—Special Services?
- (2) What are the academic or other qualifications of his administrative assistant?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) and (2) I refer the member to parts (1) and (3) of the answer to question 682.

HOSPITALS: STAFF

Working Week

814. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) What is the Government's policy with respect to a shorter working week for wages staff in Government hospitals?
- (2) What steps have been taken to implement this policy?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Claims for a 38-hour week for wages employees in Government hospitals will

be negotiated with the appropriate unions where the costs can be contained within budgetary constraints and based on—

minimising the cost;
overcoming anomalies; and
comparative conditions justice criteria.

- (2) A 38-hour week has been implemented in Government hospitals for most trade-based employees. Negotiations are continuing in respect of domestics, enrolled nurses, and nursing assistants.

TOWN PLANNING

Mosman Park

815. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Will he say whether or not he has given his approval to the Palmerston-McCabe Street subdivision in Mosman Park?
- (2) If not, when is he likely to give consideration to the matter?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1), when will the proposal be finally prepared to be put before the Town of Mosman Park?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The Lands Department is about to engage consultants who will handle the project on its behalf, including consultations with the submissions to the Town of Mosman Park.

HOSPITALS: MEDICARE

Increased Demand: Staff Replacement Policy

816. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How does the Government reconcile its 50 per cent staff replacement policy, and its application, in the manner explained by him, to Government hospitals, with the increased public demand on these hospitals which is expected to occur when Medicare is introduced?
- (2) Is the Government relying on an expectation that inadequate Government hospital facilities will force many people who otherwise would not do so, to join private hospital insurance funds, in addition to paying the Medicare levy, in

order to be assured of a hospital bed and treatment?

- (3) If not, how will Western Australian citizens gain access to hospital care if Government hospitals are over-taxed?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Adequate hospital services will be maintained if there is increased public demand. This has been covered in the arrangements agreed with the Commonwealth Government on the introduction of Medicare.
- (2) No.
- (3) Answered by (1).

HOSPITALS: MEDICARE

Increased Demand: Survey

817. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has a survey or study of any kind been carried out within the Government hospital system for the purpose of determining how much increased pressure on Western Australian Government hospitals is likely to result from the introduction of Medicare in February next?
- (2) If so—
- (a) in what way was the survey or study carried out;
- (b) what was the result?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) It has been estimated by the Commonwealth Government that the introduction of Medicare could lead to an increase of 10 per cent in admissions to WA Government hospitals.
- (2) (a) As above;
- (b) as above.
- (3) See (1).

HOSPITALS: PRIVATE

Medicare: Effect

818. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the State Government consulted with representatives of Western Australian private hospitals in order to ascertain problems which are likely to

face such hospitals as a result of the introduction of Medicare?

- (2) What problems are envisaged by the private hospitals?
- (3) What action does the Government intend to take to minimise any adverse effects on private hospitals?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Private hospitals expect some reduction in admissions.
- (3) Discussions are proceeding.

HOSPITALS: MEDICARE

Increased Demand: Estimates

819. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he discussed the probable impact which Medicare will have on Government hospitals, with officials of such hospitals?
- (2) If so—
- (a) what probable impact do the officials expect;
- (b) if increased pressure on Government hospitals is anticipated, what measures are being taken to cope with the additional pressure?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Discussions are in progress.

HOSPITALS: MEDICARE

Increased Demand: Consideration by Cabinet

820. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the possible impact of Medicare on Government hospitals, in respect of increasing pressure on these hospital facilities, been considered by the State Cabinet?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) Has the possible adverse impact of Medicare on private hospitals in Western Australia been considered by State Cabinet?
- (5) If so, when?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 20 June 1983.
- (3) See (2).
- (4) Yes.
- (5) 20 June 1983.
- (6) See (5).

HOSPITALS: PRIVATE
Medicare: Effect

821. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has State Cabinet been apprised of the possible adverse effects of Medicare on private hospitals in Western Australia?
- (2) If not—
 - (a) why not;
 - (b) when is it expected Cabinet will be thus informed?
- (3) Has State Cabinet been apprised of the possible impact of Medicare on Government hospitals in respect of increasing pressure on hospital facilities?
- (4) If not—
 - (a) why not;
 - (b) when is it expected Cabinet will be thus informed?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) and (b) Answered by (1).
- (3) Yes.
- (4) (a) and (b) Answered by (3).

HOSPITALS: PRIVATE
Medicare: Effect

822. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the State Government concerned about the possible impact of Medicare on private hospitals in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, what aspects are causing concern?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The impact upon private hospitals will depend upon the proportion of persons who wish to use these facilities and, if appropriate, take out private insurance for this purpose. Previous experience suggests that WA has shown preference to maintain a higher percentage of voluntary insurance to cover private hospi-

tal and medical services and thus there appears to be less need for private hospitals to be concerned than in other States.

(2) Answered by (1).

**HOSPITALS: ARMADALE AND ROYAL
PERTH (REHABILITATION)**

Psychogeriatric Facilities

823. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

Approximately how much will the delay in the construction of the psychogeriatric extended care facilities at Armadale Hospital and Shenton Park save the Government?

Mr HODGE replied:

Tenders for the Shenton Park units are currently being processed. The facility at the Armadale Hospital site will be considered in the context of the total capital works programme. As tenders have not been called, costing has not been accurately established.

HOSPITALS: STAFF

Replacement Policy: Savings

824. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Have any estimates been made by the Treasury or other authority as to the expected savings in the Government hospital system that will result from the Government's staff replacement policy?
- (2) If so, what savings are expected?
- (3) Has a goal, whether tentative or otherwise, been set for such savings?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) The Government's staff replacement policy applies to all areas of Government operations and no specific estimate of expected savings has been compiled in respect of the Government hospital system.

HOSPITALS: STAFF

Replacement Policy: Number Involved

825. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

What is the current total number of Government hospital employees that have not been replaced as a result of the Government's staff replacement policy?

Mr HODGE replied:

Of 352 hospital vacancies which have arisen since the introduction of the staff replacement policy, 35 have been recommended not to be replaced.

HOSPITALS: STAFF

Payments: Auditing

826. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is satisfactory auditing carried out in Western Australian Government hospitals to ensure payments to staff are at the correct rates?
- (2) Has any investigation been undertaken in Western Australian Government hospitals to ensure that overpayments and irregularities in overtime and other claims do not occur?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The matters outlined are constantly monitored by the departments, in addition to the regular reviews referred to under (1).

HEALTH: INSURANCE

Medicare: Arrangements

827. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Federal Government keeping the State Government fully informed of progress in the detailed arrangements for the introduction of Medicare?
- (2) If so, what is the latest position in respect of such arrangements?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The State Government is being kept informed of the hospital aspects of the introduction of Medicare.
- (2) The position in respect of the negotiated arrangements are as outlined in Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 7.

HOSPITALS: MEDICARE

Increased Demand: Meeting

828. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Health:

Was the probable impact of Medicare on Government hospitals discussed at

the meeting convened by him on Friday, 5 August last?

Mr HODGE replied:

Yes.

STATE FORESTS: PINE

Donnybrook Sunklands: Cost Benefit Analysis

829. Mr D. L. SMITH, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) In relation to the pine planting programme in the Donnybrook sunklands, when was the programme begun?
- (2) (a) Did the Forests Department do a cost/benefit analysis of the programme;
(b) if so, will he table it?
- (3) (a) Was an environmental impact statement or an environmental review and management programme ever prepared;
(b) if so, by whom, and will he table it?
- (4) To 30 June 1982, what area of native forest had been
(a) cleared;
(b) planted with:—
(i) *pinus radiata*;
(ii) *pinus pinaster*;
(iii) other pines (specify);
(iv) native eucalypts (specify);
(v) exotic eucalypts (specify);
(vi) other species (specify);
(vii) clover alone;
(viii) clover and trees?
- (5) What is the total area of native forest to be cleared for the programme?
- (6) What area of pines was planted in each of the financial years since the programme began?
- (7) What amount of money has been spent on the programme in each of the financial years since the programme began?
- (8) What is the estimated population of Western Australia in the year—
(a) 2000; and
(b) 2010,
on which the projections for future pine requirements in Western Australia are based?
- (9) What are the estimated annual Western Australian requirements in the years—

