

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 5 November 1981

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 10.45 a.m., and read prayers.

BUSH FIRES AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mrs Craig (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

Second Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the second reading.

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [10.46 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This amendment to the Bush Fires Act is designed to overcome problems which have arisen where new models of self-propelled harvesting machinery, marketed in Western Australia, do not have vertically discharging exhaust systems. It has been claimed that these machines fall within the definition of a "tractor" under the Bush Fires Act and consequently do not comply with existing legislation.

While fire safety is not jeopardised, insurance companies are insistent that the machinery must comply with all legal requirements to qualify for insurance cover. There are technical reasons that the configuration of exhausts cannot be changed and if the owner provides his own modifications, warranty would be affected. This anomaly was brought to the attention of the Bush Fires Board by a number of local authorities and by the Country Shire Councils' Association.

The Bush Fires Board initially tried to resolve the issue administratively by an approach to the insurance industry to ascertain whether agreement could be reached between the insured and his insurance company, particularly as fire safety was not an issue. This approach was rejected by the insurance industry.

In these circumstances there is no alternative but to amend the bush fire legislation in order to preserve the insurance cover so necessary to the farming community.

The amendments remove the absolute requirement for exhaust systems to discharge vertically on self-propelled harvesting machinery by allowing an alternative configuration whereby

the exhaust systems on self-propelled harvesters, if discharging at least two metres from the ground, may discharge horizontally or upwards of the horizontal plane. All other fire safety precautions relating to exhausts are retained.

The Country Shire Councils' Association supports the principle that the present anomaly should be removed. Provision is included in the Bill for an extension of fire extinguisher requirements as a consequence of these amendments.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Tonkin.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Government School Teachers Arbitration and Appeal Amendment Bill.
2. Education Amendment Bill.

Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Grayden (Minister for Education), and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from 4 November.

MR McIVER (Avon) [10.54 a.m.]: I welcome this opportunity to contribute to this Budget debate. The main theme of my address will highlight for the people of Western Australia the shortcomings and wastefulness of this Government.

I am disturbed by a report I have just received that the staff of the Avondale research station at Beverley are to be retrenched. It is most unfortunate the Government has taken the step to retrench the staff at the research station at Beverley. In fact, that was a criminal decision.

Yesterday I addressed a question without notice to the Minister for Agriculture. I was unaware of the fact that he was in the Cocos Islands; therefore, I have placed some questions on the notice paper in order that the Minister may clarify the situation. I do not know whether he intends to buy the Cocos Islands!

Sir Charles Court: He is up there because of the great importance of the Cocos Islands as a strategic quarantine station and he is representing all State Ministers.

MR McIVER: I have no quarrel with Ministers travelling in that way.

In the last two years the Government has spent \$251 507 on the research station at Beverley and it intends now to close it down. The Government should be castigated for taking such a step.

Sir Charles Court: Who said it is being closed down?

Mr McIVER: I understand it will be operated on a caretaker basis. I realise some of the comments I am making may not be totally accurate, because, in its usual way, the Government has not made a statement on this. It is scandalous that the Manager of the Beverley Research Station has been taken to task for speaking to people from Channel 7, because he has simply told the truth.

Mr Mensaros: It is not like closing down the refinery, is it?

Mr McIVER: The closure of the research station in any form will have a big impact on the small community at Beverley, because when families are taken out of the town, the economy is affected. I know the Minister could not care less about three or four families leaving Beverley but it concerns the shire, the business people, and the workers themselves.

The Government made great play of the Avondale Research Station and even had Prince Charles open it. It was one of the highlights of the states 150th anniversary celebrations and it is an indication of the insensitivity of the Government that it intends to curtail the operations there.

Mr Laurance: He opened the historic farm, not the research station.

Mr McIVER: Prince Charles opened the Avondale Research Station after the Government spent \$251 507 on it. I was present at the opening.

Mr Laurance: I have seen the stone.

Mr McIVER: If the Honorary Minister wants to treat this matter in a lighthearted manner and if he does not think it is of any real significance, he should come to Beverley with me and face the people.

Mr Laurance: There are two facilities: One is the historic farm and the other is the research station.

Mr McIVER: I do not need any assistance from the Honorary Minister. I am aware of what those facilities have achieved especially in regard to agriculture in the rich farming area of the Avon Valley. No-one can dispute the achievements which have been made in that area.

Every time one turns on the television, one is told how much the Liberal Government is doing for the State. However, bearing in mind the amount the Government has spent on this project,

I wonder about its efficiency, because it intends now to retrench the staff and run the research station on a caretaker basis. It appears to me the Government is not using its common sense in this regard.

The Government stands condemned for its actions concerning the research station, because not only will the activities of the research station and the staff be affected, but also it will have a great impact on the economy of the community.

The children of the research station staff attend the local school. When these children are taken away from the town, pupil numbers at the school will be reduced and there is always the danger of the school losing a teacher. Not only will the research station itself be affected by the Government's decision, but also the surrounding community will bear the brunt of it. I trust common sense will prevail and the matter will be examined further.

It is most unfortunate the Minister concerned with this issue is not here today, because he could explain it by way of interjection. However, I shall take up the matter again when we deal with the Parts of the Budget and I hope the Government will review the bad decision it has made in this regard.

Sir Charles Court: What is your concern: the historic farm or the research station?

Mr McIVER: I am concerned about both.

Sir Charles Court: But you said something was closing down. What is closing down?

Mr McIVER: Perhaps I should have used the words "winding down". Does the Treasurer intend to give me an assurance no-one employed at the Avondale Research Station will lose his job?

Sir Charles Court: That is not a reasonable request at a time when the Government has to effect economies, but it does not mean to say something is being shut down.

Mr McIVER: The Treasurer is aware both the Balladong Farm and the Avondale Research Station are situated in the area of the Avon Valley. He would be aware also of the objections voiced by both factions when they came into being. As a result of the Government's decision, both the Balladong Farm and the Avondale Research Station will suffer, because at the time of their inauguration it was emphasised they would complement each other. People would be able to view agriculture in its early stages at Balladong, and they would then be able to go to the research station and see it at a more advanced stage. Unfortunately, as a result of the

withdrawal of funds by the Government, both facilities will suffer.

I should like now to refer to education. I have heard various Government members say what the teachers should and should not do, but I have a different sort of problem at Northam at the present time where a special education unit is necessary. If such a unit were provided, disadvantaged students—those suffering from handicaps such as deafness—would be able to receive the special attention they require. At the present time the teachers at the primary school do not have the time to give such children the sort of attention they need.

I am pleased to see the Minister for Education has returned to the Chamber, because I am aware he has a sound knowledge of this matter. If ever a town required a unit to accommodate students of this nature, it is Northam, which is the focal point of the Avon Valley. If the Government established a special education unit at Northam, children from York, Toodyay, and Goomalling would be able to obtain the specialised education they need.

Not only would such a unit assist greatly the children and their parents, but it would also provide the basic sort of education such children require when they have to go out into the world and meet the challenges of life.

I appeal to the Minister to take up the matter with his departmental officers and I trust that the 1982 Budget allocation will contain funds for the establishment of a special education unit in Northam which will cater for the type of students to whom I have referred.

Mr Grayden: We have been examining representations you have made in a great deal of detail and we will certainly do everything we can to overcome the problem.

Mr McIVER: I am delighted to hear the Minister's comments. It is very heartening news.

I should like to refer in more detail to the situation at Balladong Farm. I am pleased to see we have some young people in the gallery this morning, because their history lessons may not have contained the fact that Balladong Farm was the first farm in the colony of Western Australia. When Ensign Dale discovered the Avon region the first farm was established at Balladong. Therefore, Balladong was of great significance at that time and it is of great significance today.

I am aware the Honorary Minister for Tourism has visited York and he is genuine in his endeavours to do something for the district by way of obtaining further funds. However, it is vital that Balladong Farm be allowed to continue

in operation. Indeed, it is of greater value than the Hole in the Wall Theatre which, according to an article in this morning's issue of *The West Australian*, will receive an allocation of funds from the State Government so that it can continue. I do not quarrel with that but Balladong is also entitled to a further grant.

Mr Grayden: That is a WA Arts Council decision. It has nothing to do with the Government.

Mr McIVER: Would not the Government indirectly provide the WA Arts Council with finance?

I maintain that it is an allocation of Government funds, whether directly or indirectly. The point I am making is that Balladong Farm is screaming out for funds to continue its operations. Whenever a Cabinet Minister has visited Balladong Farm, he has always had a great deal of praise for what it has accomplished. However, once a Minister drives out of the gate he forgets all about it.

Mr Laurance: That is not quite right, you know. Substantial funds have been put into that by the Department of Tourism and by the Commonwealth Government as well.

Mr McIVER: Now it wants a little bit more.

Mr Laurance: And there will be more.

Mr McIVER: There are sound reasons for asking for it.

Mr Laurance: I agree.

Mr McIVER: What I am endeavouring to promote here this morning—

Mr Laurance: I just want you to get the story straight.

Mr McIVER: When we consider that \$251 507 is given to Avondale Research Station, a project that is run on a more or less autonomous basis, and one which I will touch on further when I come to it; then there is the leasing agreement of \$750 000 for the gantry situation at Kewdale which is being given to private enterprise, surely we realise Balladong Farm should have a bite of the cherry.

Mr Laurance: It has had several bites of the cherry. It is still being supported; I want to make that clear.

Mr McIVER: They have not been bites—only nibbles.

Sir Charles Court: Fair go—you do the cause no good.

Mr McIVER: When we look at what has been allocated to other projects, surely we know

Balladong Farm should attract more support. We want only a fair share.

I will come back to my main theme; it is imperative that Balladong Farm be allowed to continue to operate in the way that was intended. York Shire is only a small shire; it is a small community. At the moment the shire is conducting a referendum to ascertain whether it can obtain private donations to continue with the concept. I think it is fair to say that the community is equally divided on this point, so I do not think we can assume that we will obtain much assistance for this very important project.

Young school children visit Balladong Farm, and they see sheep being shorn as they were shorn in the early days of settlement. They can actually see the old implements that were used by our forebears. This is so much better than looking at drawings in a textbook. The students have the benefit of the expertise available at Balladong Farm.

Balladong Farm is a unique project and it is incredible that it may be forced to close for the sake of a few miserly dollars. Yet this Government can see fit to give \$1 million to the business people outside the Perth railway station so that they may go bankrupt. That is \$1 million down the drain and yet we have to get on our knees to try to obtain a few dollars to keep this unique complex going. The Government ought to be ashamed of itself.

Mr MacKinnon: That is not true—not \$1 million.

Mr Laurance: What we need is solid community support behind the project.

Mr McIVER: The Honorary Minister does not need to give me a history lesson about Balladong Farm. I have been associated with this project right from its inception. The Honorary Minister must extend his energies when he is in the Cabinet room. That is how he can assist.

Mr Laurance: You haven't done enough yet. There is no community support.

Mr McIVER: That is utter nonsense. Thousands of people have gone through Balladong Farm since it was opened, and the shire has made a wonderful contribution.

Mr Laurance: Yes, but what about the community?

Mr McIVER: The shire has only limited resources; it is one of the smallest shires in Western Australia. What is needed is someone with a bit of drive.

Mr Laurance: What about you?

Mr McIVER: Someone with a bit of foresight. That is what we need from the Government side.

Mr Laurance: You get community drive behind it.

Mr Davies: He is a member of Parliament; he is not an organiser.

Mr Laurance: It needs a little bit of extra interest in it.

Mr McIVER: People in country areas are a little short of money at the moment brought about by the economic policies of this Government.

Mr Laurance: There has been a lot of shouting, but not much work from you.

Mr Brian Burke: You have not done much. A disgraceful Honorary Minister for Housing.

Mr Laurance: I have visited the farm more than he has.

Mr Barnett: The nearest you get to drive is the gravel in your brain.

Mr Young: He has been drinking unsweetened lemon juice.

Mr McIVER: I think the Honorary Minister has got the message even though he is a boy on a man's errand.

Mr Laurance: I think you have, too.

Mr Brian Burke: It is a Government in reverse.

Mr McIVER: There has been a complete lack of Government understanding on this project. The interjections from the other side of the House have shown that Government members need some education on this matter. It is all very well for the Honorary Minister for Tourism to say he has visited the farm a few times. What he must do is get some money for it.

Mr Laurance: It has been given money. The State Government supported it, and the York Shire.

Mr McIVER: And the money has been spent wisely. Far more wisely than the Honorary Minister's Government has spent money during its term of office. It has wasted millions of dollars.

Mr Laurance: Get the community behind it. The State Government has been right behind it—so has the shire.

Mr Brian Burke: A long way behind!

Mr McIVER: I hope that some of my comments have penetrated into the minds of front-bench Government members.

Mr Hodge: Not too much!

Mr McIVER: The farm needs assistance from the Government if it is not to close.

Mr Laurance: What if you became chairman of the local support group?

Mr McIVER: I have enough to do in my electorate without being chairman of a support group. I would say I have double the work in my electorate than has the Honorary Minister in his little tin-pot electorate.

I call also for funds to construct a new bridge over the Avon River, to replace the present bridge known as Monger's Bridge. Years ago this bridge collapsed and, due to the heavy rains and the recent winter rains, a further section of it has been washed away. If we look at the amount of money the Government has allocated to construction such as the bridges over the Avon River in the York region, we find it is very little, and the time is coming when they all must be replaced. However, if we are going to encourage people to come to Balladong Farm and raise money for it so it will be more autonomous and if we contribute as a community, as the Minister mentioned, we must have access to it. We cannot have people coming to a town where they have to go several miles further on if there is no bridge to cross to give them additional access. I realise bridges cost money and that there has been a reduction of Federal funding for road works and the like, but this bridge has been out of action now for years and it is only fair that if money is going to be equally distributed through country areas, money should be spent on bridges in the Avon region, particularly in the York section. The last rains through the Avon River and the flow of water following the rains in the last wet season have certainly had a detrimental effect. I do not say that to be an alarmist.

The bridges have been checked by very capable people in the Main Roads Department and they have indicated that at the moment the bridges are safe—

Mr Davies: If it does not rain.

Mr McIVER: —but the time is coming when they must be replaced and that cannot be done all at once. It must be done in stages. This financial year let us have support by the provision of funds for the replacement of a bridge over the Avon River, a bridge that has been out of order for many years.

I now wish to speak on a health situation.

Mr Laurance: You look very healthy.

Mr McIVER: I mentioned the Northam special education unit. We also need a hostel for our aged people. I am delighted to say that we have a three stage plan at the moment under which the lower floor of our regional hospital has become a day hospital where our elderly folk, our senior

citizens, can have an enjoyable day with trained staff. We also have a permanent care unit that is an absolute disgrace. It has 17 patients and no more can be accommodated because all it is is the old surgical wing of the hospital which was converted into a PCU. It should never have been allowed; however, it is with us.

I attended discussions with senior officers of the medical department and we talked about the third floor of the Northam Regional Hospital being for the sick. I use the word "geriatric", although I do not think it is the modern term. The floor will be a geriatric wing, and I have no quarrel with that, although I would like to see the project speeded up.

There was a survey in connection with the establishment of a hostel in Northam, and that survey clearly indicated a hostel was needed urgently. I wrote to the Minister pointing out that Harrison House, which was the old nurses' quarters in Northam but which is not now utilised, is an ideal premises. It is a two-storied magnificent building with rooms and equipment that would lend themselves so well to this, but they are lying there idle.

Mr Hodge: What did the Minister say?

Mr McIVER: He said it would be examined after these other two stages were implemented. It has come to the situation now where we are losing so many of our senior people because they have to go to Perth and try to find "C"-class accommodation to suit their needs, incurring an additional cost, when we have lying idle an empty building which has not been utilised for years. The carpets are still on the floor; the wardrobes are still there; there is a television, and even oil heating equipment. That has all been just lying there representing capital expenditure lying idle for years. All we have to do is spend a few thousand dollars by adding an additional wing for an eating area, and perhaps a lift from the bottom floor to the top floor, and that would be all. It would not be a huge expense, but it would meet a great need.