- (a) 2000; and
- (b) 2010; of—
 - (i) hardwood timber;
 - (ii) softwood timber;
 - (iii) hardwood chip material;
 - (iv) softwood chip material?
- (10) What is the estimated average annual yield of pine per hectare from the Donnybrook sunklands over the 30-year life of the present programme?
- (11) What was the estimated total cost of the programme at the time it was begun?
- (12) What is the current estimated total cost of the programme?
- (13) What is the estimated average royalty per cubic metre the department will have to charge in order to cover its costs of production?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) 1977. There were trial plantings between 1969 and 1976.
- (2) (a) Yes.
 - (b) No. This was an internal departmental study and is not in a suitable form to table. Results are summarised on page 16 of the statement of intent.
- (3) (a) Yes.
 - (b) The Forests Department. With permission, the attached statement of intent to afforest with pines in the Donnybrook Sunklands is tabled.
- (4) (a) 9 658 hectares.
 - (b) (i) 4 855 hectares;
 - (ii) 743 hectares;
 - (iii) 205 hectares *pinus elliottii*, *taeda*, *serotina*, *canariensis*, *carribeae* and *muricata*;
 - (iv) 20 hectares *Eucalyptus diversicolor*, *gomphocephala* and *calophylla*;
 - (v) 31 hectares *Eucalyptus globulus*, *paniculata*, *muellerii*, *maculata*, *oreadis*, *resinifera* and *microcorys*;
 - (vi) 5 hectares *Alnus* and *poplar*;
 - (vii) 386 hectares;
 - (viii) 5 475 hectares.
- (5) 19 800 hectares approximately, assuming that areas cleared and disease infected are planted.
- (6) pre 1977 328 hectares (trials)
 - 1977 197 hectares
 - 1978 516 hectares
 - 1979 658 hectares
 - 1980 1 311 hectares
 - 1981 1 343 hectares
 - 1982 1 450 hectares.
- (7) 1976-77 \$65 320 direct costs
 - 1977-78 \$301 974 direct costs
 - 1978-79 \$304 524 direct costs
 - 1979-80 \$862 196 direct costs
 - 1980-81 \$1 256 943 direct costs
 - 1981-82 \$1 349 391 direct costs
 - 1982-83 \$1 328 660 direct costs
- (8) State Treasury Department estimates are—
 - (a) 1 884 000 approximately;
 - (b) 2 184 000 approximately.
- (9) (a) (i) and (ii) 1 100 000 cubic metres. The demands for hardwood and softwood timber are not forecast separately.
 - (b) (i) and (ii) 1 220 000 cubic metres. The demands for hardwood and softwood timber are not forecast separately.
 - (a) and (b) (iii) Unknown. The current agreement to supply hardwood chip material is required to be renegotiated by 1991. There is no specific forecast of local demand for products derived from hardwood chip material.
 - (a) (iv) 330 000 cubic metres in accordance with the current agreement.
 - (b) (iv) Unknown. The current agreement to supply softwood chip material is required to be renegotiated by 2 000. There is no specific forecast of local demand for products derived from softwood chip material.
- (10) 16.3 cubic metres.
- (11) \$30 million.
- (12) \$26.5 million assuming future costs at 1983 values.
- (13) \$22.62 per cubic metre at 1983 values.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 243).

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Diet Products: Prohibition

830. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Did he recently publicly criticise the marketing methods of a merchandising

organisation "Total Image" which retails diet products and state that it was under scrutiny?

- (2) Is it fact that officers of the Department of Consumer Affairs, in answer to telephone calls, are stating that their department has no objection to the sales techniques of "Total Image"?
- (3) Would he clarify the apparent contradiction?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. Officers are indicating that matters relating to the organisation are being studied in relation to the Pyramid Sales Schemes Act. If evidence suggesting a breach of that Act is found, action for prosecution or injunction may be taken. I would add that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is also examining statements made on labels and in promotional material to determine whether or not there may be contraventions of section 8 of the Trade Descriptions and False Advertisements Act.

I am advised that an investigation is also taking place under the provisions of the Health Act.

- (3) There is no contradiction except that created by a promoter reported as claiming that "the firm's sales matters are within the guidelines of the Pyramid Sales Schemes Act and other marketing laws". That matter is just what is to be determined.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Beldon

831. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Government decided not to build a school at Beldon which would be operative for the start of the 1984 school year?
- (2) When precisely does the Government plan to have a primary school in Beldon?
- (3) Are plans being prepared now to build a school at Beldon?
- (4) (a) Is he aware of the pressures that will apply to the Mullaloo Heights

school if a school at Beldon is not built in the near future;

- (b) if so, how would he overcome them?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) It is proposed to have a school open in Beldon in February 1985.
- (3) The present standard design will be used for the proposed school at Beldon.
- (4) (a) and (b) The recent completion of four rooms at the Mullaloo Heights Primary School plus the temporary accommodation already on site will be sufficient to accommodate all children from the area in 1984.

EDUCATION: DEPARTMENT AND TEACHERS

Staff Replacement Policy

832. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In the light of the Government's policy to replace only half of those public servants who resign or retire, would he list all the positions, giving job title and location, in those areas under his ministerial responsibility where employees who have resigned or retired have not been replaced since his appointment as Minister?
- (2) What further reductions in employment does he anticipate by the start of the academic school year in February 1984?
- (3) Is there any likelihood that the Government's policy will either not be applied within the education portfolio or will be only partially applied?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Non-teaching—
 Computer Systems Officer—Head Office
 Stores Assistant—Head Office
 Purchasing Officer—Education Supplies
 Laboratory Assistant—Carlisle Technical College
 Technical Officer—Head Office
 Industrial Officer—Head Office
 Storeman—Education Supplies
 Teaching—
 Primary
 Teacher, Library—Graylands Primary—Part-time
 Mistress—York District H.S.—Full-time

Mistress—Esperance Primary—Part-time

Teacher, Gifted—Regional Office, Kalgoorlie—Part-time

Resource Teacher—Yilgarn Regional Office—Part-time

Secondary

Teacher—Karratha—Part-time

Teacher—Special Education Advisory, Head Office.

- (2) It is not possible to make a clear prediction since the location and number of staff who might for various reasons resign cannot be accurately anticipated.
- (3) The Premier has already stated that the policy will not be fully applied within a number of portfolios including education and police.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Declaration of Interest: Interpretation

833. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is it fact that a local government councillor who resides on a street in which it is proposed to incorporate a round-about is regarded as having an "interest" and is therefore debarred from having a vote on the issue at the council table?
- (2) If "Yes", who made this interpretation and on what basis?
- (3) Can local government councillors vote to determine the municipal rate, even though this will decide what "rates" they personally will pay on their households in which they obviously have an "interest"?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) and (2) This question seeks an answer in the nature of a legal opinion. I am unable to provide such an opinion.
- (3) The prohibitions on a council member taking part in the consideration of a matter in which he has a pecuniary interest are contained in section 174 of the Local Government Act.

Under the provisions of section 174, an interest shared in common with the rate-payers of a municipality is not regarded as an interest of a person for the purposes of that section. I imagine that these provisions would cover the situation referred to in the question.

WATER RESOURCES: UNDERGROUND

Groundwater: Wanneroo

834. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Have Wanneroo's groundwater wells been tested to ensure that whatever is causing odour problems in the water does not constitute a health risk?

- (2) If so, with what result?

- (3) If not, why not?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The tests have shown that a health risk does not exist.
- (3) Not applicable.

HEALTH: LIONS SAVE-SIGHT FOUNDATION (WA) INC.

Subsidy

835. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) How much is the subsidy which the Government provides for the Lions Save-Sight Foundation?
- (2) Is this subsidy provided for specific projects, or is the subsidy paid to the foundation for allocation as it sees fit?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) Until the close of the 1982-83 financial year, the foundation received an annual grant of \$1 000 to assist towards the cost of operating its public glaucoma screening service.

However, the grant will not be provided in 1983-84 as the foundation is being provided with accommodation at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital.

When permanent accommodation becomes available at the hospital, the rental charged will be subsidised by the Department for Hospital and Allied Services.

ABATTOIRS: NON-EXPORT

Location, and Slaughter Fees

836. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many non-export abattoirs have agreed to slaughter lambs for the WA Lamb Marketing Board?
- (2) What are the locations of such abattoirs?

- (3) What is the agreed slaughter fee at each works?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) Six.
- (2) This information is confidential.
- (3) \$4.50.

SEWERAGE

Subdivisions: Policy

837. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has the Government changed the policy of the previous Government in respect of generally not allowing subdivisions and/or building development without the area first being sewered save in very exceptional circumstances?
- (2) If "Yes", could he please detail the new policy and also state whether that has been arrived at with the support of the Health Department, the Department of Planning, the Metropolitan Water Authority, and the Public Works Department respectively?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

DRAINAGE

Country Areas: Rates

838. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has Cabinet considered yet the detailed report regarding country rural drainage rating, as mentioned in his reply to question 79 of 26 July 1983?
- (2) If so, could he say whether he is prepared to make the report available to me?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I will consider his request.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Building Contractors: Categorising

839. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has he received the report mentioned in his reply to question 40 of 24 March 1983?

- (2) If so, could he please inform the House about the policy evolved in this respect?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS: DEPARTMENT

Prices Advisory Committee: Membership

840. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

Can he now say which "other persons" he has appointed to the prices advisory committee according to the provisions of section 8 (3) (c) of the Prevention of Excessive Prices Act 1983?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Only one prices advisory committee has been appointed. Its specific task was to inquire into petroleum marketing in Western Australia. It has completed its work and the appointments of members have expired. The "other" person appointed to that committee was Dr H. Saddler, Visiting Fellow at the Australian National University's Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies.

WATER RESOURCES: UNDERGROUND

Artesian Bores: Approvals

841. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Would he please list the owners and locations of the new and/or extended artesian bores recommended by the Board of the Metropolitan Water Authority for the Governor's approval during the last six months?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (a) City of Gosnells—Lot 1648 Balfour Road, Southern River;
City of Gosnells—Lot 1656 Southern River Road, Southern River.
- (b) L. A. McGregor—Lot 10 Queens Road, South Guildford.
- (c) Prisons Department—Canning Vale Prisons, Canning Vale.

842. This question was postponed.

WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY AND COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLIES

Amalgamation: Consultants

843. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

With the proposed amalgamation of the metropolitan and country water facilities, is it envisaged to return the so-far used and presently prevailing proportion of outside consultants in research documentary, proprietary, and construction work?

Mr TONKIN replied:

There is no specific proposal either to increase or to decrease the use of consultants after the merger takes place. Consultants will continue to be engaged as circumstances require.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Class Sizes

844. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Could he please inform the House whether the previous Government's policies on class sizes within primary schools—i.e., that schools can determine their own class sizes within the available number of teachers and with the approval of the regional director—still prevails?
- (2) If not, can he define the prevailing policies?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: REDUNDANCY PAYMENTS

Government Attitude

845. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Does the redundancy case brought before the Federal Arbitration Commission by the Australian Council of Trade Unions and supported by the Federal and State Governments include claims which would require employers to give—
 - (a) three months' notice;

- (b) four weeks' pay, plus another four weeks for each year of service;
- (c) one week's pay for each completed year of service for workers aged 35 years or more;
- (d) an extra two weeks' pay for completed years of service over ten years for workers aged 45 years or more;
- (e) maintenance of income payments for a year after redundancy or retrenchment;
- (f) re-location expenses and costs of re-training?

- (2) If the above details of the claims are incorrect, would the Minister advise the correct details?
- (3) Why has the State Government supported the Federal Government in this case?
- (4) Does the State Government agree that if the claims are granted it will cost jobs in Western Australia, and further jeopardise employment opportunities?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) (a) Yes
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) Yes.
- (f) Yes.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) I refer the member to the response given to question 771 on Tuesday, 23 August.
- (4) No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: OFFICERS

Salaries: Method of Assessment

846. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is the system of the amount of rates collected by local authorities still being used to assess city clerk, town clerk or shire clerk salaries?
- (2) If "Yes", will he name what local government authorities are still using this method of paying the senior position?
- (3) Would he also state what percentage, taken from the rates collected, is paid to the officers occupying the senior position?

of city clerk, town clerk or shire clerk or whatever other designation the senior position is classified as?

(4) If not, why not?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) to (4) To the best of my knowledge, rate collections have never been used as the basis for municipal officers' salaries. However, I understand that the Federal award applying to most officers sets down a scale of salary rates based on the ordinary revenue of the municipality.

SWIMMING POOLS

Drownings

847. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Could he state the number of children drowned in backyard (private) swimming pools in Western Australia in each of the past six years?
- (2) If not, is he able to ascertain where, if at all, such information may be available?

Mr CARR replied:

- (1) and (2) The National Safety Council has advised the following statistics of deaths of pre-school children for the fiscal years indicated—

| | |
|---------|----|
| 1976-77 | 9 |
| 1977-78 | 9 |
| 1978-79 | 10 |
| 1979-80 | 3 |
| 1980-81 | 4 |
| 1981-82 | 1 |

Statistics for 1982-83 are not yet available.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL AND PRIMARY SCHOOL

Kalgoorlie

848. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Education:

Could he please advise what planning has taken place for—

- (a) a new high school in the northern suburbs of Kalgoorlie;
- (b) a new primary school in the South Kalgoorlie area,

assuming in both cases that the population of the area continues to expand?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (a) and (b) Sites for a future high school and a primary school have been identified.

The Education Department will monitor population growth as it occurs to determine when additional schools will be needed.

Other than in the South Kalgoorlie area there are no pressures on schools.

RAILWAYS: FREMANTLE-PERTH

Patronage: Monitoring

849. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Considering the claimed number of passengers travelling on the Perth-Fremantle train are compiled from observed train loadings by railway union employees and vetted by himself before release, has he directed the MTT not to release passenger statistics for the Perth-Fremantle train service without his approval?
- (2) How often does he intend to have the total number of passengers using the Perth-Fremantle train service observed and released by him?
- (3) Will he have an independent organisation, such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics, monitor each six months the passenger journeys on a day and/or weekly basis to enable assessment of the public use of this service and the results achieved?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The methods adopted by Westrail are the same as it has used in the past when carrying out passenger loading surveys—some data of which the member himself relied upon when Minister. I refer him in particular to the document "Urban Public Transport for Perth-Rail and Bus Policy", page 7, issued by him in April 1979 which quotes such data.

The MTT provides me with survey results in the first instance so that I am in a position to answer parliamentary questions without notice and to deal with personal media queries.

- (2) A full survey was carried out for the first week of operations and it is intended to make another full survey in late October or early November. This would be followed by the usual annual

survey in April next year for the three railway lines.

- (3) I am informed the MTT may wish to obtain a wider range of data than that which can be obtained from normal Westrail surveys and, consequently, assistance of Australian Bureau of Statistics or staff from some external organisation may be sought for the mentioned October-November survey.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: STAFF

Additional: Statistics

850. Mr RUSHTON, to the Premier:

- (1) Acknowledging his own comments regarding implications upon staff from questions relating to their appointment and to remove any misunderstanding, will he now give a complete list of administrative appointments made by the Burke Government, showing—
- (a) name;
 - (b) appointment or occupation;
 - (c) category under which (b) is listed;
 - (d) previous occupation;
 - (e) new salary;
 - (f) duties;
 - (g) qualifications;
 - (h) for public servants (also if item from which person transferred is to be filled or left vacant)?
- (2) Are people appointed from outside the Public Service on \$30 000 and above to qualify for 10 per cent cut in salary under the Temporary Reduction of Remuneration (Senior Public Officers) Bill?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) I do not understand what the member means by "administrative appointments". If the member has a query with respect to any particular appointment I will be pleased to consider his request for information, but I am not prepared to direct officers from essential duties to undertake many hours of research on a broadly based question such as he has submitted.

I would also state that I do not feel it is proper to make public certain personal details; for instance an individual's previous occupation.

- (2) People appointed from outside the Public Service will be subject to the provisions of the Temporary Reduction of Remuneration (Senior Public Officers) Bill.