Mr Hodge: The Minister is not even listening to you.

Mr McIVER: He has heard me on this subject before, so he knows all about it.

Mr Young: The Minister is listening.

Mr McIVER: Along with our special education unit one of the most important projects needed in our district is somewhere to cater for our aged people who can not look after themselves and live in their own homes, but, because of the size of their home, it has become too much to manage. How often have we heard the saying, "Poor Mrs

Brown. She should be in a home"? But there is nothing wrong with Mrs Brown; all she wants is the gutter mended and the lawn mowed and somebody to dig the garden. That is all that is wrong with Mrs Brown. With the loss of her partner, the home has become too large and she cannot manage those manual tasks. This hostel situation is ideal, particularly for a regional centre like Northam.

The capital expenditure required to make it operational is very little indeed. I told the medical officers at the time that I was in agreement with their stage three operation. That hospital concept now must be expedited, for the reasons I have so strongly stated here this morning. It is of paramount importance that we have a hostel for these people.

I assure the Minister that if it were implemented, we have the people and the expertise to run it. I make the promise here this morning that it will not fail. We could cut down further expense by having meals cooked at the hospital, remembering that Harrison House is a former nurses' quarters and is within the hospital grounds. We could enter into a lease agreement with the Government to have the meals cooked for the patients and for the laundry to be done, together with other ancillary services, because this is what takes the money—the running expenses.

We have the people to do just that, but need the assistance of hospital staff, and the Government's sanction. It is of great importance that the Government examine my proposal.

I strongly object to and voice a protest concerning the Government's proposal to hand over the LCL traffic of Westrail to private enterprise. What it is going to do is give away millions of dollars of capital expenditure to private enterprise so that private enterprise can further its endeavours and receive larger profits. This will have a detrimental effect on country people, particularly primary producers in remote country areas, because they will be at the ransom of these freight forwarders, as far as freight rates are concerned.

That is the major aspect of the matter. Secondly, it will further lower the morale of Westrail employees and it will retard promotion for anyone who has made that instrumentality his profession. Staff will be retrenched and it will encourage industrial unrest.

Let us put the matter into perspective. We have another situation where we do not know what will take place. Except for one news release, we have not been informed about the matter. I understand tenders will be called, inviting free enterprise to

take over LCL traffic; in other words, freight forwarders will deliver these goods to country regions.

The cost to send a muffler for a motor vehicle from Kewdale to Northam—or a commodity of up to 10 kilogrammes—is \$3. If that freight is placed with private enterprise the cost will be \$9—a difference of \$6 for just one article. We can imagine what it would cost for farm implements to be sent to country areas when that take-over is completed. By Christmas and definitely by June 1982, 800 Westrail employees will be affected. I do not know whether those employees will be invited to join the freight forwarders. If the employees of Westrail at Kewdale are to be employed by the freight forwarders, I can envisage industrial problems arising under their award. We have already seen what happened with the AWU and the waterside workers and I would have thought the Government would learn its lesson from that exercise. I am sure the same situation will take place with Westrail employees.

When a person works in a position for 35 to 40 years and it is suddenly taken from him, he will not accept that action with delight. Why is the Government hell-bent on giving away our assets?

The income from the Gantry Road at Kewdale is in the vicinity of \$250 000 and it is to be leased to private enterprise for \$70 000 so that it can rip off the country people. It is to be leased for the miserly sum of \$70 000. I am not sure of further figures involved because we have not been able to obtain them from the Government. Anyway, the Minister for Transport is not here and I would have hoped that he could enlighten me by way of interjection.

The Government is receiving \$250 000 annual income from Gantry Road and is to lease it for \$70 000. I cannot be told that that is not a giveaway.

We have already had the situation where freight rates for grain have increased and objections were raised by farmers and their organisations. I wonder what will happen when they are at the mercy of these freight forwarders. If a farmer were waiting for plough shears, it would not be a case of the part being put on a truck as Westrail does and sent by the first available train. The freight forwarders will wait until they have a full truckload for that locality. The farming producer could be held up for four or five days in the middle of harvesting or seeding. He may have to travel to Perth for the part at his own expense.

Mr Grewar: It will be better. It takes three weeks on Westrail.

Mr McIVER: I challenge that statement. Where does it take three weeks? With such a large enterprise as Westrail, how can it be profitable when the Government is continually dismantling it and causing morale of such a low ebb? The morale has never been at such a low ebb and the reason for that is the decisions made by the Government.

I should like further information on the member for Roe's statement that it could take three weeks to have something forwarded by Westrail. If it were a small article it could easily be sidetracked because of the human element involved. Some of our large transport companies also make mistakes and at times goods have finished up in the Eastern States.

The Government's action which will cause unemployment must be challenged; it must be objected to in the strongest possible terms. I make a plea also to country members on the Government side and say that if they are genuine in their representation of country people they must consider this situation and discuss it with the people who pay them to do their job.

Sir Charles Court: I think you have not realised that they probably are right behind the proposed change, because I think they will receive a quicker service.

Mr McIVER: I was hoping the Premier would make some contribution.

Sir Charles Court: Do not forget that Westrail remains a participant.

Mr McIVER: Yes I know it remains a participant, but a greatly reduced one. I am saying that the proposal will be to the detriment of the country people. It will have a detrimental effect on freight rates. The Premier has been very evasive and secretive about what is to take place. I have a good idea which company will be involved, but I will not state its name. That company will have gold poured into its hands. The Government will more or less hand over its capital asset which belongs to the people of Western Australia. I am sure that in time I will be proved correct.

Sir Charles Court: I think you would be wise to wait and see what is proposed. First of all, it is expected to save Westrail a great deal of its deficit by 1984, and secondly, it will provide a greater service to the public.

Mr McIVER: I am pleased the Premier mentioned Westrail's deficit. It will already affect 800 employees and from the information I have received—and I believe it is authentic—after

Christmas the Government intends to disband a further 18 railway stations in the country, as has been done recently at Bencubbin, Ballidu, and Bolgart.

By taking away the railway offices from those centres the opportunity to enter into a competitive field is reduced because there is no-one there to negotiate, so the people will use road transport.

Of course that is what it is designed to do because of the continual dismantling of Westrail. As members know it is very poor that people who have been very conscientious and who have given a life service should be rewarded with retrenchment. Another term now being used by the policy makers of Westrail for this is "cross-pollinating". They are the latest words to describe the practice of a person doing someone else's job. It is maintained that with long service leave and annual leave not so many men will be affected when in essence the people who have the most long service leave—some have even four lots—are senior officials. I cannot understand why they are not instructed to take the long service leave that is owing to them instead of it accumulating to the extent that they are able to take away large cheques from the Treasury. That is not why long service leave was granted; it was granted for services rendered. I note that my time has expired, but I have welcomed the opportunity to speak in this Chamber.

Mr Grewar: You have three minutes.

Mr McIVER: I will accept any criticism, within reason, of the statements I have made. Perhaps it can be proved that some of the things I have said are wrong and I hope the comments I made in relation to the Avondale Research Station were wrong. However, it is evident from the interjections of the Treasurer that I am correct in my thinking in terms of the number of personnel who will be retrenched. It will have a light role to play. When thousands of dollars are spent on projects including the research station at Katanning, there is no wonder that funds are not available to meet the State's education and health requirements. It is also no wonder that the Prime Minister of this country is so reluctant to give additional funds to this State which cannot manage the finances it receives at present.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [11.37 a.m.]: Unaccustomed as I am to speaking from this distance from the table, there are a few points I would like to raise in this debate. One matter is that of defence, and we have heard a considerable amount of debate from both sides of this House on this subject. One never ceases to be amazed by the statements made by the so-called experts.

They talk about first strikes, second strikes, and third strikes. These people wheel in matters relating to nuclear submarines and things of that kind.

This State needs some form of defence force which is practical and which can be put into operation quickly. It should be based in Derby, Broome, or thereabouts. We should not be trying to compare this country's defence forces and equipment with the major military powers of the world, or trying to match them, because that would be absolute stupidity. It is hopeless for the Treasurer, members of the Opposition, or the Treasurer's colleagues to debate this matter in this House and to go on *ad infinitum* hoping that results will be achieved. Nothing can be achieved.

No-one, not even the chiefs of staff of our defence forces, can tell us when or where Australia is likely to be attacked within the next 15 years. The equipment that Australia is buying or putting into operation—and it is expensive equipment—will be well and truly obsolete by the time this country is attacked. Considering the way in which the world is going one would doubt very much whether conventional-type operational equipment would be any good in a major confrontation. However, Australia needs a defence force. One of the reasons we need a defence force, particularly Navy and Air Force patrols, is that Australia is very close to the South-East Asian countries.

Through State agreements we have granted valuable leases to companies to develop the North-West Shelf and other such areas in that vicinity, but what protection have we offered to those companies? In other words we have people living there in a community situation, and if they are attacked by some sophisticated pirates we cannot defend them. We do not have a gun boat of our own. The Commonwealth Government has one patrol boat operating, but we have a mighty big coastline. Only in the last two or three days oil tankers off the west coast of Africa, when proceeding at their normal speed of 10 to 15 knots, were attacked by sophisticated pirates and were robbed at either gun or knife point. It will not be long before we experience this kind of activity if we have no way of defending the oil rigs along our coast. There is already a lot of activity in relation to the boat people and this is taking place not very far from our coast. We do not need war vessels with nuclear plants; what we need are fast patrol boats that can operate effectively from the north-west.

Mr Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: We need at least three of these boats so that when one is being refitted two are operational.

We also need Air Force surveillance in order that we can ascertain where the boat people or drug runners are situated. A surveillance system conducted on a contract basis by civil airlines is nonsensical. The defence system is part and parcel of the policing of this country and it has to be defended from illegal drug running and illegal immigrants. The whole defence system in this country needs to be reorientated to be part of the civilian make up. At the moment defence is treated as a separate entity and I have always queried this.

An allocation for the State Emergency Service has again this year been included in the expenditure columns of the State's Budget. In the case of an emergency, action should be the prime responsibility of our defence forces and the State Government.

All personnel in our defence forces ought to be trained primarily to cope with fire, flood, famine, earthquake, or whatever disaster might occur. If given this task, members of our defence forces would be more firmly integrated into a community system. The Commonwealth or State Governments should act quickly to provide a better defence system. Unfortunately the Treasurer does not take heed of this. However, in the not-too-distant future two or three people stationed on an oil rig may be attacked by pirates and then, perhaps, he will say something should be done. The Treasurer was warned, but he is not interested.

We should ensure a fast naval patrol vessel is available in the vicinity to ward off any such occurrences. We should not enter into agreements and controls which we are not able to police. The only way we could police that situation would be to get the Commonwealth to accept its responsibility through the Constitution Act for our defence. If the Commonwealth is responsible for our defence, it is also responsible for the defence of people who drill for oil or gas on the continental shelf. It is time we did something in this regard, rather than allow the matter to go on and on, and talk about gigantic naval bases at Cockburn and the like.

Some criticism was levelled at the Whitlam Government the other night. However, one of the very practical things which came out of that Government was in relation to defence. The then Minister for Defence (Mr Barnard) took a personal interest in the matter and visited the north and areas around Derby, and even

considered purchasing stations for the purpose of establishing multiple defence training bases. The Navy, of course, was a little chary about the proposal because of the extent of the tides in the area. The Navy is the senior service and, if the tides are running against it, it might cause it more problems than it would normally have and, as a result, the Navy did not want to be in it and caused the whole proposal to fall through.

It is important we understand we are not going to have mighty warships in the area, or visits from the American Fleet from time to time. They are for those countries which can afford it; we cannot. We are not in that class and we should concentrate on making sure our particular needs are met. We must remain within the class we can afford by ensuring the north coast of this State is patrolled by fast naval patrol boats and is backed up by adequate military personnel who can quickly pick up anyone who happens to lodge on our coast.

Mr McPharlin interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mt. Marshall should have consideration for the fact that *Hansard* is at the opposite end of the Chamber from his position.

Mr JAMIESON: For the benefit of *Hansard*, I indicate the member for Mt. Marshall said that Mr Barnard did very little in obtaining more sophisticated equipment. I remind the honourable member that Mr Barnard was the first Australian to fly in an F111. The purchase of these aircraft was arranged by the Menzies Government, at great cost to the Australian taxpayer. All sorts of delays occurred and when the Whitlam Government came into office, the aircraft still had not been delivered. Mr Barnard went over to America to try to establish what was happening.

It was difficult for the Whitlam Government, faced as it was with an expensive legacy from a previous Government, to make available money for the purchase of the sophisticated equipment to which the member for Mt. Marshall refers. Indeed, I believe we should not be in the market for such equipment; that is where we are falling down. We simply cannot become a major military power, so there is no use our even trying to be in that league.

It is high time we woke up to ourselves and framed our defence forces around our requirements. If people enter our territory, we should be in a position to get rid of them, or arrest them, or do what is necessary, and fast naval patrol vessels would go a long way to achieving that end. All we have been able to do to date is occasionally to sneak up on a few Taiwanese

fishing boats when they enter our waters from time to time. We bring them down to Fremantle and put their boats in the dock and we are like the collie dog which has caught a car; we do not know what to do with them. Generally, the boats are confiscated and the fishermen are repatriated to Taiwan or whatever their country of origin may be.

That is the type of defence we need for the north of our State. A military base stationed in the north would provide a great economic impetus to the local communities, whose business people find it difficult to maintain their activities due to the lack of population. It does not help an isolated area to have military bases stationed near Melbourne, Sydney, or other large cities, because the economic benefit of such bases are lost due to the proximity of the cities.

If we are to use our defence forces to assist in decentralisation, military bases should not be placed too close to major centres of population. I realise that problems will occur in relation to leave and other matters when military personnel are stationed a great distance from major cities. However, there is a not insignificant air service to the area, and I am sure some arrangements could be made and any problems overcome.

We have heard a great deal of argument during the course of the debate about the matter of wages and salaries, and their effect on inflation; the same old arguments I have heard from the Liberal Party since I entered Parliament have been trotted out once again. Not once has any member of the Government advanced a practical solution to the problem.

Members opposite are crooked about strikes. However, they do not object to the situation where a farmer finds he has not received an adequate return for his wheat, and decides that, next year, he will grow barley because he will receive a better return for his product. That is a form of the withholding of a commodity that normally would be expected to be available on the world market. However, that does not seem to matter to members opposite; they are interested in attacking only the workers who withhold the only thing they can; namely, their labour, and their ability to produce.

Members opposite never come forward with an overall plan of activity which will lead to a better economic system. The Liberal Party is interested in representing only the wealthy producers of this country. Of course, the Liberal Party top notchers are not the wealthy producers; they simply sit in judgment and make their investments, whether their money has been gained properly or

improperly in the past. They are not the ones who actually earn the money.

Mr McPharlin: You are overlooking the risks involved in running a business or a farm.

Mr JAMIESON: If the member for Mt. Marshall is talking about the capital investment, very often that has been accumulated for these people; they have not accumulated it themselves.

Mr McPharlin: You do not understand the situation.

Mr JAMIESON: Like the member concerned, many of these people have unearned increments due to the effects of inflation over the past 20 or 30 years; they rely on those unearned increments to back up their belief that they are big time in the world. However, they are not; they are simply part of the system, and until they realise that fact we will get nowhere; confrontation will continue. We must be able to show people that if there is to be an improvement in the economy, they will benefit from it and will receive a share.

We cannot say to them, "When there is an improvement in the economy, it doesn't matter how much it improves; you have got to go to a court. You get your financial improvements out of the court, whereas I can get my second boat and my beach house without doing anything about it". We cannot say that because the members of the public are not as gullible as they were 50 or 60 years ago.

Nowadays most people receive some sort of education. Many of them are receiving an education which they will not be able to use in the jobs they are able to obtain. There always will be a danger that such people will be able to work out the financial problems and the difficulties better than the people who have investments at stake. Perhaps they have become too preoccupied with their investments or the development of them to do the right thing; whereas the people who do have the time are able to understand the problems in the system and realise that they are not in their interests or in the interests of the general public in Australia.