RAILWAYS: FREIGHT

Less-than-carload: Report

851. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has a report upon the first 12 months of deregulation of less-than-carload freight been completed by the Commissioner for Transport?
- (2) (a) If "Yes", will he table the report;
(b) if "No" to (1), when is the report expected?
- (3) Have any requests for franchised freight services as a result of deregulation of less-than-carload freight been received?
- (4) Have any franchised or subsidised freight services been introduced as a result of the deregulation of less-than-carload freight?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I expect to receive the report towards the end of September 1983.
- (3) I am not aware of any formal approach for franchised freight services.
- (4) No.

RAILWAYS: FREIGHT

Road Trucks

852. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is Westrail running any freight services with its own road trucks?
- (2) Will he please list the road trucks still held by Westrail with respect to—
(a) make;
(b) tonnage;
(c) year of purchase?
- (3) Are the vehicles listed in (2) still for sale?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes. Transport of mineral sands, Capel to Bunbury.
- (2) (a) to (c) This information is not readily available and will be supplied to the member in due course.
- (3) No.

RAILWAYS: ALBANY-PERTH

Reopening

853. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the restarting of the overnight rail passenger service to Albany under re-consideration?
- (2) Is a day rail passenger service to Albany under consideration?
- (3) If "Yes" to either (1) or (2), who is carrying out the review?
- (4) When is the report expected?
- (5) What locomotives and carriages will be used?
- (6) What is the estimated cost of—
 - (a) refurbishing the Albany track for passenger traffic;
 - (b) reconditioning or purchasing adequate rolling stock;
 - (c) providing facilities to support the sleeper/overnight service?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Westrail.
- (4) 30 September 1983.
- (5) and (6) (a) to (c) These aspects are being looked at in the review and the answers to your questions cannot be provided until Westrail's report has been examined.

- (7) Is it intended to start the train from Perth or Bunbury?
- (8) How many journeys a day is the train expected to make?
- (9) How many passengers travelled each way to Bunbury and back for each day last week on this train?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) A fast inter-city passenger rail service between Perth and Bunbury will be introduced in 1986-87.
- (2) to (8) A Westrail study group is currently undertaking an in-depth evaluation of the requirements for the new service between Bunbury and Perth. The matters raised by the member and all other relevant aspects of the proposal are already being comprehended in the study which is due to be completed by 31 October 1983. It would not be appropriate to pre-empt the findings of the study group. However, I expect to be in a position to make public announcements on this exciting project before the end of the year.

(9)

| | To Bunbury | To Perth |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Monday—15 August | 116 | 122 |
| Tuesday—16 August | 132 | 112 |
| Wednesday—17 August | 106 | 52 |
| Thursday—18 August | 107 | 79 |
| Friday—19 August | 145 | 92 |
| Saturday—20 August | 82 | 82 |

RAILWAYS

"Australind" Service: Replacement

854. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the *Australind* passenger train to be replaced during 1986?
- (2) When will tenders be called?
- (3) When will tenders need to be let to have the train running in 1986?
- (4) What is the estimated cost of replacing the train?
- (5) What maximum speed will the train be designed for and expected to travel?
- (6) What fuel will be used to power the train?

ROADS: BICENTENNIAL PROGRAMME

Fuel Tax

855. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Relating to the allocation of the Commonwealth fuel tax for bicentennial road funds and public transport, what funds were allocated from this source in 1982-83 for public transport in Western Australia?
- (2) For what purpose were they used?
- (3) What impact did these funds have upon the 1982-83 MTT deficit?
- (4) What funds were available from this source for WA public transport during 1982-83?

- (5) What sum from this source is available for WA public transport in 1983-84?
- (6) For what purpose are these funds in (5) to be allocated?
- (7) What impact and saving of MTT deficit are these funds expected to have in 1983-84 financial year?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) As the member should have been aware, in 1982-83 the Commonwealth did not make any allocation from the Australian bicentennial road development trust fund to public transport in Western Australia.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) and (5) Up to a 25 per cent share of the allocation for urban arterial roads may be available for WA urban public transport—the share being estimated as \$1.75 million for 1982-83 and \$4.19 million in 1983-84. Funds not allocated in a particular year may be carried forward.
- (6) Due to a delay in Commonwealth allocations for 1982-83, Western Australia has proposed a combined 1982-83 and 1983-84 programme of urban public transport works under the bicentennial fund for the following purposes—
 High speed, high priority bus services.
 Suburban rail services.
- (7) It is unlikely that funds allocated from the bicentennial fund will have any significant financial impact on the MTT in 1983-84. The funds are interest free and, wherever possible, projects are being designed to reduce the urban public transport deficit.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Fares: Honour System

856. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) As the economic and efficient "honour system" for fare sales and collection on public transport is dependent upon equally efficient "spot checks" by experienced inspectors, why are the specially trained MTT inspectors not checking fares on the trains as well as the buses and ferries?

- (2) How many suburban public transport inspectors are employed by—
 (a) MTT;
 (b) Westrail?
- (3) How many more inspectors have been, or are to be, appointed to check fares on trains as a result of his request as reported in *The West Australian* of 22 August?
- (4) Are these additional appointments to be made from MTT, Westrail or another source?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) MTT inspectors are only used for bus and ferry operations. It is surprising to say the least that the member was not aware that Westrail has its own qualified inspectors to cover train operations.
- (2) (a) 45 uniformed inspectors used in various capacities;
 (b) eight specifically related to fare inspections. (Includes one officer who also carried out inspections part time on country passenger trains).
- (3) Three have been seconded and are included in (b) above.
- (4) Secondments are from Westrail.

857. *This question was postponed.*

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN: STAFF

Mr D. T. A. Rowe

858. Mr PETER JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) With regard to Mr D. T. A. Rowe, who has been appointed as a media services consultant to the Government, was Mr Rowe involved in the WA Shopping Centre Retailers Association?
- (2) Is he still involved with this body, or any similar community organisation?
- (3) Is Mr Rowe associated with a grapegrowing organisation in the Swan Valley?
- (4) If so, what organisation and on what basis?
- (5) What requirement has the Government imposed on its ministerial appointees that they cease any involvement or remunerative activity whilst being paid from public funds?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.

- (3) No.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) Mr Rowe's contract is on a fee-for-service basis, based on an hourly rate, and does not preclude him from undertaking other income-earning activities.

A similar contract existed for Mr W. W. Mitchell with the previous Government.

MEAT: LAMB

Marketing Board: Telephone Listings

859. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that in the latest Perth telephone directory under the listing of the Lamb Marketing Board, sublisting residences, there are 14 names and numbers listed?
- (2) What positions with the Lamb Marketing Board do these employees hold?
- (3) Does the Lamb Marketing Board pay for each employee listed under the Lamb Marketing Board listing his or her telephone account?
- (4) How many people are employed by the Lamb Marketing Board?
- (5) How does the Lamb Marketing Board maintain price equalisation?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (5) I am seeking a written answer from the WA Lamb Marketing Board and the member will be informed when an answer is received.

ROADS

Rossmoyne: Sewerage Installations

860. Mr WILLIAMS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What moneys, if any, have been made available to the City of Canning for the reconstruction of roads in Rossmoyne which have been damaged during sewerage installations in the area?
- (2) When was such finance made available to the City of Canning?
- (3) Does the Metropolitan Water Authority place any time limitation on local authorities for repair work of this nature?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) The Metropolitan Water Authority has placed orders on the City of Canning for

it to repair or reconstruct roads at MWA cost.

- (2) The orders were placed on 29 September 1982 (sewerage reticulation area 6A, Bateman) and 11 February 1983 (sewerage reticulation areas 6B and 4C, Bateman).
- (3) No time limit is placed, but the local authority is advised when the MWA work is completed and it is requested to expedite repairs.

ROAD

Kalbarri-Port Gregory

861. Mr TUBBY, to the Minister for Tourism:

With reference to the proposed new alignment for the Kalbarri to Port Gregory road and conflicting views put forward by the National Parks Authority and the Main Roads Department, because of the need to reach an early decision and the importance to tourism, would he accept an invitation by the Northampton Shire Council to visit Kalbarri and view the compromise put forward by the council?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

No.

The Director of the Department of Tourism visited the area on June 16 at my request as the result of an invitation from the Shire of Northampton and the Kalbarri Business Association.

Officers of the Main Roads Department, the Department of Conservation and Environment and the National Parks Authority will meet shortly in an endeavour to determine a route for the road which will be acceptable to all interested parties.