Some people want to flog the unions from time to time about what they do. People complain about the Teachers' Union because it went on strike over an issue. I notice that lately the Teachers' Union has decided to join the Trades and Labor Council. Most of the other white collar unions have joined the TLC recently—the Municipal Officers' Association, and a lot of others. I would not mind if they were all affiliated with the Labor Party, but they are not, of course. The TLC has twice as many unions affiliated with it as has the Labor Party.

Mr Blaikie: What do you think of the tactics of the Transport Workers' Union?

Mr Evans: You are out of your seat!

Point of Order

Mr EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Blaikie: Blackballing the employers!

Mr EVANS: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Warren has drawn my attention to the fact that the member for Vasse is interjecting, and he is out of his seat. The member for Vasse indicated to me that he is acting as the Government Whip today. Therefore he has taken it for granted that he can occupy that seat.

The member for Vasse is the acting Whip; but, in point of fact, no request has been made for a change of seat, and the member for Vasse ought not to interject from other than his own seat.

Debate Resumed

Mr JAMIESON: At least that has sorted something out. Now he is going back. As I understand his question, he asked whether I agreed with the Transport Workers' Union in some of its manipulations—

Mr Blaikie: I am in order in saying this—particularly in relation to their actions that they are proposing to take now to blackball those employers who do not comply and grant the \$20 rises completely outside arbitration.

Mr Grewar: Absolutely shameful.

Mr JAMIESON: I do not think it is shameful. The member cannot have it both ways.

Mr Blaikie: It is quite wrong.

Mr JAMIESON: Is it quite wrong?

Mr Blaikie: You should get what the marketplace can pay.

Mr JAMIESON: The member for Vasse runs a farm, and he wants to obtain the best possible return for his produce. How do we determine what the market can pay so far as a worker is concerned? We have to go through the ramifications of the courts, but the farmers do not have to.

Mr Blaikie: You go outside the court.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, I know. The farmers do not even go to court in the first place.

Mr Blaikie: It is grossly unfair.

Mr JAMIESON: If members opposite want the fixing of prices, let us fix all prices. They will not

agree to that. We should not fix the wages of workers and then allow other people to do what they will.

Mr Blaikie: They are operating outside arbitration.

Mr Tonkin: You withhold your produce if the market is low. In other words, you go on strike.

Mr JAMIESON: The workers have one commodity only, as against the various commodities that the farmers produce. The worker's one commodity is his labour, and he is entitled to sell it. The workers will sell their labour in the marketplace, as the farmers do.

Mr Blaikie: Not under intimidation and blackmail.

Mr JAMIESON: The farmers indulge in that when they want to, also.

Mr Blaikie: Nonsense!

Mr JAMIESON: It is not nonsense. If it is to the advantage of the farmers, it is all right; but if it is to the advantage of anybody else, it is not all right.

Mr McPharlin: Obviously you do not understand the marketing system.

Mr JAMIESON: Here is the man who, every time I twig him about his liking of socialist philosophies on organised marketing, always tells me it is not socialism. He is trying to tell me I do not understand marketing. He just does not understand the system prevailing in the world.

Mr Tonkin: You do not believe in market forces. You want the Government to intervene.

Mr Cowan: Perhaps you could give us a definition of the word "socialism".

Mr JAMIESON: I could bring out various dictionaries and encyclopaedias, and the definitions they gave would all be different.

Mr Cowan: None of them would say that orderly marketing is socialism.

Mr JAMIESON: Of course—

Mr Cowan: Because orderly marketing happens to be controlled by the growers themselves rather than by the bureaucracy. This is socialism?

Mr Tonkin: This is only one definition. Worker co-operatives are a form of socialism. Syndicalism is 100 years old.

Mr JAMIESON: If by controlling the people who are producing a commodity one controls the price, one is indulging in a form of socialist activity.

Mr Cowan: We do not control the price. We have an orderly marketing system.

Mr JAMIESON: Members opposite do not control the price in the orderly marketing system?

Mr Tonkin: It is interference with free market forces.

Mr JAMIESON: The member for Merredin had better go and start his economics course again. He does not seem to be sure where the system has gone wrong.

We cannot have restrictions for one side of the community and enable life to run smoothly for the other side. That would not occur, no matter who was in Government. If members opposite are to insist on this nonsense, they will always be in trouble and have some form of confrontation.

I wanted to raise a matter with the Premier, but he has left the Chamber. He will have to read my remarks later. Always I have been outspoken about amenities and perks for members of Parliament. As a matter of fact, several years ago I made a long discourse during the Budget debate on the matter of members' rights to transport within this State. I pointed out on that occasion how the rights had been eroded over the years, and they were reaching the stage that they did not amount to very much.

Since I spoke on that occasion, we have seen an improvement in the situation, although I would not regard it as a practical and positive improvement. I do not want anybody to assume from what I am about to say that I have any intention of joining the ranks of long-serving members of the Parliament who have retired, because as long as the electors require me and I can be of service, I will be here.

I express my concern that the Premier has disengaged himself from any consideration of the fact that many members have served in this Parliament for long periods of time; and apart from the superannuation to which they have contributed, their conditions have deteriorated grossly.

I draw the attention of members to the fact that from 1913, anyone who had served a considerable time—20 years or so—as a member of Parliament and perhaps had been a Minister was entitled to a gold pass for life on leaving Parliament. This gave him access to rail travel to wherever it might be in the State. There were quite considerable rail services available in those days; trains were the principal form of travel. They could take people all over Australia.

That gold pass is still available today, but the problem is that there are only a very few places which are connected by railways these days. To that extent the privilege of receiving a gold pass for rail travel has gone backwards.

In the other States, with the exception of New South Wales, the upgrading of this sort of privilege has gone on over the years. An ex-member of the Queensland Parliament, having served 12 years, is entitled to a gold pass for himself and is further entitled, with his wife, to one interstate air flight each year for the rest of his life. In the case of an ex-member of Federal Parliament the time period is 20 years, although I could not imagine anyone wanting to be a Federal member for 20 years. Nevertheless, such an ex-member and his wife are entitled to free transport anywhere in Australia for life. The other States have various arrangements.

About 18 months or two years ago I wrote to the Treasurer and raised this matter with him once again. He indicated that he would have inquiries made and pointed out that if anything were done it would have to be done unilaterally because there was no hope of getting all the Premiers to agree. I agreed that that was probably correct.

Ex-members of the Western Australian Parliament are in the worst position of all. Let us consider the former Deputy Premier (Sir Des O'Neil). He qualified for a gold pass because he was a member for over 21 years and a Minister for a considerable time. But what does this lifetime gold pass entitle him to? He can get on the *Indian Pacific* and, if he is keen on rail travel, he can travel backwards and forwards across the country all year and the Government will pay the bill. If he should want to take along his wife on a trip, perhaps to see their grandchildren, he would have to pay for her fare. As a serving member of Parliament, a member's wife is entitled to very great consideration.

The point I am making is that if this entitlement to free transport was justified in 1913 the Government should be updating this arrangement to meet the standards of the day. When this privilege was granted the prime mode of travel was by train; the new service was through to the Eastern States and people could not get a better way to travel. These days we have airline services both intrastate and interstate; it has become the prime mode of travel. It is up to the Government to consider this matter further.

I do not think unlimited facilities should be made available to us, but because of long service to the State a member should be entitled to a better form of travel entitlement. I do not hide my light under a bushel on this matter. I am quite prepared to go public, because I believe it is better that the public know what we think about these matters. If the public in 1913 believed that this gold pass should be given to ex-members of

Parliament, the public of today should be prepared to have the scheme updated.

One of the things which upset me after I had written to the Treasurer on a matter dealing with members of Parliament having their privileges updated was that, after some delay, instead of getting a letter from the Treasurer, I received one from the Under Secretary of the Premier's Department. That would be in order if the matter touched on an ordinary departmental subject, but it was not in order as we are dealing with something which affects members of Parliament. It is important that the Treasurer understands what I have been saying. He can have the subject summarised for his officers to look at, but it is important that we go public on a subject such as this; we should not hide our light under a bushel.

Other States have upgraded and improved services provided to ex-members who have served their State for a long time. This State Government should do the same thing for ex-members of the Western Australian Parliament, particularly as we are at a disadvantage by being so far away from the other States.

New South Wales is the only other State which has not improved this facility, but people there can get to Adelaide by train overnight on the *Indian Pacific*; it is easy for people there to reach most major cities. Perhaps because very few of them want to visit Western Australia no pressure has been brought to bear on the New South Wales Government to improve travel facilities for ex-members of Parliament. They have all they want now.

Ex-members of our Parliament should be entitled to travel via the medium most people use these days—the airlines. Ex-members of the Queensland Parliament who served for 12 years are entitled to this facility and I believe a similar facility should be available, perhaps after a longer period of time as a member of Parliament, to ex-members of our Parliament. The time period could be determined by the Premier in consultation with other people. Besides the availability of the gold pass for rail travel this State should offer ex-members of Parliament and their spouses the right to travel intrastate or interstate, once a year, by air.

Such a scheme would not break the Treasury, which is always the fear. Answers to questions I have asked in the House indicated that only 39 per cent of air fares available to a member and his spouse were being used. Members are not overusing this facility even while they are serving members. When they are ex-members the likelihood of their using this facility extensively is

even less because they would have the expense of paying for accommodation wherever they stayed and would have to make all sorts of other arrangements for themselves. The availability of free air fares should be available to them if they want to use it.

Sir Charles Court: Can you give me a practical reason that a retired member of Parliament—who is probably drawing more generous superannuation than the average citizen—is entitled to this, as a citizen?

Mr JAMIESON: Previously I mentioned superannuation. I objected to the argument presented in the letter I received, because I was told that members of Parliament had a better superannuation scheme than most people and therefore the matter I raised should not be considered. All the other States have superannuation schemes which are equal to or better than our own, particularly in Queensland. I am not trying to align us with that State; perhaps people there have a greater income because they are selling more coal than we are selling iron ore.

The fact is, if it was justified in 1913 for the people of this State, through the Government, to say to ex-members of Parliament who had served for a long time that they had the right to free transportation when they retired, the situation should be upgraded now to bring it into line with today's type of transportation. In those days the best means of travel was by train. However, air transport is much more suitable today.

The proposition I put forward will not break the Treasury or do any harm at all. I am prepared to go public on such matters at any time, because I do not believe people will abuse this sort of availability of free transport.

It is possible the former Deputy Premier went backwards and forwards to the Eastern States 100 times each year and the Government picked up the tab for that. However, if he wanted to take his wife with him on one trip, he had to pay her fare. It is true that a member's wife is entitled to certain travel concessions and other matters associated with the imprest account. However, the transportation provisions under which we operate today were introduced in 1913 and they should be updated. In those days no aged pensions were paid. The situation has changed completely since then and the Government should ensure this State keeps abreast with standards in other States.

Ex-members of Parliament in Western Australia are disadvantaged, because they are so far away from the other States and they do not have an up-to-date sort of transport allowance. The Treasurer should look seriously at

introducing a scheme under which, after a certain number of years as a member of Parliament or if one is an ex-Minister, transport concessions would be provided.

Ex-members of Parliament who have served for a certain number of years, and their spouses, should be given one intrastate and one interstate air flight a year. Indeed, I doubt whether 30 per cent of ex-members would take advantage of such a concession and I base that statement on inquiries I have made. However, air travel of that nature should be available to ex-members and their spouses so that people, who have served the State for a long time, have access to some sort of transport concession.

I understand a number of the members of this Parliament have been agitating for concessions of this nature, but frequently they are confused with the issue of superannuation when in fact they have nothing to do with it. Most people have access to some form of superannuation or pension scheme these days. That was not the case in 1913. I am endeavouring to compare the conditions which exist today with those which obtained in 1913 and I am making a comparison also between the position in this State and that in other States.

There is justification for a review of transport concessions for ex-members of Parliament, but there is no justification to tie that matter in with something like superannuation which the other States have anyway. If we reviewed this matter properly, it would be advantageous to members who have served in the Parliament for a considerable time.

I do not know how long the Treasurer is likely to remain in Parliament. However, were he to retire, a couple of years after the retirement date it is possible he might be asked to speak to a group of people in Melbourne. Such a request would be made on the basis of the standing he had gained during the years he served the Parliament of this State. In that situation, the Treasurer should be able to take advantage of free air travel.

I ask the Treasurer to do something about this matter and to update the transport concession available to ex-members.

During the course of my remarks, I have referred to defence and the fact that there seems to be a prevailing idea in this State that the unions should be belted forever whilst employers and businessmen should be able to charge what they like for their products. However, people who rant and rave constantly about trade unions and the fact that people join the TLC should realise these organisations are designed to assist the

worker. People do not join unions in order to go on strike. It is a lot of hogwash to say that union leaders make the workers strike. The busiest time for a union officer is when the members of his union are on strike. Indeed, his head seldom hits the pillow at such times. It is a good gimmick to make those sorts of statements, because they scare people and create the impression the unions are at fault.

With those remarks I shall conclude my speech on the Budget and I shall raise the other matters with which I am concerned when we deal with the sections of the Estimates.

MR SODEMAN (Pilbara) [12.22 p.m.]: I join my colleagues to make a statement which we were told last night by the Opposition has been made 10 or 11 times in this House. This Budget has been "framed in difficult circumstances". I congratulate the Premier, members of Cabinet, and Treasury officials—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SODEMAN: —for the balance they have achieved in funding throughout the State. This year's Budget is a milestone in this State's history. It is the first \$2 000 million Budget to be brought down. I wish to highlight and comment upon several matters mentioned in the Budget. The first is education. Even though education for this State was deprived by the Commonwealth of approximately \$75 million, it is good that the education allocation increase is higher than that for most other departments.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Let's see about the increase at the end of the financial year.

Mr SODEMAN: The overall increase in revenue generally was only 11.4 per cent, but the increase of funding to the Education Department was approximately 12.4 per cent. That is rather interesting in the light of the comments made in recent months by Opposition members.

The Budget indicates that this year the Pilbara alone will receive \$11 million for new education facilities. I will highlight the number of projects on which money will be spent. An amount of \$1.4 million will be spent on improvements and additions to the Karratha High School. Following expenditure of \$1.5 million in 1980-81 on the Millars Well Primary School, a further \$146 000 will be spent this year. An amount of \$1.3 million has been allocated for the construction of permanent secondary buildings at the Wickham District High School. An amount of \$100 000 under the works programme will be provided for the Pilbara Camp School; and \$340 000 will be supplied for effluent schemes at Pilbara schools and community ovals.

Mr Brian Burke: What will you do about industrial relations in the Pilbara?

Mr SODEMAN: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to be patient; I have just started. Major allocations have been made for technical and further education facilities in the Pilbara region.

Mr Davies: Are you talking to the Budget or the GLF?

Mr SODEMAN: I ask the member to hang on a bit. Work will continue this year on construction of the Hedland and Karratha Community Colleges. An amount of \$5.6 million and \$2.3 million respectively will be spent. These figures are rather interesting in the light of the political grandstanding in recent months of members opposite and, of course, the Teachers' Union.

The next matter to which I bring the attention of the House is that of housing. The maintenance and upgrading of existing homes, and the construction of new ones in the Pilbara this year, will cost a total of \$15 million. There is no doubt that, particularly in the Karratha area, the provision of housing is of the utmost importance, and the Government is aware of that. Housing not only for families, but also for childless couples and single people is required. In regard to accommodation for single individuals the Government has amended the Act to meet their requirements. We have spoken with the shires, and already the Honorary Minister for Housing has embarked on a pilot scheme with the Port Hedland Shire Council to determine whether the needs of those individuals can be met. At the same time we are actively encouraging the Roebourne Shire Council to move in the same direction.

When one considers that \$15 million will be spent in the Pilbara out of \$57 million for housing throughout the State, one realises the point is made rather clearly that the Government has given priority to the provision of housing in the Pilbara. We could do with more money in that area, but the amount to be spent is an indication of the Government's genuine concern.