LAND

South-west Land Resource Task Force: Committees

862. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Premier:

- (1) Further to question 631 of 1983 respecting the south-west land resource task force, are any of the committees on a Government employment contract?
- (2) If "Yes", would he provide details of the length of contract and any salary and allowance paid?

- (3) Further to (2), would any member of the committee be subject to the legislative provision of the Temporary Reduction of Remuneration (Senior Public Officers) Bill 1983?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) Dr Mulcahy and Mr Halse have been assigned to the task force on a "loan basis" for 12 months.

Dr Shea has been appointed on a three-year contract as scientific adviser on environment and forests, on a salary of a Level 5 Forestry Officer, currently \$41 693 per annum, and has been assigned to the task force for 12 months in the first instance.

- (3) The above three task force members will be subject to the provisions of the Temporary Reduction of Remuneration (Senior Public Officers) Bill.

STATE FORESTS: PINE

Planting: Manjimup

863. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

Further to question 702 of 1983, of the 500 hectares required as a yearly minimum pine planting at Manjimup, what additional areas of land will be required, on a yearly basis as per above, to meet other management requirements, i.e., firebreaks, ecology and wildlife areas, etc.?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Firebreaks normally make up about 10 per cent of the area required for planting. Ecology and wildlife areas will not be required under this programme.

STATE FORESTS: PINE

Establishment: Cost

864. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Forests:

What is the per hectare cost of establishing pine trees, including all infrastructure (roads, airfields, firebreaks, etc.), in—

- (a) forest, and
- (b) alienated areas?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) \$600.
- (b) \$200.

WATER RESOURCES: METROPOLITAN WATER AUTHORITY AND COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLIES

Amalgamation: Consultations

865. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What communications has—
 - (a) he and/or
 - (b) officers of his department, had with the—
 - (i) Bunbury Water Board;
 - (ii) Busselton Water Board,
 relating to proceeding with the Government's proposal to "take over" country water authorities?
- (2) What has been the response to date from each of the water boards concerned?
- (3) (a) Has he established any timetable to effect the take over of either or both water boards, and
 - (b) if so, would he give details?
- (4) What are the reasons that the Government is intent on establishing a single water authority for Western Australia?
- (5) Has he or his department found any defects with either the operation or administration of either the Bunbury or Busselton Water Boards?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) (i) On 31 May, I, with officers concerned with the establishment of a State water authority, met the Bunbury Water Board, in Bunbury, to initiate discussions on this matter. Following subsequent correspondence, arrangements are now being made for a further meeting.
- (ii) On 21 July officers concerned with the establishment of a State water authority met the Busselton Water Board, in Busselton, to initiate discussions on my behalf with the board on this matter. Following subsequent correspondence, arrangements are now being made for a further meeting.
- (2) Each board presented arguments opposing the merger of its organisation into the State water authority.
- (3) (a) No.
- (b) Not applicable.

- (4) The reasons for the establishment of a single water authority are to guide and manage, in consultation with the Western Australian Water Resources Council, the orderly development of the State's water resources; to integrate activities common to the existing organisations, so as to improve effectiveness and unify policies; to rationalise and standardise criteria and practices and develop common standards; to merge the existing organisations so as to rationalise staffing arrangements, eliminate duplication of effort and facilitate, and develop a single, efficient, responsive organisation; to facilitate the gathering of technical expertise in specialised fields and its ready availability to all areas of activity; and to develop an organisation structured along modern management principles, equipped to manage present and future water operations and to plan for future needs.

- (5) I have raised, with each of the boards either directly or through my officers, a number of issues which cause me concern and which I wish to discuss further with them before making judgments.

MEAT: LAMB

Imports and Exports: Value

866. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What has been the amount and estimated value of lamb, sheep and sheep meats imported into Western Australia and from what State or country by—
 (a) WA Lamb Marketing Board;
 (b) private and other sources,
 in each month since 1976?
- (2) During the same period, what has been the amount and estimated value of lamb, sheep and sheep meats exported from Western Australia by the—
 (a) WA Lamb Marketing Board;
 (b) private and other sources,
 to—
 (i) overseas;
 (ii) interstate markets,
 in each month since 1976?
- (3) What has been the WA Lamb Marketing Board's—
 (a) yearly operating cost;

- (b) yearly operating cost per kilo of lamb handled;
 (c) yearly cost per head of killing costs from
 (i) metropolitan;
 (ii) export;
 (iii) country abattoirs?
- (4) (a) What is the yearly number of total people employed by the board;
 (b) yearly cost of wages/salaries paid;
 (c) yearly operating profit and/or loss;
 (d) yearly number of vehicles operated by the board,
 in the period since 1976?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) to (4) I am seeking a written answer from the WA Lamb Marketing Board and the member will be informed when an answer is received.

MEAT: LAMB

Marketing Board: Promotions

867. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

What has been the nature and yearly cost of promotions of the WA Lamb Marketing Board since 1976?

Mr EVANS replied:

I am seeking a written answer from the WA Lamb Marketing Board and the member will be informed when an answer is received.

MEAT: LAMB

Grading System

868. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Will he give details of any steps that have been made to enable the consuming public to be able to purchase lamb as per grading available to the producers and wholesalers?

Mr EVANS replied:

No specific steps have been taken.

MEAT: LAMB

Marketing Board: Price to Producers and Wholesalers

869. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What has been the average price paid to producers by the WA Lamb Marketing

Board for each grade supplied in each month since 1976?

- (2) What has been the average price charged to wholesalers by the WA Lamb Marketing Board for each grade in each month since 1976?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I am seeking a written answer from the WA Lamb Marketing Board and the member will be informed when an answer is received.

MEAT: LAMB

Marketing Board: Number Processed

870. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What has been the total number of lambs processed by the WA Lamb Marketing Board as a result of direct sale by producers in each month since 1976 in—
 (a) metropolitan/export;
 (b) country works?
- (2) What has been the total amount of lamb processed by the board as producers own lambs and repurchased or similar by producers in each month since 1976 and processed through—
 (a) metropolitan/export;
 (b) country abattoirs?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I am seeking a written answer from the WA Lamb Marketing Board and the member will be informed when an answer is received.

MEAT: LAMB

Consumption

871. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What has been the per capita consumption of lamb in Western Australia since 1976?
- (2) How does consumption in Western Australia compare with the other Australian States during the period of (1) above?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Official statistics are not compiled. I refer the member to comments on page 16 of the recent Department of Agriculture position paper on the Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board.

TRANSPORT: STRATEGY COMMITTEE

Road User Charges

872. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What progress has been made with the establishment of a transport strategy committee to be given the task of reviewing the correct level of road user charges and how they should be imposed, as announced by him on 23 June 1983?
- (2) When is it anticipated that some results will be available from this review?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Invitations are being forwarded to certain individuals and organisations to take up appointments to the committee.
- (2) It is not possible to give the member any firm indication of when the committee might report until it has met and determined the amount of work necessary. I would expect, however, to receive the report some time in the new year.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Dealers: Licensing Board

873. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Who are the present members of the Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board and what interests do they represent?
- (2) Is it intended to amend the Act to allow for changes to this board?
- (3) As the Government has announced that it intends to amend the Motor Vehicle Dealers Act, to provide for the introduction of a fidelity fund, what representations have been received from the industry seeking the establishment of such a fund?
- (4) Are any other amendments to the Act being considered?
- (5) If so, can he give details?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Raymond John Cooper (Chairman)—Independent
 Clifford William Houghton—WA Automobile Chamber of Commerce (Inc.)

William Frederick Harry—Australian Automobile Dealers' Association (WA Division)

Ian Critchton Miller—Royal Automobile Club of WA (Inc.)

William Philip—Nominee of the Minister representing consumers.

- (2) Not at present.
- (3) Strong representations were received from the WA Automobile Chamber of Commerce. Similar representations on the same matter were made to the previous Government. As would be expected, no action was taken in spite of the history of failure of dealer firms resulting in substantial loss to consumers. The present Government intends moving quickly to prevent further losses.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) The Government intends to introduce a requirement that a purchaser shall receive a duly completed copy of the contract of sale at the time of entering into the contract. The Government also intends to require the use of a standard form of contract possibly by adopting the contract document recently published by the Standards Association of Australia. Other details will be evident when this Bill is before the House.