Another matter that is often discussed is that of expenditure on roads. An amount of \$11 million will be made available for upgrading roads in the Pilbara. An amount of \$3.45 million will be spent on the construction of the Nanutarra-Wittenoom Road which will follow expenditure of some \$13 million recently in the Paraburdoo-Tom Price area.

Other items of significance in the 1981-82 works programme include \$130 million allocated for the Dampier-Perth gas pipeline and the

Pilbara integrated power scheme. An amount of \$157 000 will be spent on Port Hedland Hospital staff accommodation, and \$53 000 for extensions to the X-ray facilities at that hospital.

Mr Davies: You are not getting this out of Consolidated Revenue are you?

Mr SODEMAN: As the ex-Leader of the Opposition would appreciate, when members speak on this part of the Budget it is open to them to talk on any matter such as the union movement, shipping, etc.

Mr Davies: This is the Loan Budget, not the Revenue Budget.

Mr SODEMAN: I have decided to talk on certain matters, and at the stage when the member desires to speak he is entitled to talk on anything he wants to.

Mr Davies: I don't think public works are mentioned in this Budget.

Sir Charles Court: They don't have to be.

Mr SODEMAN: It does not matter; they do not have to be in this Budget. Members of the other side have missed many things because they have not been in their seats.

Mr Brian Burke: Just carry on.

Mr SODEMAN: An amount of \$1.4 million will be spent on the continuation of the De Grey River scheme which provides a new source of water for Port Hedland.

Mr Brian Burke: You said you will get on to industrial relations.

Mr SODEMAN: I will do so shortly. An amount of \$300 000 will be spent on the upgrading of Karratha's water supply, and \$25 000 for the Point Samson water supply. Further items of expenditure cover alterations and additions to police stations and other Government facilities.

Getting a little closer to the matter in which the Leader of the Opposition is interested, I will make a few comments about the iron ore industry in the Pilbara. I was amazed by the comments made by the obviously ill-informed member for Yilgarn-Dundas. Some of his remarks were quite astounding. For instance, he said that the iron ore companies are considering the formation of a cartel to operate in the overseas iron ore market place. As I indicated by interjection last night, the Government is almost daily in touch with the iron ore companies, and if they have changed direction and want the Government to become involved with them I have no doubt at all that they will communicate with the Government very shortly. If they have not changed direction *en masse*, I would say the remarks of the member for

Yilgarn-Dundas are the result of one person blowing in his ear. Time will tell what the outcome of the matter will be.

The member referred to a contracting/expanding Japanese steel industry. I am afraid all of us on this side of the House were totally confused by what he was saying. He made another comment referring to capacities of ships going to the Pilbara. He was totally inaccurate when he said the Government is not interested in large ships carrying ore out of the Pilbara. He said the Government is not interested in having 200 000-tonne, or more, ships operating in that area, and is not interested in having a deep water port.

For the information of members opposite, the member for Yilgarn-Dundas did not do his homework. I am disappointed that he is not now in the House. He should appreciate that through one of our ports alone we have had 250 000-tonne ships on a number of occasions, and those ships have taken approximately 200 000 tonnes of ore. On many occasions ships carry approximately 80 000 tonnes of ore. All the ports in the Pilbara can accommodate such ships, and if necessary the capacities of those ports can be expanded. In fact, the *Seiko Maru* holds the Australian record for the largest cargo ship to Japan, and the *Lauderdale* holds the record for the largest cargo taken to Europe, and that was 190 000 tonnes. The member's comments in regard to the tonnages being shipped from the Pilbara and the Government's attitude to shipping in the Pilbara were totally misleading. He should have done a little more homework.

Sir Charles Court: The *Lauderdale* has since taken out more than 199 000 tonnes.

Mr SODEMAN: The member for Yilgarn-Dundas was a long way off the mark with his figures when talking about a deepwater port. He declined to say whether he was talking about Ronsard Island. If he was, he should have said so. The people of Port Hedland would not be happy if shipping was removed from the Port Hedland area and there was a contraction instead of an expansion in the local economy. If that is what he was suggesting, we cannot agree with him. We do not support the concept of a further deep water port at the expense of an already stable and growing community. Perhaps at a later date the member will elaborate.

The member referred to industrial relations in the Pilbara. He said that this Government has failed in that regard, and that it has a bad record. However, he is at variance with a couple of important people, one being someone whom the

people on the other side hold in high regard because he is the ex-President of the ACTU and the past-President of the Australian Labor Party nationally. I refer to Bob Hawke.

He went on a junket to Japan with two other people—this occurred in 1977—after which he went to the Pilbara and spoke at various centres. He simply said that the Japanese steel industry people had told him that the biggest single problem they had in regard to the Western Australian iron-ore market was the lack of a continuity of supply because of the industrial situation. Mr Hawke said he would return to rectify the problem, but he did not. He could have done so, but he did not. He could have blamed the companies, but he did not. I do not say that the unions are totally to blame. The companies and the Government should take new initiatives if they are required.

Mr Brian Burke: What initiatives?

Mr SODEMAN: Mr Hawke returned from Japan not pointing the finger at the State Government or the employers. I have the Press cuttings of what occurred at that time—for obvious reasons I kept them. Bob Hawke stated quite clearly that the unions had to pull up their socks and co-operate better with the employers, the State Government, and the Federal Government, and that course of action would be in the best interests of not only the Pilbara, but also the unions and Australia. Bob Hawke said to the unions, "Pull up your socks".

Mr Brian Burke: When was this?

Mr SODEMAN: This occurred in 1977. I am quite happy to supply the Leader of the Opposition with the Press cuttings.

Mr Brian Burke: We have you in 1977 and the Premier in the 1960s—great god!

Mr SODEMAN: To accommodate the Leader of the Opposition and other members on the other side I inform them that their national past-President and the ex-President of the national union body stated that the unions in the Pilbara had a great deal of work to do to improve industrial relations in that area. Many people involved with the ALP were startled by the actions of the union movement in the Pilbara.

The ALP has close family ties with the union movement; therefore when the member for Yilgarn-Dundas asks, "What is the Government doing?", the Government can well ask the ALP what it is doing to foster good industrial relations in the Pilbara instead of encouraging the unions to be militant, to be bold, and to become involved in things which do not relate to industrial matters. For example, in recent years, working time was

lost over the union movement's reaction to section 54B of the Police Act, and we nearly lost time over the reaction to the workers' compensation legislation. That loss would have been totally unnecessary. Also time was lost when certain individuals took time off work during the Noonkanbah situation. The list could be continued. All that action was encouraged by people on the other side of the House. I very much doubt whether one of them would deny that. When they talk about the industrial relations situation and the Government's responsibility in this regard, we must remember the tie the ALP has with the unions, which sheets right home to the ALP that it is time it faced up to its responsibilities, and its members started to have a good look at themselves.

In a recent week Commissioner Collier produced a report. Normally Industrial Commissioners balance their reports. They are very careful as to at whom they point the bone. This recent report was clearly directed at the irresponsible activities of the unions. It was not directed at all union members, just the small group of people at the top of the union movement. Before rank and file union members go on strike, during strikes, and even after strikes, many of them are not aware of the reason for the strike.

They go home to their families who say to them, "Why aren't you working?", and many of them do not know why, so there is a great deal of work to be done. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas is to be complimented for raising one of our biggest problems in the Pilbara. It is interesting when the Opposition pokes scorn at the Government by saying that a Liberal Government cannot handle an industrial situation, and if Labor were in power things would be better.

Mr Carr: Hear, hear!

Mr SODEMAN: With the Opposition things would be different all right, because if it did get in, the encouragement it gives to unions to be irresponsible and militant would increase tenfold. We have an ALP Premier in Tasmania. I do not know what the Opposition or the member for Yilgarn-Dundas would say to this, but in Tasmania there is a town called Burnie which has 20 000 people and it has ground to a halt under a Labor Government. If Labor has the magic answer to industrial problems and unionism in Australia, why under a Labor Premier in Tasmania is it unable to get its own house in order?

In *The Australian* of Thursday, 24 September there is a large article headed, "The boom town that was driven to the dole". It says this—

"She's like a big ocean liner running out of steam in mid-sea—she's just about becalmed," said the president of the town's Chamber of Commerce, pharmacist Adrian Haywood.

The article continues—

It's a long run of shipping and other transport strikes, both national and local, which has brought the town of 20 000 to its knees.

The Opposition sits on the other side and says a Liberal Government cannot handle industrial matters. The public in general knows precisely what the Liberal Government's intentions and ethics are and is aware of the lack of intent and interest from the members on that side of the House.

I direct the attention of the House to the matter of pre-school services in the Pilbara. There is a great degree of apprehension at the moment as to what their future will be. I repeat my request to the Minister for Education that when he is making his deliberations on the matter, acknowledging that we have to look at achieving economies with the present budgetary situation he takes into account that communities in the Pilbara are somewhat different from those in other parts of the State, not only in terms of the distance from, say, a capital city and the isolation that some people experience because of this, but also in terms of the structure of the communities as far as the family situation is concerned, which is different. Generally speaking, the communities are young and do not have an extended family situation available to them—uncles, aunts, grandparents, and the like—and the alternatives for mothers and young children are somewhat limited. When the Minister sits down finally and decides what the State Government's policy structure will be in this regard, I ask him to pay special attention to the Pilbara and take these points on board so that we may not be disadvantaged unduly. With those few remarks, I have pleasure in supporting the Budget.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [12.38 p.m.]: This morning on the front page of *The West Australian* there appeared a very important announcement that the South Australian Government had decided to grant land rights to Aborigines in that State. By so doing, it has allocated nearly 10 per cent of the land in South Australia to Aborigines who are regarded as the traditional owners of that land, most of which is in the northern part of South Australia. The announcement was also important because, on the question of land rights, it focuses the spotlight

right onto the Court Government of Western Australia.

Sir Charles Court: We are miles ahead of South Australia with our Aboriginal land reserves. Do you not know that they are a better title than freehold because they cannot be altered except by Parliament?

Mr Carr: That is not what the Aborigines think.

Mr HARMAN: I am not aware of that.

Mr Carr: The Aborigines are not aware of that, either.

Mr HARMAN: That is why I let the Treasurer go on; I knew the longer I let him continue, the more he would put his foot in it.

Sir Charles Court: You had better look at the real title of South Australian Aborigines' land before you start getting excited about it.

Mr HARMAN: All I can say is that *The West Australian* printed this morning that Aborigines were given title to that land. No such provision exists in Western Australia.

Mr Sodeman: What are the conditions that apply to it? Can they sell it?

Sir Charles Court: What about Aboriginal reserves in Western Australia?

Mr HARMAN: What about them?

Sir Charles Court: I am just asking you.

Mr HARMAN: What about them?

Sir Charles Court: Have they not got a good title in the name of many Aborigines?

Mr HARMAN: I have demonstrated on many occasions in this House the title they have got. If the Government wants to allow a mining company entrance onto an Aboriginal reserve, all it does is excise that area from the Aboriginal reserve. The Government has done it before and will do it again. All it has to do is bring a Bill to this place and have it rubber-stamped.

Sir Charles Court: All we have to do!

Mr Sodeman: That is all that has been done in South Australia. S.A. has just brought a Bill into Parliament and can bring another one in and get rid of it.

Mr Hassell: What is the difference?

Mr HARMAN: It is a surprising scene in this House. The Government must be very touchy about land rights.

Sir Charles Court: It is about time you stood up for your own State.

Mr HARMAN: The Government makes a very important decision to grant a title to Aborigines over certain areas of land—

Mr Hassell: It is no better than the title; in fact, it is not as good as the title we already have.

Mr HARMAN: How does the Minister know? He has not seen it. He is misleading the House.

Mr Carr: He does that often.

Mr Hassell: Our title requires parliamentary approval to change it, and so does theirs.

Mr HARMAN: The Minister is suggesting to the House that the title the South Australian Government has is of no value, and yet he does not know what sort of title it is.

Mr Sodeman: He didn't say that.

Mr HARMAN: So what the Minister is doing, as he has done before, is misleading the Parliament. The Government does it. The Minister was taught by a very good person to do that.

Mr Hassell: What you are saying is quite wrong. You have no basis for it and don't know what you are talking about.

Mr HARMAN: Perhaps we can go back to my original statement now. The decision was made by the South Australian Government to grant a title of land to Aborigines.

Mr Laurance: It is not as good as ours; it is a long way behind ours.

Mr HARMAN: How does the Honorary Minister know?

Mr Laurance: I know.

Mr Carr: Because the Treasurer said so.

Mr HARMAN: This is the level of intelligence that some Government members demonstrate. A title has been granted to Aborigines and I am saying that puts the spotlight right back here on Western Australia with its Liberal Government and focuses on its actions. Already the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has complimented the South Australian Government for its action.

Let us look at the whole question of land rights from an historical point of view. Western Australia was settled in 1829 and for the following 76 years not one acre of land in this State was set aside for the use and benefit of Aborigines; that is, from 1829 to 1905, not one road was set aside for their use. Throughout our history from 1829 to 1905 the Governments of the day took no action to recognise the traditional owners of land in Western Australia.

Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr HARMAN: Before the luncheon suspension I referred to the important decision made by the South Australian Liberal Government to grant freehold title to Aborigines

in the northern part of South Australia so that they may control their own land and be in a position to negotiate with people who wish to go onto their land. They are also able to develop the land as they wish.

I had an unexpected barrage of interjections from the Government when I said that was a significant step and that the spotlight was now on the Court Government in Western Australia to demonstrate its attitude to Aborigines. The level of debate was such that it led one to believe some of the members of the Government knew all about South Australia's proposed legislation, but when questioned further they were not able to make any significant points about it.

What would be the attitude of the Court Government to this significant move by the South Australian Government? I can assure members that the response from the Court Government will be nil because the Premier has claimed that what the Aborigines have in Western Australia is far better than what is envisaged under the South Australian legislation. What do the Aborigines have in Western Australia? Certain areas in Western Australia are classified as Aboriginal reserves and it is necessary for persons, other than Aborigines, to obtain permits to enter such reserves. However, under the new Mining Act provision is made for the Minister for Mines to ignore, if necessary, any recommendation made by the Minister for Community Welfare about mining on Aboriginal reserves.

He may ignore that recommendation, but when it comes to the position of mining in State forests, a different principle applies. As I have said before in this House, trees have more importance to this Government than have Aborigines. If a mining company wishes to enter an Aboriginal reserve and the Aborigines in that area, through their representatives on the lands trust, say they do not wish mining to take place, the decision of the Aborigines can be overruled by this Government. But, the Premier says the Aborigines in Western Australia have a better title to their land than that which is proposed in South Australia. That indicates how little he knows about the legislation in South Australia.

The legislation in South Australia has been formulated as a result of negotiations between the Government and the Aborigines, and that is very significant. Many attempts have been made in this State by Aborigines from the Kimberley, Pilbara, and central reserve areas, to negotiate with this Government on the subject of land rights. However, their endeavours have been unsuccessful. They have not been able to change

the head-in-the-sand, Victorian attitude the Court Government adopts when dealing with Aborigines.

Under the proposed legislation in South Australia, if the Aborigines agree to a mining company entering their land to carry out exploration work or mining, an agreement is made between the mining company and the Aboriginal owners. If the Aboriginal owners subsequently determine an agreement with the company, there is provision whereby at least one-third of the royalties of whatever mineral is mined is paid to the Aboriginal owners and the remaining two-thirds is paid to the South Australian Government.

In this State, even when permission is granted to a mining company to enter and mine on Aboriginal reserves, there is no provision for royalties to be paid to the traditional Aboriginal owners. They receive no royalties at all. The Government receives the royalties and the Aborigines in Western Australia miss out again. If the Aborigines in Western Australia say "No" to mining, the Government can override them, but if they say "Yes" they do not receive any royalties from the mining company concerned. In South Australia Aborigines do receive royalties. A further point to make is that, under the South Australian legislation, if the Aboriginal owners say they do not want the mining company to operate on their land the matter goes before a judge for adjudication, and he is a person who is unbiased. However, in Western Australia the matter goes before a political person who is obviously biased, as the Minister for Mines would be, because his primary interest is mining.

Mr Hassell: You obviously do not understand how the system works or how the Government works, and you ought to know better as you have had experience in a ministerial role.