TRAFFIC: CONGESTION

Reduction

874. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

Following his recent visit to Singapore an article in *The West Australian* of 2 August indicated that some measures which have successfully been introduced in Singapore to spread peak-hour demand and reduce inner-city congestion will be considered for Perth, will he indicate what measures are being considered?

Mr GRILL replied:

Measures being considered include—

- (i) Discount fares on public transport during off-peak periods.
- (ii) Discounted commuter car park charges for cars with passengers (high occupancy cars), to encourage greater utilisation of the many empty peak period

car seats and to reduce the number of vehicles entering the city during the peak. Around 70 per cent of all car seats coming into the city during the 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. peak are presently unoccupied.

- (iii) Reservation of prime car park locations for high occupancy cars.
- (iv) Use of priority lanes by high occupancy cars.
- (v) Encouragement of flexi-time and other arrangements which reduce travel demand during the critical peak times.

Currently four out of every 10 people who work in the central city travel to work with the MTT. Moves such as the reopening of the Fremantle passenger rail service will help encourage greater use of public transport and thereby further reduce inner-city congestion.

RAILWAYS: FREMANTLE-PERTH

Reopening: Modern Technology

875. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

Was any consideration given to utilising alternative forms of modern rail technology for the Perth-Fremantle passenger service before the service was reopened using the existing technology and outdated rolling stock?

Mr GRILL replied:

The Perth-Fremantle rail service was re-introduced using existing rolling stock as it was apparent no specific plan for changed technology for suburban rail passenger services was developed by the previous Government.

It was obvious a change of technology could not be implemented in the short-term future and accordingly the Government made the best use of the resources left available by its predecessors.

TRANSPORT

"Transport 2000—A Perth Study": Recommendations

876. Mr LAURANCE, to the Minister for Transport:

Does he intend to act on the recommendation in the report "Transport 2000: A

Perth Study" (page 13) that, "Responsibility for the operating and investment decisions for suburban passenger railways should be removed from MTT and returned to Westrail. Operational investment man power and industrial decisions cannot be made in isolation from the freight operation—by far the greatest component of the rail system"?

Mr GRILL replied:

I have asked the Metropolitan Transport Trust and the Co-ordinator General of Transport for advice on desirable amendments to the Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust Act. After I have received and considered that advice, I will put my recommendations to Cabinet.

MINERAL SANDS: INDUSTRY

Inquiry: Membership

877. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) With reference to part (5) of question 767 of 1983, what are the qualifications and experience of Dr John Mathews, which fit him for membership of the Government inquiry into the mineral sands industry?
- (2) With reference to part (6) of the same question, has not Professor Winn expressed concern at possible radiation hazards associated with the mineral sands industry, referring especially to possible problems with monazite?
- (3) How does the Government reconcile its desire for an independent and unbiased review of the mineral sands industry, with its appointment of Dr Mathews and Professor Winn?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Qualifications and experience of Dr John Mathews—

| | |
|---------|---|
| 1976 | B.Sc. (Econ)—London School of Economics |
| 1977 | M.Sc. (Eng) in Control Systems—Imperial College, London |
| 1979 | PhD in Control Systems—Imperial College, London |
| 1979-81 | Health and Safety Researcher, Association of Scientific Tech- |

nical and Managerial Staffs (ASTMS), U.K.

1981 Research Officer, Head of Unit (ACTU/VTHC Occupational Health and Safety Unit)

- (2) I have seen no such report.
- (3) I do not believe an expression of concern about radiation hazards associated with the mineral sands industry should disqualify Professor Winn, or Dr Mathews for that matter. I am sure the member would agree it would be impossible for a scientist not to have a view on such a matter, but it would not necessarily prevent him from conducting an independent and unbiased review.

MINING: ACT

Inquiry: Membership and Terms of Reference

878. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What are the terms of reference of the committee appointed by the Government to inquire into certain aspects of the Mining Act 1978-1982?
- (2) Who are the members of that committee?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) See the advertisement in *The West Australian* dated 25 July 1983.
- (2) The committee will be chaired by Mr Michael Hunt. The names of other members have not yet been finalised.

FUEL AND ENERGY: SOLAR

Weather Monitoring Stations

879. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What amount of funds have been provided in the 1983-84 capital budget of the State Energy Commission for the purchase of the eight weather station units he referred to in the final sentence of his answer to question 603 of 16 August?

Mr BRYCE replied:

\$20 000.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Building: Cost

880. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) How much is the new building for the State Energy Commission estimated to cost on completion?
- (2) How is the building being financed?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) Approximately \$26 million.
- (2) Normal capital works program.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Capital Projects: Interest Charges

881. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What is the value of interest charges associated with financing major capital projects extending for more than one accounting period which have been capitalised in the accounts of the State Energy Commission during the years ended—

- (a) 30 June 1981;
- (b) 30 June 1982; and
- (c) 30 June 1983?

Mr BRYCE replied:

The interest charges capitalised are as follows—

\$ Million

- (a) 18.3;
- (b) 24.1;
- (c) 54.4 (provisional).

TOURISM

Penalty Rates

882. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Tourism:

Is he in support of tourist industry requests that action be taken to reduce, or do away with, penalty rates as they affect employees in the tourist industry?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

At the tourism forum held over 14 and 15 June this year, the subject of penalty rates was discussed.

I indicated at the time that the matter had been raised by many segments of

the industry and that it was one which, it had been suggested, should be the subject of an in-depth national study.

I advised the forum that I would be happy for the study to proceed and that I would co-operate with it.

HOUSING

Willetton: Stage 3

883. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

When will he be making a final decision on the nature of the development which the State Housing Commission is proposing for its Willetton Stage 3 subdivision?

Mr WILSON replied:

Consideration is still being given at this time and I will advise the member of the precise terms of the development by letter in the near future.

FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION ACT

Amendment: Right of Arrest

884. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Referring him to an article in *The Independent* newspaper of 20 March 1983 which reported that the Burke Government may be moving to amend "the State Energy Commission Act as amended in 1979 to give SEC officers the same rights of arrest as police officers for such offences as trespass", is the Government planning to amend the State Energy Commission Act, 1979?
- (2) If so, what will be the general nature of these amendments?

Mr BRYCE replied:

- (1) No decision has been made.
- (2) Not applicable.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE PUBLIC SERVICE: PUBLIC SERVANTS

Wage Cuts: Premier's Statement

184. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Does the Premier recall writing a letter, dated 14 June, reference No. 400/79/4, in which he said, "My Government

holds the view that it would be inappropriate for Governments to seek to take from workers conditions that they have acquired through the Commission" and, "My Government would not favour a lessening of conditions of service"?

- (2) Does he also recall that eight days later, on 22 June, he announced that he would reduce the salaries of about 4 000 people by up to 10 per cent?
- (3) Will he please tell the House what happened in the eight days between the letter and the announcement of the pay cuts to make him change his mind on such a fundamental matter of principle?

Mr BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) There seems to me to be in the question an implication that the Government has adopted this measure as a preferred measure in attempting to minimise its expenditure or to manage its financial position. The Government has never said that that is the case.

Mr O'Connor: I never implied anything.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It seems to me that is a clear implication to be drawn from the question. I think it is just as inappropriate for a Government from time to time in areas such as, I suggest, the means testing of pensioners, to take certain action to impose a means test on pensioners; nevertheless it is sometimes necessary. What I am trying to draw is the distinction between—

Mr O'Connor: I asked why the change of mind in eight days.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am saying it is not necessary that there is a change of mind. What is absolutely the case in this instance is that the Government has been forced, in other areas besides this, into some unpalatable measures in order to manage the State's finances as it sees is appropriate. I am not saying we think everything we do will be our preferred course of action had we not been forced into that action by the exigencies of the time; for example, had we not been confronted with the financial position we did confront when we gained office.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If that idea is worn out, how worn out is the Opposition's constant harangue which blames the

Whitlam Government for everything apart from starting World War II? Whether we are right or wrong, that is what we perceived when we came into office. We perceived that on advice from the Under Treasurer, and perceiving that advice we acted in a way we thought was necessary. But we are not saying that is the preferred method of approach; we are saying it is the necessary method of approach. The Opposition should not think that we are going to balk at the hard decisions, because we are not.

Mr O'Connor: You are saying you can make a promise today, break it tomorrow, and make another the next day.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As a result of the financial situation with which we have to deal, it will be necessary to take certain action that might not be the appropriate action were we not forced by that situation to contemplate it. Whether the Opposition agrees is a matter for its own judgment. All I say is that, on balance, we believe the decision to temporarily reduce certain salaries was necessary. That is the decision we made, knowing that a great number of people would perceive it to be unpopular.

LIQUOR: WINE

Tax: Representations

185. Mr TROY, to the Premier:

I draw his attention to the fact that despite the widespread speculation that a wine tax would be imposed in the Federal Budget, no such tax was imposed. I ask—

- (1) Is it a fact that the State Government made representations to the Commonwealth on this matter prior to the Budget?
- (2) In the light of Commonwealth's decision not to impose such a tax, how does he regard current prospects for the wine industry in this State?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1) and (2) Mr Speaker—

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I think the Opposition supports a tax on wine. If not, why the guffaws? I had plenty of time to make a

representation to the Federal Government opposing a tax on wine, but the Leader of the Opposition never made such a representation.

Mr Clarko: Have a little whine.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Why did the Opposition not make a representation?

Mr O'Connor: There was no need to do so when we were in Government.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Opposition thinks its responsibilities cease once it loses office, it will not do a thing. Under the Westminster system, an Opposition has a role to play. If members opposite think they can say that in the public interest they should approach the Prime Minister seeking that there not be a tax on wine, that is what they should do. They did not do that. I was pleased that the Commonwealth did not impose a wine tax in the Budget. It is a fact that I personally made representations to the Federal Treasurer (Mr Keating) on this matter.

Mr O'Connor: And so did I.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I did so because I thought the imposition of such a tax would inhibit the strong development taking place in the industry in this State. The wine industry in Western Australia has been undergoing a period of considerable growth. New facilities and wine-making techniques have been installed in the Swan Valley in recent years and I think it is agreed that there has been a dramatic improvement in the quality of wines from the valley.

Grape growers in the Swan Valley will get another boost from the Government's decision to back the establishment of a distillery, something which the Opposition when in Government rejected out of hand.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Members opposite had all the time in the world to fund a distillery and so help the industry, but they sent it packing.

In addition, new grape growing areas have been opened up, most notably around Gingin, Margaret River, and Mt. Barker. In the unlikely event that there is a by-election in Mundaring, I think Mr Troy will win by 4 000 or 5 000 per cent on the majority he had last time.

Mr Clarko: Are you running scared?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: These regions have produced premium wines which have won wide acclaim and which are beginning to penetrate Eastern States markets in a limited way.

Members will be aware that last week two Western Australian wines won major trophies at the Melbourne show, most notably the Jimmy Watson Trophy for dry red wines, Australia's most prestigious wine award.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the House that if these interjections continue it is probable that I will have to do my duty and call for orders of the day to be resumed. If members want questions to continue, they should abide by the rules.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This will give Western Australian wines a huge marketing boost in the Eastern States. My colleague the Minister for Economic Development and Technology has instructed his officers that contact should be made with the industry to ascertain how the Government can help industry to take advantage of the outstanding marketing boost the awards have given the State. For all the reasons, the industry's prospects are obviously bright, and the continued tax-free status of wine will help advance those prospects.

TAXATION: TOBACCO

Federal Budget: Effect

186. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that, as a result of the Commonwealth Government's increase in tobacco excise, the State Government will raise an additional \$1 million approximately through its levy which comes in on top of the Federal excise duty?
- (2) If so, does the Premier plan to ease the level of the State levy?
- (3) If not, will he merely accept the windfall and the further increase that will now occur every six months?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) I am not sure of the exact amount that will be added to the State's revenue as a result of the increase in excise an-

nounced last night in the Federal Budget. I will have the matter looked at and I will ascertain from the Treasury what it believes is the accurate figure.

However, without going into too much detail—because, as the House will know, we are in the midst of Budget considerations and it would not be appropriate to reveal prior to the delivery of the Budget in this place the detail of our considerations—despite those steps we have taken to manage the State's finances in the most efficient way that we think they can be managed, we in this State still have a very difficult budgetary problem with which to contend. While we are doing our best to rein back all expenditure, impinging heavily on departments and their estimates—sending them back not twice or thrice but more than that to the individual Ministers—we still have a serious problem and we are still looking at all the revenue options facing the Government.

In that situation I do not think even the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would believe that we should remit certain taxes if we are to be forced to impose even more burdensome ones in other areas. The matter will be considered and, strange as it may seem, we do not want to impose more taxes or raise more revenue than we believe is prudent.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mullaloo Heights

187. Mrs BEGGS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of the overcrowding problems at the Mullaloo Heights Primary School?
- (2) If yes, what action if any does he intend to take so that all students in the catchment area are accommodated adequately?

Point of Order

Mr CLARKO: In today's questions on notice I asked a question virtually identical to this. Is it in order for a member to ask another question of a similar nature?

The SPEAKER: Order! I know of no Standing Order that precludes a member from asking a question without notice on a similar subject.

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) I thank the member for her question, which does not bear directly on the situation referred to earlier by the member for Karrinyup. The member for Karrinyup sought information on a related point.

Mr CLARKO: I asked what pressures were applying on the Mullaloo Heights Primary School, and you gave me the explanation and told me about the rooms to be built there.

Mrs BEGGS: Let him answer my question.

Mr PEARCE: The situation is that I am very much aware of the population pressures on the Mullaloo Heights Primary School. I am aware of those problems largely because of the very many representations made to me on this question by the member for Whitford, who arranged for me to visit this school and speak to the parents. A two-pronged attack is being made on the problem of reducing the population pressure. The first is that I have personally advanced the construction of the Beldon Primary School from the Education Department's proposed schedule for the school building, which the previous Government had arranged for that school, so that we will be able to have the first stage built and ready for operation for the beginning of the 1985 school year, a year ahead of the proposal which the previous Government had on the drawing board.

Mr CLARKO: Not true; false.

Mr PEARCE: The previous Government had expected to have the school ready for the 1986 school year.

Mr CLARKO: You should withdraw that.

Mr PEARCE: I made the decision to build the Beldon Primary School; no decision had been made previously. The Education Department had a proposal for it to be built and ready for the 1986 school year. The previous Minister had made no decision to advance that work, but I have made that decision now so that it will be ready for the 1985 school year. This will considerably reduce pressure on the Mullaloo Heights Primary School. On the Education Department's projections, the additional four classrooms built this year plus the transportable accommodation which is

on site will provide sufficient accommodation for the children who are projected to be at that school next year.

I will give the member two unequivocal undertakings with regard to this: Firstly, if the growth rate next year turns out to be faster than that projected by the Education Department, additional facilities will be immediately provided; and, secondly—the member has several times taken up this matter with me—there will be no teaching of children in withdrawal areas at Mullaloo Heights Primary School as happened under the previous Minister.

UNION: CIVIL SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Wage Claim

188. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier aware of the report in this morning's *The West Australian* that the Civil Service Association has reached an understanding with him on its 8.35 per cent wage claim?
- (2) Will he inform the House whether that understanding involves an undertaking by the Government not to oppose the wage claim when it goes to arbitration?
- (3) Will he tell the House whether a 4 per cent national wage increase would take about \$56 million out of his Budget, and whether a further 8 per cent increase would take the total cost to about \$170 million a year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) It is necessary that I provide some detail about this matter because the Opposition appears to be ignorant of what has happened publicly previously. Simply put, I informed the CSA—not as a bargaining matter or as a lever to be used in respect of bans that quite frankly were not having any effect, apart from perhaps one area—that the Government had decided the CSA could proceed to lodge its application for the 8.3 per cent increase that it sought by way of application as long ago, I understand, as November 1982. I informed the CSA that provided the application was lodged after the September national wage case, and that in the event the wages freeze remained in place until 23 December—its present projected operative date—there could be no implementation of any judgment that was

handed down until after that wages freeze period.