Mr HARMAN: I know how it works, and that is what I am concerned about. I know how the members opposite work.

Mr Hassell: You know very well Ministers do not operate in that way, or independently. There is a system.

Mr HARMAN: How long has the Minister been in Cabinet?

Mr Hassell: Long enough to know how the system works.

Mr Young: Three times longer than you were.

Mr HARMAN: Long enough to know what happens! Obviously the Minister does not know.

Mr Hassell: You are talking absolute nonsense and you ought to know better.

Mr HARMAN: The basic difference between the South Australian legislation and the Western Australian legislation—which is totally inadequate—is that the latter does not meet the demands of the Aborigines, nor does it meet the requirements of this day and age.

A point I have been trying to make in this Parliament for some years now is that the recognition of land rights for Aborigines is basic to the whole future of the Aboriginal race. In recent years there has been an upsurge in what is termed "Aboriginality" which is a driving force for Aborigines to develop a sense of pride in their race, culture, and customs.

Mr Hassell: But it will not help the problems with drink, education, health, housing, or employment.

Mr HARMAN: In my view this upsurge in Aboriginality has been the reason for a change which has occurred amongst the Aborigines. They are developing a tremendous pride in themselves and are developing a great sense of initiative. This has been based on the subject of land rights, and they are saying, "This was our country; we were once a very proud race of people; we want to be that again and the way to do it is to become proud of being an Aboriginal; proud to know what our customs were; and proud to know what belongs to the Aboriginal culture, which comes from the land itself. All our stories are based on the land and all our figureheads, gods and idols, are moving throughout the land".

This is of significance to them and it is vital that the Government of Western Australia accepts there is a relationship between Aborigines and the land. The Government can recognise this by granting them land rights—a title to land. There are at least three significant areas in Western Australia where the Government could begin to adopt the standards that have been adopted in South Australia, and I refer to the land in the Kimberley, Pilbara, and the central reserve area—the Warburton Range region. The people of those areas still regard themselves as traditional owners of that land.

It might well be a good thing and of great value for the Government to start looking at what is happening in the other States and give consideration to what can be done in Western Australia to improve its relationship with the Aborigines. If negotiations of this kind could be entered into between the Aborigines and the State Government it would be much better than the present Victorian, holier-than-thou attitude of, "I am a white man, I was here first and I have a right to the land". Some members of the

Government have displayed this attitude recently by way of interjections.

Mr Hassell: You obviously do not know what happens in that direction.

Mr HARMAN: We are all human beings, we all live in this country, we all want to make something of it. We should not adopt this Victorian, holier-than-thou attitude which some of the members of the Government are displaying now. I feel quite ashamed to be in the same Chamber as those persons.

Let us consider the history of land rights in Western Australia. Settlement began in 1829 and it was not until 1905 that the Government of Western Australia decided to do something about setting aside land for Aborigines. So, 76 years went past before even an acre of land was set aside for the use and benefit of Aborigines. During those 76 years we saw nothing but persecution of Aborigines, and Aborigines being driven out of their traditional surroundings; we saw many of them become degraded; and we saw women treated in all sorts of degrading ways. This has resulted in what was once a proud race becoming beggars, without any hope, and these people have been the victims of many diseases—including syphilis—which were brought to this country by European settlers. They have been subjected also to drinking, gambling, and whatever.

The Minister for Police has the audacity to say that all these people just lie around and drink.

Mr Hassell: I did not say anything of the sort. That is the inference you drew, and it is wrong, as is the rest of your information.

Mr HARMAN: I am quite disgusted at the Minister's attitude. I thought he was a reasonable sort of man.

I have given the history of the situation until 1905. Not a thing was done to help the Aborigines up to that time. A Royal Commission was held in 1905 but it was not until 1913 that the Government of the day decided to set aside land for the use and benefit of Aborigines. Therefore it was well over 80 years before anything was done.

Contrast that attitude by those Governments with what happened in the eastern goldfields in 1890. Members must remember that in those days, gold had not been found in that area. An agreement was made in 1890 between the State Government of the day and the Rt. Hon. Lord Castletyne, Lord Butler, and Benjamin Septimus Brigg, who were described as "gentlemen of London" as trustees for the Hampton Lands and Railway Syndicate Ltd. These people did not live

in this State, but were granted 80 000 hectares of virgin land for which they paid just over \$12 000. One of the conditions was that any gold and silver found on the land would be reserved to the Crown.

These gentlemen of London must have been fairly resourceful because only five years later, in 1895, they successfully applied for permission to the rights of whatever gold and silver was found on that 80 000 hectares of land. For every ounce of gold the gentlemen of London were able to produce from this 80 000 hectares, they were obliged to pay the State Government 2s. an ounce. They were given freedom from paying land tax until 1905.

There is the contrast. Here we have the gentlemen of London being granted freehold title to 80 000 hectares of land in an auriferous country. Probably, that fact was not known in 1890. However, it was certainly known after 1893, when gold was discovered, yet in 1895 they were able to secure, in addition to the freehold title, the absolute rights to all minerals, including gold and silver, found in the area which by then was already established as a goldfield.

This company subsequently became known as Hampton Gold Mining Areas Ltd. I do not know whether the permits which were granted to this company are valid; I believe it should be the subject of an inquiry by the Crown Law Department, because there has been a suggestion the permits were granted for only 10 years.

Whatever the legal position, the land of Hampton Gold Mining Areas Ltd. was recognised by this Government in the new mining Bill, as it was in the original Mining Act, as an area which was exempted from the Mining Act.

This company went along for quite a few years and did nothing on the land. No record is available indicating why it received the land. It did not develop the land in any way; there was no agricultural development of the land. These gentlemen of London simply obtained the land and have sat on it ever since.

In 1966, along came Western Mining Corporation Ltd. and found nickel on some of the land owned by Hampton Gold Mining Areas Ltd. Western Mining did a deal with that company by purchasing some of its land at an undisclosed purchase price in return for which Western Mining would pay the company royalties on the nickel won from the land.

The other day I was reading through the report for 1981 of Hampton Gold Mining Areas Ltd. The report—produced in England by the company—revealed that the group's profits before

tax amounted to £stg1.842 million, compared with £stg1.78 million the previous year. After-tax profits this year amounted to £stg 0.95 million, as compared with £stg 0.57 million the previous year. The heirs of those enterprising gentlemen of London now own a significant company in England which is reaping royalties from Western Mining Corporation to the tune of something like \$800 000 each year. In fact, since the nickel operation commenced, this company has received in excess of \$10 million.

This company has invested these royalties into the North Sea Oil project which, of course, is its own business. I am simply pointing out the contrast. Here we have Aborigines in Western Australia who have been denied any opportunity of owning land which is traditionally theirs; yet, along come the gentlemen of London and they are able to obtain the freehold title to a large area of land, and subsequently enjoy all sorts of financial benefits from that arrangement made back in those early years.

I do not know how much the State Taxation Department receives in land tax from Hampton Gold Mining Areas Ltd. I endeavoured to find that out from the Treasurer a couple of months ago, but he flatly refused to tell me, saying that the matter was confidential. I also tried to find out how much was being paid to the State by way of royalties on gold mined in this area, and the answer was, "None". I do not know whether the original permit to mine gold still holds. However, the original permit provided that the company should pay the State a royalty of 2s. an ounce.

The English report mentioned the fact that the company was mining gold on one of the locations it owns. I refer to the White Hope Goldmine, which is situated on location 48, south-east of Kalgoorlie. The report states as follows—

During the year the Company received its first income from the two year tribute agreement which commenced in February 1980. 4 170 tonnes of ore were milled in the period under review at an average head grade of 11.9 grams per tonne. The ore was treated by North Kalgurli Mines Limited at its custom mill and overall recoveries averaged 78%. The operation produced a profit for the Company of £100 000 consisting of royalties and repayments of development expenditure written off in previous years.

Yet no revenue has come to this State. We do not even know whether the company has paid land tax. However, we have been told it is not paying any royalties on gold.

That is the contrast we have in this country, a contrast which is still being condoned by the Court Government. It is about time we started to become really earnest and sincere in our attitude towards land rights for the traditional owners of Western Australia.

Mr P. V. Jones: Are you recommending we commandeer this land? You are saying it is wrong, but what are you saying we should do?

Mr HARMAN: I cannot follow the Minister.

Mr P. V. Jones: You are saying it is wrong that successive Governments have recognised this Hampton situation as being separate because of the title. You are suggesting we should rectify it by commandeering it.

Mr HARMAN: I am pointing out the contrast.

Mr P. V. Jones: How are you suggesting we rectify the situation?

Mr HARMAN: I said I was very concerned about the legality of the instruments made at the time giving this company access to all this land and the gold and silver.

Mr P. V. Jones: There is a case proceeding.

Mr HARMAN: I said the matter ought to be referred to the Crown Law Department. I would be happy with that.

Mr P. V. Jones: I have indicated that is under way.

Mr HARMAN: I would like to know the result of the case, although I probably never will. I have considered one contrast—and there are others—concerning the manner in which those gentlemen in London were assisted in the early days and given huge tracts of land and rights to minerals and gold, yet the people who were the traditional owners of the land were neglected and degraded. Many of them are now beginning to develop a sense of pride and initiative and have begun to set a fine example to the rest of their people. It is time we started in earnest to negotiate with them and recognise the principle of land rights so that this can be a starting point and an impetus for a recovery among Aborigines in Western Australia.

For many months I have been concerned with the north-west gas scheme. It has been referred to in some circles as another Sydney Opera House. We have seen where the costs involved have escalated 44 per cent in 12 months—from \$450 million to \$600 million—and that is just the cost of the pipeline itself.

The whole project has been surrounded by secrecy. The Government has refused to tell us what the wellhead price of the gas will be. It has refused to tell us what the royalty will be that the

company has to pay the Government. It has refused to tell us the price for the gas to be paid by Alcoa. It has refused to tell us what the price for the gas will be to the Japanese utilities. It has refused to tell us what will apply when the Government is bound to accept and pay for all the gas each day. It has refused to tell us what it will do with the gas it does not use. Obviously the Government will have to pay for it, but it will not tell us what will happen to the gas and whether it will just go up into the air or be stored in other reservoirs. There are other matters less important about which it is also difficult to obtain answers from the Government.

I have been endeavouring to research the unique pricing scheme which a certain newspaper editor announced as Government policy. The basis of the scheme is that if a firm is using oil it will be offered gas at a price pitched just below the cost of oil. If a firm is using coal it will be offered gas at a price pitched just above the price of coal so that the economics of a change-over will be attractive to the user of the gas.

It has been confirmed that the domestic users of gas will pay in excess of the price of the Dongara gas. It has been confirmed that this is a deliberate policy of the SEC; it has deliberately jacked up the price of Dongara gas to consumers in Perth so they will more readily accept the cost of north-west gas when it comes on stream.

My estimate of the cost to the domestic consumers is that it will be something like \$3.50 per million BTUs. On the basis that it costs 10 to 12 times more to pay for domestic gas because of distribution costs and so on, Perth people will be paying something like \$36 per million BTUs. It will be almost impossible for people to meet that price. It is a tremendous increase in the cost of gas into homes.

I have been endeavouring to ascertain how many firms which are using coal will be able to switch to gas and how many using oil will be able to switch to gas, but this information is confidential. I asked the Minister to reconsider his decision and he said I should drop him a line, which I did some six weeks ago. I am still waiting for a reply. It is probably a lot quicker to ask a question in the House than to write to a Minister; at least the answer is given that day or perhaps the next. I took the time to present my arguments and explain my reason for wanting the information, but I am still waiting for a reply.

All this secrecy and so-called confidentiality is making it extremely difficult for the Opposition and the people of Western Australia to appreciate what this north-west gas pipeline is all about.

When we hear stories that it is going to be another Sydney Opera House it brings to mind the idea that perhaps the next thing the Government will be doing is running a lottery—the north-west gas lottery—to pay for the gas. Unless the Government can give us the information we seek so that we can work out our own sums, we will be in the dark for a long time.

The way this problem can be overcome, the way the Government can protect itself, the way the Opposition can obtain the information it desires, the way the public of Western Australia can be reassured that this project will be worth something to them and not just an imposition of extra dollars each week, is by the establishment of a parliamentary committee to scrutinise the project. It would not cost the Government very much. Members of the committee would be able to question the SEC, the company, and the Government on this project. In that way the public would become aware of what was happening.

Many people are running away from this problem. They are throwing up their hands in horror and saying they do not know from where the gas is to come, how it is to be paid for, and what is going to happen to it. They do not know whether it is to be left to go up into the air or placed in reservoirs. There will be a huge increase in costs for gas used by industries; the cost for gas will be higher than the cost for coal. Firms in Perth already have been told that they will not be able to have the Dongara gas until 1984—or when the north-west gas comes on stream. They have committed themselves to finding other sources of energy; for example, coal, oil, and, in some cases, sawdust.

Mr McIver: I understand it is only a myth.

Mr HARMAN: Industry generally is in doubt about the situation. The SEC is trying to sell industries the gas that will be available, but the SEC is not saying what the price of that gas will be—the SEC is doing its sums. Because industries lack knowledge of the price that will have to be paid they are seeking alternate sources of energy.

The way the situation has been presented to me indicates that the whole question of the pipeline is in a bit of a mess. The Government is in a bind. It has run into the problem of having to pay higher interest rates, and obviously it will have to capitalise the extra interest payments into the total cost of the pipeline project. We will have to pay that money back in years to come without having the protection of additional industries and things like petrochemical works to absorb all the gas produced each day.

These matters worry many informed people of Western Australia. We have reached this stage because of the Government's secrecy. What it is doing ought to be exposed so that we know exactly what is happening and where we are going.

I venture to say that unless the North-West Shelf pipeline project is placed under public scrutiny we will witness a severe political blunder by this Government. Be that as it may, it will be a tremendous imposition on the paying public of Western Australia.

Now is the time for us to consider closely the total expenditure involved and the way the project will be financed. We must consider the total cost and how loans will be repaid and whether we will obtain a benefit.

Mr Sodeman: Is this one of those "I told you so" speeches?

Mr HARMAN: I feel sometimes in this House, especially as an Opposition member, that when someone makes many good points in a speech those points fall on deaf ears. Perhaps on this occasion some of the members opposite have begun to see the light and will urge their Government to take some steps to ensure that, firstly, we do something positive in regard to land rights and, secondly, get something positive going in respect of scrutinising the cost of the North-West Shelf pipeline.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [2.53 p.m.]: I join in this debate to put some points of view I have held for many years. This time probably will be the last occasion I address the House in a debate of this nature. I will say more about that in a moment.

I am concerned that in Western Australia and, it seems, in the rest of Australia, we now have a system of industrial relations which dictates how trade unions may discuss with employers the conditions of their members. This system has been accepted by Governments. Now the only thing left for the trade union movement to do to achieve its objectives is to enter into confrontation.

Recently the Western Australian Industrial Commission granted an increase of a little over \$6 to approximately 300 000 Western Australian workers. It is clear that the Government has interfered on every occasion the trade union movement has sought wage increases for workers. The Government has gone to the commission to oppose any wage increases. The Government has been told forcibly by the commission that the Government's stories and cases fall on deaf ears because those stories and cases have no validity. The commission has ruled against the

Government on almost every occasion it has opposed wage increases.

I can remember that in the early days—I am old enough to remember them because I earned my living as an industrial advocate—the unions could go to the commission with their formula and criteria to support a wage increase with the basic knowledge that they had a chance of having the claim accepted or at least having it given a proper degree of consideration. In simple terms, we could go to the commission and argue our cases in the knowledge that there was at least a 50 per cent chance of our requests being granted. Over the years I have noticed a propensity on the part of employers to adopt a different attack in regard to industrial relations.

Unions always seem to be on the receiving end of the scorn of Liberal Governments in this country, and in particular, the Court Liberal Government presently ruling this State. The scorn is bolstered by the view that workers do not have a right to go to the commission for the purpose of obtaining a decent wage, and thereby a decent living standard. When unions do go to the commission they find that there is a tendency to move away from the system first followed some 20 years ago.

We have gone past the stage of that great utopia of wage indexation. It was the great hope of the trade union movement, to which the movement gave 100 per cent support. The movement said that wage indexation should be given 100 per cent support, but then the workers of Australia received a mixed grill from the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The trade union movement was told that it could have wage indexation provided it accepted the criterion of need imposed upon it. Other guidelines were laid down. Ever since then the movement has been held to ransom because those criteria were imposed upon it. At the time the commission said, "They are the criteria. We will not allow you to get your flow-on of cost-of-living indices until you accept the parameters we set down". The trade union movement had not accepted that wage indexation as it was first put to it should have certain restrictions.

One of the great disasters of 1981—and the commission has recognised this—is that the commission failed to provide a system of wage justice to workers in this country in terms of what they were entitled to receive.

We will move much closer to the American system of industry bargaining. Workers and employers will bargain because the workers will

want some form of compensation and reward for the work they do. Those rewards will be deserved.

As I have said, this will be my last opportunity to speak in this place on industrial matters. It must be accepted that we have reached the stage of having the wheel of industrial relations complete a turn. We have almost reached the stage of having our knives drawn out, employers against employees, to fight over industrial matters. We do not have discussion and satisfactory resolutions from discussion. The only way forward is to browbeat one's opponent. The worker should not be blamed for this situation. Workers have been forced to accept the situation because employers have decided that they are in financial trouble. They believe they are in difficulty and will not be able to remain solvent unless workers' claims are denied.

The western system is crumbling around the ears of all concerned. There is no doubt about that. In fact, every western country is experiencing an economic crisis. Of course, employers are looking for a scapegoat, and have decided upon the working class. Employers have decided that workers are not entitled to their just desserts.

We are told that big businesses are entitled to make big profits, but it has been forgotten that the way those businesses obtain those profits is by using the efforts of the working class. Until that economic factor is realised we will have continuing disputation between workers and employers.

Fortunately not all employers are gilded with the same colour; not all employers look at a worker as a person who provides the profit the employers receive for their workers' endeavours.

I become very disturbed when we look at the result of the rapacious appetite of mining companies when they mine in the Darling scarp and jarrah forest. The mining companies mine for bauxite, gravel, granite, or gold and leave behind a great hole in the ground and very little else.

I have heard a great deal over the years about the rehabilitation carried out by Alcoa. I have heard their representatives on the public rostrum explaining how we have nothing to worry about because the area mined is only a small percentage of the State forest. It has been said, "Do not worry, we will rehabilitate. As far as we are concerned we are spending more money than others have spent on rehabilitation". Of course Alcoa is spending a great deal of money; it is its public relations job. The company is not spending money because it wants to. It has been forced, by public opinion, to rehabilitate the mined areas.

The company has said that the jarrah forest is only a small portion of the State forest and we have nothing to worry about. I say that is a major portion of our jarrah forest and it is being denuded and destroyed. It will never be replaced unless man gets out of that scene and leaves it to nature to make good the damage suffered as a result of people working there.

Mr Sibson interjected.

MR SKIDMORE: I am not interested in the interjections of the member for Bunbury. I suggest he keeps his remarks for his own speech and allows me to get on with mine.

All Governments in Australia must recognise that there is a need for recreational facilities for the community. We have heard a great deal about the shorter working week and over the last six months many workers have been awarded a shorter working week. Is it all we have to do in this world to be nothing else than figures to be used or manipulated until we reach the age of 65 years and then drop off? It would seem that that is the belief of employers. However, people should be looking forward to fewer working hours. There is a general awakening amongst workers and they have been demanding a shorter working week. The working week will become shorter and shorter and industry will have to sustain many people working possibly a 30-hour week in the near future.

What will we do with our leisure time? Will we drive to the Darling scarp which has been denuded of all trees and be told that this is our recreational area? Will we be told that that is where we will find fulfilment in our leisure moments?

There is a need for recognition by Governments that people will need these areas for their leisure time. This Government has been rather shortsighted and has ignored recreational officers who have been appointed to many shires in Western Australia. They are funded partly by Government and partly by local government. The funding provided to local government is totally inadequate. It does not cover the desire of ratepayers to have recreational officers in the future. If only the Government would open its eyes and see that we will require more recreational officers in the future so that people have some purpose in their leisure time. However, the Government does not seem to be able to apprehend that need.

Mr Sibson: Many councils do not take up the opportunity to use them.

MR SKIDMORE: Maybe there is a reason for that. For instance if we consider the Nedlands

council, we realise that maybe it does not need recreational officers, because the people in Nedlands can pay for their leisure over and over again. However, when we consider the Bassendean Town Council and the Shire of Swan, we realise that they have a shortage of funds and, in fact, one of the two officers provided has been seconded to the Swan Shire. That has been done with the faint hope that he may be able to provide one day a week to the Bassendean shire. If the member for Bunbury believes that is a fair and equitable distribution of officers, then I do not agree with him.

Quite recently a group in Guildford undertook a very comprehensive study of the area, aided and supported by Professor Gordon Stephenson and other town planners. I pay tribute to the Shire of Swan officers who supported that group in its study. Its report indicates that the Government at long last has recognised that of all the places in Western Australia, Guildford is the only area which has been able to survive the rapacious appetite of the real estate developers. Very little modern development has occurred in Guildford. Modern development is supposed to be the great utopia of our country. Development is supposed to do something for the people of Western Australia. However, Guildford has escaped the real estate development which has taken place in other parts of the State.

The report of the group has not indicated a need for millions of dollars to be provided for the area, it has simply asked for the traffic to be diverted away from Guildford in order to allow the area to develop in the way its forefathers envisaged.

I ask the Minister concerned: When will we have a bypass system for Guildford? When will we have the bridge and extension over the Swan River from Walter Road through to Morrison Road and then on to Great Eastern Highway? When will we have the diversion of traffic to Great Eastern Highway? When will we have a bypass road from the south so that the traffic problem will be solved? James Street in Guildford carries as much traffic as St. George's Terrace does, if we consider a vehicle count. I think approximately 21 000 to 24 000 vehicles go through the hamlet of Guildford each week. Members can well understand why the residents say it is time something was done to keep the traffic out of Guildford.

So my plea to the Government is to make an effort to remove the traffic congestion so that Guildford can be developed in a way that enhances its character. I do not mean something like that pseudo piece of work at Armadale—the

reconstructed scene of early days. We can see such developments all along the Murray Valley in New South Wales. As one passes town after town, one sees all these so-called early colonial villages. However, they are just facades, like the facade at Armadale. Guildford is there; it is real. Some 50-odd homes in the area have come under the auspices of the National Trust of Australia, and approximately 15 of these are recognised by the trust as worthy of preservation.

I recall that at one time it was decided to push over the old liquor store. The owner was prevailed upon to keep the bricks, and he repaired the shed behind the store. This became the major part of his distribution business, and something precious was saved.

The Rose & Crown Hotel-Motel has been taken over by a company which is recognised as being conscious of the need to preserve such buildings. This company endeavours to encourage tourism, because in this way the viability of such establishments is assured. There are many other places in Guildford such as the old Stirling Arms Hotel. This whole area could be quite wonderful; certainly its potential should be recognised by the Government. The only way for Guildford to survive in the future is by the implementation of a bypass road system. Certainly the people of Guildford should be considered.

Mr Williams: What do you think about the one-way road system in Midland?

Mr SKIDMORE: That is the biggest disaster that has ever hit Midland. I am glad that I was reminded of this by the member for Clontarf. It will destroy the whole concept of park-and-ride at Midland. When the workers are returning home the cars will not be able to get out of the car park and turn right to go to the hills. To return to their residences, these motorists will have to follow a circuitous route along a slip road, move out into the main stream of traffic, accomplish a right-hand turn, and go through two sets of traffic lights just to get out onto the road to the Darling scarp. This system was just a sop to the Main Roads Department; and the only interest of that department is to move vehicles from point A to point B as quickly as possible. There is no other reason for the system. It shows that the department could not care less about pedestrians.

Frequently, as I sit in my office right opposite the Centrepont crosswalk, I hear the screech of tyres on the road, and I shudder. Unfortunately at times pedestrians on this crosswalk have been hit and we have had to endeavour to assist them. The motorists just will not stop. The pedestrians face two lanes of traffic, but later on they will face

four lanes of traffic going one way. That is certainly no recipe to preserve the dignity and the life of pedestrians in Midland. So in answer to the member's question, I say it is an absolute calamity. It is the worst piece of planning I have ever seen, and the Midland people will regret the result of that planning for the rest of their lives.

I am told that it is only a stop-gap measure to allow the roads to be planned. So the department does not feel it has to worry about what is happening in Midland—having instituted this idea, it will just wait until everything sorts itself out. Only time will tell. Certainly I hope the member for Clontarf will carry on the fight about this.

Mr Williams: I have done it long enough.

Mr Pearce: He might do something in time!

Mr SKIDMORE: I am just indicating to the honourable member that I will not be here to do the job. Someone will have to carry it on for me.

I commend the member for Maylands on his efforts to make members in this Chamber understand the needs of Aboriginal communities. Quite recently a Federal Government Senate committee visited our fringe dwellers to endeavour to find out their needs. I know it was very difficult for the fringe dwellers to talk to members of the committee, and I do not blame the fringe dwellers for that. As the member for Maylands so aptly put it, these people must surely be very sceptical about "white talk". For years and years—indeed for a century—we have said to these people, "We will do this and that for you". However, after hearing all the promises the Aboriginal—who is a very trusting person—sees nothing when he looks for results.

We know what is happening with the fringe dwellers who reside at Lockridge in the electorate of Morley. These people have been subjected to a type of degradation which we could never understand. These people are not the product of their own desires; they are the product of our desires. It is the white people, the domineering white people, who have driven them to drink.

One fringe dweller said to me the other day, "It is far better, Jack, to get drunk on cheap wine and sleep under the Guildford traffic bridge in complete and utter oblivion than it is to stay awake and fight".

So many people ridicule the fringe dwellers that one would almost think they are subhuman and have no right to speak out. When they do speak out the white people sell them down the drain. It is on only very few occasions that I have been able to speak on this matter in the House without heaping some degree of scorn upon Government

members. However, I would like to pay a tribute to some Government members who, during one period, assisted me tremendously in regard to the Aboriginal problem. I refer particularly to the Minister for Health. I thank him very much for his efforts on behalf of the Aboriginal people and I feel that at least we made some progress with the villages which became a reality for these people.

I find little joy in not being able to commend the actions of the Swan Shire Council. Over a period of many years it has paid only lip service to the needs of the fringe dwellers. I am conscious of the fact that the Lockridge people have had very little to sustain them either. So under the burden of all these problems, the Robert Brophos and their children have reached such a depth of despair that I can readily understand the reason that it became necessary for the police to arrest some of the fringe dwellers the other day. Nothing is being offered to these people; they have nothing to work for.

As the member for Maylands said, white people just cannot understand the affinity which the Aborigines have with the land. Aborigines do not rape the land and they do not use up its resources. Before we came here they farmed the land and looked after it. When a certain area could no longer sustain their tribal needs, they moved on to another area giving the former area a chance to regenerate. Each tribe had the right to return to such land when it was fully replenished and able to meet their needs.

We cannot understand the social heritage of the land. So many of the Aborigines' dreamtime stories involve the land. I have suggested before that Government members ought to read Xavier Herbert's *Poor Fellow My Country*. This is a book of approximately 800 pages, and certainly anyone who reads it will have a better understanding of the feeling the Aboriginal has for the land, and the need he has to own land. He does not want to be given land on the basis that mining companies may come in and desecrate his sacred sites.

That is not what they want. They want land they can look after—land that may be theirs as it was in centuries gone by. They and they alone have learned to look after the land.

We rape the land. Our coal mines rape it. Bauxite mining rapes it. Consider the quarries up in the hills. Have a look at what they have done. Are we proud of it? The Aborigines owned the land for 1 000 years, and they never did that sort of thing. We have had it for 150 years, and it is a damned mess. We have a lot to answer for in regard to this matter.

When I first came into this place I found that it was different from the field in which I had served for so long. In the field of industrial relations, I was able to work in a tribunal where at least one had a 50-50 chance of winning. However, I have been in Opposition all the time I have been here, and it has become apparent that I will never win a vote, no matter what might happen. This has caused tremendous frustration for me. I have felt that my seven or eight years here have been wasted. My efforts to help the working people have been an absolute waste of time.

I have been bound by party politics to support this issue or that issue. I make it clear that on almost every occasion I have agreed with the domination of party policy over myself, because the Australian Labor Party has evidenced the only sensitivity to the working people that will lead those people into a better way of life. Certainly they will not have that leadership from a conservative Government.

I regret that the Speaker is not in the Chair at the moment. I have not bothered to read *Hansard* over the years, but I realise that I must have tried the Speaker's patience "something awful" on this point.

Mr Williams: That's right.

Mr SKIDMORE: I can imagine that at times he must have felt like taking hold of me and personally ejecting me forcibly from the Chamber. I pay tribute to the forbearance of the Speaker (the member for Kalamunda). I thank him very much for that, and I thank him for the guidance he has given me as a member. If ever the Speaker had the right to discipline a member, certainly he had the right to discipline me many times. I accept that as a matter of fact.

In my discussions with the Speaker, he has appreciated my points of view. One attitude I have always adopted is that members of Parliament should be truthful. If I have believed sincerely that a member of Parliament, whether he be on the Government or the Opposition side, is telling lies, I have challenged him and said that he has been telling lies. Such a statement should be allowed in this House, because that is what truthfulness is all about.

Of course, such statements have put me into a lot of trouble with the Speaker because I would not withdraw my remarks. I am reminded of one occasion when I told a member that he was not telling the truth—that he was telling lies—and the Speaker said, "I ask the member for Swan to withdraw". I just packed my bags and walked out of the Chamber! If members read *Hansard*, they will find that is the only occasion on which the

member for Swan did not withdraw his remarks about a member. *Hansard* shows that I accused a member of telling a lie, and my accusation was not withdrawn. The Speaker did not really intend me to withdraw. He meant to say, "Would the member for Swan withdraw his remarks?"

Mr Speaker, I am pleased to see you have returned to the Chair. I was referring to the fact that on a number of occasions you would have liked to eject me forcibly from the Chamber because of my conduct. You have readily understood the attitude I have adopted, and I thank you for that.

I want to say also, as I said to the Acting Speaker (Mr Crane), that under the rules of this place you have disciplined me on a number of occasions, and the discipline was well deserved. I accept that. I must have pushed you to the limit of your tolerance on many occasions. I can well understand the frustrations you must have felt. You must have thought, "What do I do with this guy?"

I have often asked myself, "Why do I act like this?" Probably it is only because I have felt so strongly about an issue that I have done such things. I thank you for your patience, Sir.

My eight years in this place have been a very frustrating time for me because no effort by anybody on this side of the House to play a role in the destinies of the State and the people in it have been successful. That is the State in which I live, and which I love so freely.

In my service of eight years, I can say that my electorate work has given me the necessary support to allow me to continue. I say "Thank you" to the electors in Swan for the support they have given me. I hope they will give the same support to the candidate of the Australian Labor Party (Mr Gordon Hill) who will succeed me at a forthcoming by-election. That by-election will be held after I announce my retirement from the Parliament. I say simply that the support of my electorate has sustained me in this place.

The last few weeks have been a very difficult time for me. I left the party of which I had been a member for some 42 years. I have had a time to reflect on the action I took; and although I have some regrets, I am steadfast in the principle that I enunciated at the time of my resignation from the Australian Labor Party. At this stage I have not changed my opinion, because I believe in that principle. Having made a decision, I shall stick to it at the present.

It may be that in the future I will change my attitude. I say simply that I have never gone away

from the Australian Labor Party as the party to which I will always give my full support, as distinct from the utterances I have made regarding the manner in which the leadership of the Parliamentary Labor Party changed.

I will always be a socialist. Nobody will ever change that. However, it is not my intention to remain a member of Parliament after the end of this session. I indicate my intention to resign early in January next year. By the middle of January I shall have submitted my resignation to you, Mr Speaker.