- (2) Never was any undertaking made or implication given that the Government's decision in respect of the application was other than it might be thought to be; that is, a decision that would assess the needs or the interests of the State, which appeared in the matter of that application. I am now going to tell the Leader of the Opposition what my view is. We would certainly not—I repeat not—support an application for an 8.3 per cent pay increase. Without wanting to prejudice the result of that application, on the fairest possible assumption, it seems that an increase in that matter of 4 per cent might be justified. The Government's decision is simply this: These are exceptional times and people do have to go without. We will be approaching the application in that frame of mind.
- (3) Quite frankly, I do not know the answer to this question; however, I do know that if we are to return to a system of centralised wage fixing, and if that centralised system is to work, we cannot have by State Governments making unilateral decisions which burn away any judgment or decision that is handed down. If we are to have a centralised system, it must be "one in, all in"; that is the only way it will work. The result of the individual and unilateral actions by parties to the individual relationship was the breakdown of the previous system of indexation, so we have a commitment to pass on any increase that is awarded in the national wage case, and that is a commitment we will seek.

LIBERAL PARTY

Mr Geoff McDonald: Speech

189. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Youth and Community Services with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Is he aware that a meeting was held in Kununurra on 16 August 1983 at which the speaker, Mr Geoff McDonald, was introduced by Mr Joe Kerekes, executive officer of the Liberal Party's Kalgoorlie north division?
- (2) Has he seen a report of that meeting which outlines Mr McDonald's speech linking the Aboriginal land rights move-

ment with the Communist Party, an independent black nation, false sacred stones, Taubmans paint traditional paintings and Christians in the Uniting Church, the Victorian Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches having communist links to exploit aborigines?

- (3) Is he concerned about these reported statements and comments of Mr McDonald?
- (4) Is he aware that the Liberal Party executive officer, in introducing Mr McDonald, is alleged to have said, "We are behind his activities and we support him"?

Mr WILSON replied:

I thank the member for some notice of his question.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: I have to rule that question out of order. Had it been put to the Premier, I may have considered it, but in the circumstances of its being directed to a Minister, I rule the question is out of order.

Question Without Notice Resumed

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Cannington: Political Speech

190. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that approximately two weeks ago the Federal member for Tangay (Mr Gear) in company with another Federal member visited the Cannington High School to present flags to the school?
- (2) Is he aware that following the presentation of the flags the Federal member for Tangay proceeded to make a highly-charged party-political speech concerning electoral matters?
- (3) Has the Minister received any complaints about this?
- (4) Will the Minister investigate the matter?
- (5) Does the Minister believe that in our school system there should be a proper balance and a proper presentation of political views?
- (6) Does the Minister consider that the presentation of such a political speech in

a high school in those circumstances is a legitimate activity within a school?

Mr MacKinnon: Mr Gear will be a very short-term member!

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (4) I am unaware of the incident to which the member refers because no complaints of any type have been made about this matter, except by the member raising the question this evening. I presume that since the school is a long way from the member's own electorate he is only reporting on alleged facts in this matter and not from any personal knowledge.
 - (5) With regard to the general question on treatment of political issues in schools, I have conscientiously and firmly taken the view since the day I became Minister that all such issues should be dealt with on a strictly objective basis with provision made for all points of view to be discussed. I have made this point to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who had raised the question about such treatment following the complaint by the RSL. I have rebuked on television the ministerial adviser who was reported as having communicated a different course of action with regard to electoral reform. The rules with respect to the treatment of contentious issues are rather objective and they are very firmly enforced in the school system and are supported wholly by me. However, I have received no complaints with regard to the Federal member for Tangay or any other members about the sorts of speeches they have made when presenting these flags. If the member wishes to persist with—
- Mr Hassell: I asked if you would investigate the matter.
- Mr PEARCE: I am not going to investigate it on the basis of assertions made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.
- Mr Hassell: Good heavens above!
- Mr O'Connor: You will let anything happen.
- Mr Old: That is objective.
- Mr PEARCE: The question was based on allegations only. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition clearly was not present.
- Mr O'Connor: You abused the Parliament the way you were carrying on there.
- Mr PEARCE: If the member wants to make a formal objection to my quoting the

first-hand source of the complaint and not a vague allegation—

Mr Hassell: It is not a vague allegation. It is quite specific.

Mr PEARCE: —I will look into the matter.

ELECTORAL: VOTING

Liberal Party Platform

191. Mrs HENDERSON, to the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform:

Is the Minister aware that in respect of the Federal Parliament the Liberal Party of Australia policy states—

..... there needs to be:

An electoral system which guarantees as far as practicable equality of voting powers, with regular redistributions and compulsory voting.

I ask—

Does this accord with the policy of the Western Australian Government?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Obviously the policy referred to was in regard to an electoral system which relates—

Mr Clarko: Is this State or Federal policy?

Mr TONKIN: —to redistribution—

Point of Order

Mr CLARKO: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: I know what the member is about to say and I must rule that question out of order.

Questions Without Notice Resumed

LIQUOR: DISTILLERY

Swan Valley

192 Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) In relation to the proposed Government assistance to grape growers in the Swan Valley of which he appears to be well acquainted, was an independent financial examination of the project conducted by his Government as was the

case with the Esperance Meat Exporters Ltd. project?

- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If it was, did the inquiry recommend that the project proceed?
- (4) When will full details of the assistance be made public?
- (5) If the detail is not to be made public, why not?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (5) I know this matter has been the subject of interjections of a repeated nature by the member, and I suppose he has a particular interest in it; however, I am unable to provide the specific answers that he requires in response to a question without notice. If the member puts the question on notice he will receive a considered response. In general terms, all I can say is that as far as possible the Government always ensures that very strict financial criteria are complied with prior to providing any assistance of the nature referred to in the question and that, obviously, was the case in the instance the member referred to in regard to the Esperance Meat Exporters Ltd.

Mr MacKinnon: You would be happy to provide this information if I put the question on notice?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have already said that in a general sense, as was accepted in the Esperance Meat Exporters case, we do take steps to ensure that the financial criteria are complied with.

LIBERAL PARTY

Mr Geoff McDonald: Speech

193. Mr BRIDGE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that a meeting was held in Kununurra on 16 August 1983 at which the speaker, Mr Geoff McDonald, was introduced by Mr Joe Kerekes, executive officer of the Liberal Party's Kalgoorlie north division?
- (2) Has he seen a report of that meeting which outlines Mr McDonald's speech linking the Aboriginal land rights movement with the Communist Party, an independent black nation, false sacred stones, Taubmans paint traditional paintings and Christians in the Uniting Church, the Victorian Council of

Churches and the World Council of Churches having Communist links to exploit Aborigines?

- (3) Is he concerned about these reported statements and comments of Mr McDonalds?
- (4) Is he aware that the Liberal Party executive officer in introducing Mr McDonald is alleged to have said, "We are behind his activities and we support him"?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) I am advised that this is so.
- (2) Yes, I am concerned.
- (3) Yes. If the report is correct, Mr McDonald, whom I understand is the author of a book entitled *Red Over Black*, appears to be spreading a crazed conspiracy theory based on racial hatred, promotion of untruths, and the linking of Aboriginal land needs and communism by the most dubious and illogical methods. These actions do nothing to advance the continued racial harmony of the area and are both destructive and counterproductive for the people of the region.
- (4) Yes, I am aware of the statement that was allegedly made by the executive officer of the Liberal Party's Kalgoorlie north division. The Liberal Party should be ashamed of itself for deliberately promoting division and disharmony within the community to suit its own narrow prejudice and bitter political ends.

ROAD

Blue River

194. Mr O'CONNOR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is there a section of road which the Derby Shire is unable to complete on the Blue River Road in Kimberley?
- (2) Could the Minister advise the reason the shire is unable to complete this road?

Mr GRILL replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for some notice of the question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) and (2) There is no road named "Blue River Road" in Kimberley. However, a check with the council indicated that the road in question could be the proposed access to Blue Water at Cone Bay. This has been called the "Meda-Oobagooma-Kimbolton-Cone Bay Road"—

Mr Hassell: No wonder he called it the blue river road.

Mr GRILL: —for which a \$277 000 programme over the years 1982-83—1988-89 has been approved by the Commonwealth Minister for Transport from the Australian bicentennial road development fund. Before work commences, the council has to resolve environmental issues and the necessary clearances for the road to pass through traditional tribal grounds of the Bardi and Mowanjam people. The council currently is negotiating with the communities and seeking formal approval from the Aboriginal Lands Trust for a 2.5 km section at Cone Bay.