To everybody who has supported me and given me great encouragement, and to all those who have been off-side with me at various times—the people who have thought, “He is a pretty difficult sod”; and I admit that I am, at times—I offer my thanks for their patience. I admit that at times I have been a little pig headed and hard to move when I have adopted a stand; but after all, if we are honest in our intentions, we have come to this place to stand for various things.

The Parliament is not a place where we have a right to stand on a public rostrum as individuals. We come here representing the electorate; and the Parliament cannot do anything but good.

I thank you, Mr Speaker, for being so kind.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Clarko) in the Chair; Sir Charles Court (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Procedure in Committee: Statement by Chairman

The CHAIRMAN: Before I begin, I should like to make a brief statement. Since we last dealt with an Appropriation Bill in Committee, the Standing Orders have been changed. The effect of the change should be twofold and, in the main, members will be given a greater opportunity to speak on matters which come within the Estimates. When I call the first part, which deals with Parliament, I shall immediately call the first division. In the past, free-ranging and broad debate was allowed on the part and, subsequently when the division was called, many members used item 1 as a means to have a general debate.

The wish of the Standing Orders Committee, which has now been carried out, is that members have the opportunity, when the division is called, to have a general debate. That will be the opportunity for everybody to speak within the

parameters of that particular division and the part will no longer be a place for general debate.

Members will understand that, in the first part which deals with Parliament, there are approximately 20 divisions, so a person could speak 20 times in a general nature on the divisions, whereas previously he had to encompass his general comments when he spoke for 30 minutes on the part. When we get to the items, debate must be confined to the matter under consideration. No longer will a person be able to use an item 1, as members have done in the past, as an opportunity to have a free-ranging discussion.

When we get to the items, members will have to be much more relevant and specific that they were previously. As Chairman, I shall have to restrain members if they seek to wander away from the specific item. Of course members will have a much greater opportunity to speak generally when the division is called and there will be many more opportunities to do so, because, for example, as I have stated, in the first part there are 20 divisions. However, when dealing with the items, members will have to be specific in their comments, because the new Standing Orders are now designed in that way.

Committee Resumed

Division 2: Legislative Council, \$305 000—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition takes the opportunity to restate its attitude towards the Legislative Council and to say that, as far as it is concerned, the Legislative Council represents all that is unfair and undemocratic in the electoral laws covering this State.

How Government members can countenance a situation in which they are prepared to accept that a vote accorded to one person should be worth 14 times the value of a vote accorded to another person is beyond the understanding of the Opposition. It cannot see the justification for treating one Western Australian in a way different from that which another Western Australian is treated.

We realise that, crystalised in the Government's attitude towards the Legislative Council, are the political considerations which so often propel this Government.

In talking generally, I want to touch specifically upon something which has become obvious to us, and that is the unhealthy rivalry which appears to have developed between the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly and the President of the Legislative Council. That sort of

rivalry which has been made obvious in the alternating of the position of chairperson on different committees at different times, does no-one any good.

We have all heard the mutterings abroad about the plans of the President to have a brass plaque mounted over the door of Parliament House to coincide with the planned celebrations of the 150th anniversary of parliamentary rule in this State.

While we are busy squabbling, we are doing so at the expense of the value of the votes, in the case of the Legislative Council, of those people who live in the metropolitan area. It is time the Government took a long and hard look at the situation which is persisting in respect of the Legislative Council. It is time the Government took a long and hard look at the different performance of that body during the times when a Labor Government has been in office in this Chamber, although not, I stress, in power in this State.

It is extremely important for the Government to have some honesty about the way in which it faces up to the reality of its use and abuse of the Legislative Council, and the idleness of its claims that the Legislative Council is anything of a House of Review, but rather is nothing but a blocking measure aimed to prevent the ALP from ever assuming power in this State.

Let me give the Committee an assurance that, at the 1983 election, members should have no doubt that the question of the value of the votes of the people of this State will be placed squarely before the electors. I have no doubt about or lack of faith in the character or nature of the people who live in this State and their ability to decide for themselves that it is no fair race if we have one competitor enshrining himself in laws which prevent the race being run fairly or laws which result in one entrant starting 50 yards in front of the other to finish at the same place.

It is true that, if we are to gain control of the Legislative Council, the Opposition party in this Chamber needs to win well in excess of 54 per cent of the votes at the next State general election. That is akin to a horse winning a race and losing it unless he passes the post two lengths in front of the next successive rival. It is not something about which Government members should boast and it is something which, in 1983, will be the subject of some focus and attention at the polls.

The Opposition looks forward to the legal challenge to the validity of the electoral laws brought down by this Government some months

ago, and we face the challenge confidently, because we believe that, enshrined in the Constitution, the words "directly elected by the people" do not justify the sort of malapportionment this Government embodies in the laws it foists upon the people of this State.

I recap by saying simply this: The Legislative Council continues to be an abuse of the democratic process and accompanying that abuse now we have the petty rivalry about which all of us know which sets the Speaker against the President in some thrusting race to see who is the most pre-eminent in the precincts of Parliament.

Mr Sibson interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Bunbury cannot deny he has noticed the rivalry. Indeed, everybody has.

Mr Sibson: Whether or not I deny that the rivalry exists, I know the ALP has rivalries within its own party.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am glad the member for Bunbury does not deny he has noticed it and I ask him whether he thinks it is healthy rivalry.

Mr Sibson interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Not only is the Legislative Council an abuse of the democratic process, but also the abuse has turned to pettiness when we see the rivalry between the presiding officers in each of the Chambers.

As far as we are concerned, the Legislative Council represents everything that is cruel and unfair in the democratic process, so called, in this State. That is not to say we are afraid to face this Government on the old or the new boundaries, because there are 18 months to go before the election and we will see members opposite on that day and witness how the cards fall. At the same time, there is no justification for what the Legislative Council represents in our system.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no further general debate I shall call the items. While members are not debarred from speaking on an item if they have not indicated at the appropriate time that they wish to do so, Standing Orders say the Chairman shall obtain an indication as to which items members wish to speak on and he shall then roster them in the hierarchical order of item numbers.

Item 1: Salaries, Wages and Allowances—

Mr TONKIN: I presume under item 1 I am permitted to speak about the Legislative Council members who are paid a salary? It is dealing with the salaries of Legislative Council members. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN: I am initially advised, no. Salaries are provided under a special Act which is not under the section.

Mr TONKIN: They are officers rather than members?

The CHAIRMAN: They are officers rather than members, yes.

Division 2 put and passed.

Division 3: Legislative Assembly, \$263 000—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition's attitude towards the addition of four new members of Parliament and the elevation, haltingly though it has occurred, of two back-benchers to the position of Ministers in this Chamber, is well known and I take this opportunity to endorse that attitude. Who in this Chamber can honestly say that we need four new members of Parliament in the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council? Is there any member here who says that his or her work load is so great as to justify extra members of Parliament? If no-one is prepared to say by way of interjection that there is some justification, wherein lies the reason for what has been done? How can the Premier at times of financial stringency justify the addition of these extra salaries to the State's pay-roll?

Mr Bertram: Impossible!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: "Impossible", as the member for Mt. Hawthorn says, and as confirmed by the Premier's silence.

Sir Charles Court: Don't give me that stuff. Silence is not consent in this place any more than it is anywhere else.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Tell us the justification for it.

Mr Pearce: That is the legal maxim silence implies.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Of course, the Treasurer does not have to respond as his Minister did not have to respond last evening and, as the previous Minister chose to remain seated on one occasion, and we all know the penalty paid for that. He was called on to the mat of his Premier and the Premier himself now proposes to do the same thing.

Mr Pearce: He might help the Premier's mat.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: And if the Treasurer is not going to answer—

Mr Hassell: He does not have to say anything.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If Parliament is not the proper place to call on the Government to outline

the basis for its actions, then where is the proper place?

Sir Charles Court: The reasons were given in this Parliament when the legislation was introduced, so don't give us that nonsense here.

Mr Tonkin: You said, "Here's the Bill. Like it or leave it".

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The reasons for the addition of four members of Parliament were never given.

Mr Tonkin: Never given.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: And that is why the Premier now cannot find them.

Sir Charles Court: They had to be given when the Bill was introduced.

Mr Tonkin: They don't have to be. You had the numbers; you didn't have to give anything.

Sir Charles Court: It is no good your saying we have not stated the reasons to Parliament because they have been stated.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What are those reasons? If they have been stated, perhaps the Treasurer will do the Parliament the courtesy of restating them.

Mr Rushton: Read *Hansard*.

Mr Bryce: They are not in *Hansard*, and he knows it.

Sir Charles Court: Valid reasons were given to the Chamber.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In the time the Treasurer has taken to dodge the question he could have enumerated the reasons one by one.

Mr Hassell: All the time you have been saying nothing of any value.

Mr Grayden: The interjections are highly disorderly.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am making the point that there has been no attempt—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Blaikie): Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There has been no basis laid for the reason that this Government is claiming we require the appointment of four extra members of Parliament. The Parliament has a right to know.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr Hassell: Your new slogan is, "A stunt a day to keep the truth away".

Mr Pearce: Tell the Parliament the truth!

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat. I have said on many occasions that when I sit in

this Chair I do not intend ever to allow interjections to proceed when the speaker on his feet does not wish to catch them. If that is not the situation and if the person who is addressing the Chamber shows an inclination to accept the interjections, up to a point I will accept that, but I will not accept people interjecting over him. I will not have it, because it does not go towards making any progress.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not mind interjections at all, and I am not concerned about the Chief Secretary's interjections. What I want to say is that the Treasurer has a no more appropriate place in which to explain reasons for the addition of these members of Parliament than in this Parliament today when we are considering the Estimates before us. The Treasurer's reluctance to heed the request of the Opposition to state the reasons for the addition of four new members of Parliament and the appointment of two new Ministers proves the point that the Opposition has stated time and time again that there is no reason, except to protect this Government on every occasion that it begins to develop feet of clay. We say that over and over again because it is true, and because the Government's reluctance to explain the basis for its argument or action needs to be broadcast abroad because in 1983 it will be one of the issues on which this Government will be brought down.

Mr BRYCE: I rise to join with the Leader of the Opposition in expressing my disgust with the unnecessary increase in the size of the membership of this Chamber. When the legislation was introduced the Premier did not at any stage give this Chamber valid reasons for the increase in the size of the gerrymandered structure in this Chamber. The Premier brought the legislation to this Chamber for one express purpose and that was to enable himself and his colleagues, on the basis of homework done by his back-room boys, to fine down a gerrymander.

As the Leader of the Opposition has said, over the last eight years every time this Government has developed feet of clay it has turned to the Constitution, to the Electoral Districts Act, and to the Electoral Act to manipulate those three Statutes in order to avoid the electoral consequences of its performances and operations.

This Premier has never at any stage advanced a single, valid reason for the increase, and on at least two occasions in the past we have seen Statutes brought to this place to increase the number of members of Parliament, of the Legislative Assembly, and on occasions also of that other place, and that legislation resulted in decisions which have led to a total increase of 10.

Add to that increase the increase in the size of the Cabinet. The Premier—the Minister in charge of the Treasury—who would pretend to be concerned with the good housekeeping and careful management of the taxpayers' funds in this State, lavishes upon his own party in offsetting the cost of all these additional salaries purely for the purpose of changing the shape of the lines which define the difference between the metropolitan area and the rural and agricultural parts of the State. That was his sole and simple reason for doing so on two previous occasions. We have seen this particular action in recent times with the Government bringing in legislation to increase the number of members. There is no justification for it. It is a scandal and is totally unnecessary, and the Premier ought, at this stage, to reflect on what that has meant during the period of time that he has been at the helm of affairs.

It reflects very, very poorly indeed on any Government that it has gone to the lengths to which this Government has gone to manipulate the Constitution, to manipulate the Electoral Act, and to manipulate the Electoral Districts Act simply because it has made a series of decisions, one after the other. It is part of the Government's decision-making process which has developed.

I believe the tactics the Government has used on those three occasions, spread over eight years, is reprehensible. There is no justification for them, and there is no justification for this Premier to argue that money is not available for so many worth-while causes in this community when it is necessary for his own political survival to squander money on salaries and other associated expenses to increase the size of the Legislature.

Mr JAMIESON: I refer to the constitution of the Legislative Assembly in its present form. It appears to me that Parliament as a whole—and the Legislative Assembly is included in that—has never been in such a mess in all the time I have been a member of Parliament. I would like to know exactly where we stand. A number of matters are before the courts at the present time and, of course, we cannot discuss them individually.

A hopeless state of affairs has arisen because no-one knows what is the situation; we do not know whether Ministers are justified in what they do, or whether the Electoral Districts Act is in order, not to mention another action that has been taken by our friend in Fremantle Prison who has caused some concern to the Government. Surely the Government has been very tardy in achieving legal determination of these matters. These situations cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely, and if the Treasurer thinks other

things are more important I will remind him that the most important thing in this State is the Parliament. He may think the most important thing is the Cabinet or his own administrative responsibilities; he has often said that Parliament should have the responsibility; but he has not done and is not doing anything to resolve the situation which has prevailed for some months. He should get the Attorney General off his backside and make him do something.

The Treasurer is always complimenting the Attorney General and saying how good he is, but I have not seen him display any great ability in dealing with such matters. He is very tardy. I have had to remind him of the matters I have referred to him and I always seem to be chasing him up. If he is a good legal man, then he should be better than he is.

It is important for the people of this State to know exactly what the position is in relation to the future number of Ministers. People should also know the future of the electoral boundaries. It is not good enough for the Government to sit back and let the process of law slowly grind away. It can do better than that; it can do more than a private citizen is able to do in order to have matters brought before the court for opinion and determination, and it is not doing it. I feel the Treasurer owes it to the people of this State to take action in order to solve all these problems as quickly as possible.

We can criticise what the Government has done in the past in relation to increasing the number of seats, increasing the number of Ministers, and increasing all sorts of things; but it is like water off a duck's back as far as it is concerned. The legal situation should be determined as quickly as possible. The Treasurer will say one has to wait for court listings, etc., but this is not the case. As an administrative body the Government has certain advantages that other people do not have in obtaining court listings. There is, however, a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Government to solve the problems which currently exist in order that the people of Western Australia will know exactly where they stand.

Mr TONKIN: We were told by the Treasurer and the Chief Secretary that reasons had been given for the increase in the number of members of Parliament. I have a copy of the Chief Secretary's second reading speech and I have been unable to find any reasons for this move.

I find it extraordinary that the Premier, having been offered the opportunity, did not tell us the reasons. If he thought he had a good case, he would be delighted to sprout the propaganda he is

always putting forward saying that the State is in good hands and under good leadership. But he declined the opportunity presented by the Leader of the Opposition to state the reasons that extra members of Parliament are required in this State.

In the Chief Secretary's second reading speech various reasons were given that a redistribution was necessary, but nowhere did it mention why it was necessary to increase the number of members of Parliament in this State. We, the Opposition, reiterate that we do not need more members of Parliament.

A Government that cries poor mouth and cannot educate our children and treat the sick is able to provide funds for more members to sit on the Government back benches. That is a scandal. Once again, although I know he will treat my request with contempt, I ask the Premier to state the reasons for the increase in the number of members of Parliament. In his speech the Chief Secretary did not give one reason that the increase should be implemented.

Sir Charles Court: The Minister introduced the legislation which deals with this specific matter and it ill becomes you to try to re-hash it now. You had plenty to say about it at the time and since.

Mr TONKIN: The fact of the matter is that the Premier knows that if he had good reasons that four extra members of Parliament were needed he would be leaping to his feet to demolish the Opposition. He knows in his heart of hearts that there is no good reason that we should have more politicians in Western Australia, and the people know that, too.

Dr DADOUR: I do not know whether I am speaking at the right time; members will have to wait and see. I would like to know the total cost of the two additional Honorary Ministers. I realise they are not receiving ministerial salaries, but I am aware their colleagues are throwing money into the pot.

Mr Carr: I hope they are declaring that to the Taxation Department.

Dr DADOUR: I am taking everything into consideration: staff, cars—not only the cars they have themselves, but the right to use chauffeur-driven cars—office space, office rent, and superannuation. I would like to know the total cost of the two Honorary Ministers.

I was very pleased that members of the Cabinet did not accept a salary increase recently. When the nurses were granted a 5.7 per cent increase by the Industrial Commission they were immediately taken to task and asked by the Treasurer not to accept it. The Treasurer is always telling us we

should abide by the referee's decision, the "referee" being the Industrial Commission. If anybody was wrong in the Treasurer's eyes on that occasion, it must have been the Industrial Commission, and not the nurses. The nurses were asked by the Government not to accept the increase, but they did. Members of the Cabinet were then virtually forced into not accepting their own increases.

I did not accept my increase. Each month, the additional money is sent to a very worthy charitable institution in my electorate. I believe I am able to use that money better than if it went into Consolidated Revenue in the form of additional taxation. I am continually at loggerheads about the way we spend money in this State, because I do not believe it is spent to the best advantage, and to benefit the people. I cannot in all conscience live with this problem because it is so wrong. The Government continues to spend money in areas where it should not.

I ask the Treasurer: What is the total cost of the two Honorary Ministers?

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have made it clear by interjection there is no good purpose to be served by going over all the matters which have been canvassed *ad nauseam*. The Opposition continues to say the same old things.

We have made it clear we wished there to be an increase in the number of members of Parliament; we put the matter to Parliament, and it was passed.

Mr Bryce: You fiddled.

Sir CHARLES COURT: That remark does not become the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Bryce: You have fiddled with the Electoral Act and the Constitution.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: We have done nothing of the sort, and that remark does not become the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. We

are getting a little tired of some of the language he uses.

Mr Bryce: That is precisely the truth, and you do it very often.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Sir CHARLES COURT: The complaint about extra salaries for additional members of Parliament has no relevance in this Budget, nor will it have much relevance in the next Budget; therefore, it ill-becomes the Opposition to try to make an issue of this on a financial item to which it does not apply.

The member for Subiaco rightly said the additional salaries of the Honorary Ministers were met by the other Ministers, as is customary when we have Honorary Ministers.

The other matter he raised has been the subject of questions on a number of occasions, and information has been provided. However, if it has not, I will be only too pleased to research it again, and ensure he is informed. The Government has no desire to withhold the information, because it is a fact there are some incidental expenses. On the other hand, the actual salary component is not a burden to the taxpayer.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr Brian Burke (Leader of the Opposition).

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with amendments.

House adjourned at 4.26 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PRISONS: PRISONERS

Fremantle: Study Leave

2507. Mr PARKER, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Has there been a change to the policy concerning study leave for prisoners at Fremantle Gaol in the last 12 months, and if so, what?
- (2) What was the old policy?
- (3) What is the current policy?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes.

Up to 1978 leave of absence subject to prison regulation 98 1(e) for the purpose of study at educational centres in the community was available for all minimum security prisoners to pursue bona fide educational programmes.

In 1978 following serious offences committed by two prisoners on study leave, the programme was scaled down to allow study leave only during the final three months of sentence if the prisoner was approved for work release.

Such study leave had to be based on an established study programme, be employment related and in some way relate to the social re-integration concept of work release.

The department's current policy is to provide within the prison setting educational facilities which assist prisoners wishing to enrol in and pursue appropriate external study courses that are also available to members of the community.

Under the provisions of clause 87 (5) in the Prisons Bill 1981 it will be possible for the Minister to approve study leave in certain circumstances.

- (2) If so, has the Government evaluated these proposals?
- (3) Is it proposed to introduce legislation and, if so, when?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A committee has made recommendations to the Government, and these are under consideration.
- (3) When the Government completes its evaluation of the committee's report a decision will be made.

POLICE: NORTH-WEST

Vehicles: Air-conditioning

2521. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Has the Government appointed a committee to examine requests from the Police Union for air-conditioning vehicles for officers in the north-west?
- (2) Who are the members of the committee?
- (3) When is the committee expected to make recommendations to the Government?
- (4) When does the Government expect to announce the results of its considerations?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) to (4) No. All police vehicles north of the 26th parallel are air-conditioned, with the exception of the police vehicle at Koolan Island, which is a soft-top and is being replaced in the current Budget with an air-conditioned Daihatsu.

The matter of air-conditioning of police vehicles was written into the police award in 1979.

The criterion for air-conditioning is: A patrol vehicle used for more than five hours on day shift.

ANIMALS: PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT

RSPCA

2515 Mr PEARCE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Is it a fact that the RSPCA made recommendations to the Government for changes to legislation dealing with cruelty to animals?

POLICE: PERSONNEL

Retirement: Voluntary

2522. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Has the Government appointed a committee to examine proposals for voluntary retirement of police officers at age 55?

- (2) Who are the members of the committee?
- (3) When is the committee expected to report to the Government?
- (4) When is the Government expected to announce any decision arising from the committee's deliberations?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The matter has been widely discussed within the joint superannuation committee (a body comprising representatives of the unions involved in the scheme), the State Superannuation Board and Treasury. No proposals have been put to the Government for consideration.

However, I am pursuing information on consideration of the matter following a union request that I should do so.

POLICE: PERSONNEL

Promotions

2523. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) What is the average time taken for a police officer to reach the rank of—
 - (a) sergeant;
 - (b) inspector;
 - (c) superintendent?
- (2) What were the comparative times taken five years ago?
- (3) Have representations been made to him pointing out that the Government's low recruiting policies of the last two Budgets are decreasing promotional opportunities in the force?
- (4) Have representations been made to him pointing out that the slowing of recruitment and promotion in recent years is having a detrimental effect on morale?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) (a) Approximately 14 years;
(b) approximately 29 years;
(c) approximately 33 years.
- (2) (a) Approximately 14 years;
(b) approximately 28 years;
(c) approximately 31 years.

- (3) I am aware of the current delay in promotion becoming available for some police personnel. Promotion rates will always vary with the rate of growth of the Police Force.
- (4) Such representations have been made.

POLICE: PERSONNEL

Overtime

2524. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) What was the total wage cost of all overtime worked by all police officers during the 1980-81 financial year?
- (2) How many man hours of overtime does this represent?

Mr HASSELL replied:

(1) Police Department	\$1 655 096.16
Road Traffic Patrol	\$ 980 326.39
	<hr/>
	\$2 635 422.55

(2) Police Department	126 931
Road Traffic Patrol	76 616
	<hr/>

Hours 203 547

It should be noted that a significant proportion of overtime work undertaken is not for additional duties, but to enable police officers to complete work commenced during normal shift, for court appearances as a follow up to prosecutions previously commenced, and for other finalisation of inquiries.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

Child Welfare Act

2536. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Does he intend to contact, or has he contacted all licensed daycare centres to request submissions or an expression of opinion on proposed changes to the Child Welfare Act?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) Does he intend to advise, or has he advised licensed daycare centres of details of any proposed changes to the Child Welfare Act?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) to (4) No. The proposals for the legislation have been sent to a representative sample of persons involved in child day care work. However, any other interested day care centre is welcome to apply for a copy of the proposals and submissions on them would be welcomed.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Film: "Caligula"

2538. Mr DAVIES, to the Chief Secretary:

Which version—i.e. what cuts had been made from the original—of the film "Caligula", was viewed by the State advisory committee?

Mr HASSELL replied:

The State advisory committee viewed the version of the film "Caligula" which was given an "R"-rating by the Chief Commonwealth Film Censor on 18 February 1981.

The original film was previously rejected by the Chief Censor on 18 March 1980. Following this rejection, a plan of reconstruction was submitted to the Chief Censor by the importer in October 1980, but found to be inadequate. The present version, approved by the Chief Censor on 18 February 1981, is the one released for screening in the United Kingdom.

Cuts made from the original film are not known.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

MTT: Sunday Timetables

2544. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is he aware that his latest MTT bus timetables are barring people from attending the Sunday church services of their choice?
- (2) If "Yes", what does he propose to do so as to enable these people to resume what in many cases has been a long established practice?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) Following recent representations I have asked the Metropolitan Transport Trust to examine modification of the timetables for Sunday bus operations and this will take into consideration church service times. An investigation of other possible transport alternatives that may best suit the Sunday situation is also planned.

I expect to receive the trust's report and recommendations shortly.

ROAD

Mitchell Freeway

2545. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it a fact that there is little, if any, lighting of the Mitchell Freeway between Powis Street and Scarborough Beach Road?
- (2) (a) If "Yes", is this simply because the State does not have sufficient money; and
(b) if "No", when will this situation be corrected?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes, the on and off ramps only are lit.
- (2) (a) and (b) It is considered there is insufficient justification to light the through carriageways. It is an increasingly common practice elsewhere not to light the main carriageways of freeways such as this away from the central city and interchange areas.

WATER RESOURCES AND SEWERAGE: CHARGES

Melville Glades Golf Club

2546. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Further to question 2494 of 1981 relating to the Melville Glades Golf Club, why is this club non-ratable?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Because of the provisions of section 72(h) of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act.

IMMIGRATION

Fairbridge Farm: Closure

2547. Mr SHALDERS, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) In light of the announced closure of Fairbridge Farm School and in view of the excellent facilities which exist there, would the Government give consideration to assisting in the location of a suitable alternative use for this centre so that its rural nature and general sound condition of facilities may be preserved and maintained in the future?
- (2) Has the Government any knowledge at this time of other organisations which may be interested in the possible use and lease of this establishment?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The Fairbridge Society has announced its intention to retain the buildings as a Fairbridge memorial village and continue to operate it as a viable proposition. It is developing its own plans to reduce farming activity. It is understood surveys are being undertaken as to the best possible use of the village. I have had discussions together with other officers with the Secretary of the Perth board of the society and assistance is being given where possible.

EDUCATION: COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL HOSTELS

Albany, Katanning, and Mt. Barker

2548. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many extra students will be accommodated at the Katanning High School hostel after the expenditure of \$100 000 as provided in the Loan Estimates?
- (2) If it is recognised that Katanning area families do not wish to go to Albany (question 2439 (3) of 1981), why is it that the Country High School Hostels Authority refuses to accept that Mt. Barker area families prefer Mt. Barker to Albany?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Nil. This expenditure is to provide permanent accommodation to replace temporary accommodation that has been at the hostel since 1979.
- (2) The authority has established hostels at major towns throughout the State to support the surrounding region. The region surrounding the Katanning hostel can support the hostel adequately and as the hostel is close to capacity applicants on the fringe areas are directed towards Albany, Narrogin, or Esperance hostels as applicable. Mt. Barker being close to Albany, naturally comes within the catchment area for the Albany hostel.

FUEL AND ENERGY:
ELECTRICITY*Power Station: Kalgoorlie*

2549. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) With reference to question 1896 of 1981 relating to the Piccadilly Street power station, is it correct that the figures on the plant rating and overload capacity at that power station in Kalgoorlie are based on all units being operational at the one time?
- (2) If "Yes", would the State Energy Commission see this as an unrealistic assumption?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) I am advised that the maximum continuous safe rating of a power station is based on the assumption that all units except the largest are available. In the case of the Piccadilly Street power station in Kalgoorlie, the maximum installed capacity of the station is 18.16 MW, and the maximum continuous safe rating without the largest machine is 15.66 MW.
- (2) and (3) Not applicable.

FUEL AND ENERGY:
ELECTRICITY*Power Station: Kalgoorlie*

2550. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

What provision, if any, has the State Energy Commission made to cope with

the peak load demands at the Piccadilly Street power station in Kalgoorlie during the summer and winter peaks of 1982 and future years, prior to the installation of the power transmission line from the metropolitan area?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

A 2.2 MW generating unit is to be installed, and is expected to be operational by February 1982.

HEALTH: MENTAL

Hospital: Graylands

2551. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many criminally insane patients are being detained in Wembley ward, Graylands Hospital?
- (2) How many of these patients have had psychiatric treatment prior to their last offence or last alleged offence?
- (3) Of the attacks on psychiatric nurses and other patients since the beginning of this year, how many were committed by criminally insane patients of Wembley ward?
- (4) How many of the criminally insane patients in Wembley ward who have attacked nurses and other patients have received ECT treatment prior to committing the attacks?
- (5) How many attacks by patients of Graylands Hospital on nurses and other patients have occurred in each of the past five years?
- (6) How many patients were involved in the attacks this year on staff and patients at Graylands Hospital?
- (7) How many of the patients involved in the attacks on nurses and other patients have received ECT treatment prior to the attacks?
- (8) (a) Of the attacks that have occurred this year at Graylands Hospital, how many could be described as sexual assault; and
(b) has the incidence of such attacks increased in recent years?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Two.
- (2) One.
- (3) Nil.
- (4) None.

- (5) to (7) It is estimated that at least 200 man hours of research would be required to provide the member with a reply.
I consider the time required to undertake this task is not justified.

- (8) (a) Nil;
(b) no.

WOOD CHIPPING

Royalties

2552. Mr EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Forests:

What royalty rate is being charged currently by the Forests Department for logs used for wood chipping?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

\$3.15/m³ under forest produce (chipwood) licence No. 1588.

\$2.00/m³ for a parcel of approximately 10 000m³ from an area being cleared for pine planting near Busselton.

HEALTH: NURSES

Rosters

2553. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it a fact that a circular has been issued to all hospitals on the subject of the nurses (public hospitals) award and the roster of staff on a fixed rotating basis?
- (2) If "Yes", could he confirm that the circular requires all nursing staff to be rostered to work on a fixed rotating roster?
- (3) On what basis was the decision to change from the present roster system to a fixed rotating roster system made?
- (4) Is it fact that a fixed rotating roster system will effectively prevent nurses in country hospitals in particular, being able to arrange their shift roster to allow for more than two consecutive off-duty days?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), is he aware of the approved practice in some country hospitals of nursing staff arranging shift rosters to allow a nurse more than two consecutive off-duty days for travel to the city on business of an urgent and personal nature?

- (6) If "Yes", would he consider revising the fixed rotating roster system so that the practice mentioned in (5) can continue?
- (7) If not, why not?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The circular does not require all nursing staff to work on a fixed rotating roster.
- (3) Because of the requirement to provide eight hours between shifts and the penal cost where this is not achieved, a fixed roster is the most effective method of reaching this objective.
- (4) No.
- (5) to (7) Not applicable.

HOSPITAL: KALGOORLIE REGIONAL

Staff: Overtime

2554. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What was the average monthly cost of overtime for staff employed under the nurses (public hospitals) award at the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital in 1980-81?
- (2) What was the average monthly cost of overtime for staff employed under the nurses (public hospitals) award at the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital in September and October 1981?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) \$2 417.
- (2) September 1981—\$2 368
October 1981—\$3 190.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Hyden Area

2555. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

If there has been no change in the plans to connect farmers east of Hyden to the State Energy Commission power supply, when can farmers expect—

- (a) to be offered a contract to supply power to their properties;
- (b) the work to be commenced;
- (c) the work to be completed?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (a) to (c) I released a list of future contributory extension schemes in priority order when I met with local government representatives at Lake Grace last April. The list still applies, and each scheme will proceed in order as and when its members decide to join, and in accordance with the capital funds available to the State Energy Commission.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Keys: Availability

2556. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can he confirm that the State Housing Commission has advised the incoming tenant to the commission's property at 5A Lavant Way, Balga, that maintenance has been completed on the property, but that the keys will not be available for four to six weeks and that the commission will not contact the contractor to ensure that the keys are made available earlier?
- (2) If "Yes", in view of the special needs of the incoming tenants and the fact that they have paid all the required fees, will he ensure that the keys are made available to them this week?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) It is difficult to be precise but it is understood such information was given to the ingoing tenant by an inquiry officer without a prior check on the real position. The State Housing Commission does have a good liaison with its maintenance contractors who will in urgent circumstances re-schedule work to facilitate early availability of keys to tenants. There must be some flexibility to the contractor to schedule his work programmes which in doing so reflects in the cost of the job. The contract does however restrict the time to be taken over the job with allowance for the degree of urgency.
- (2) The keys are now available and the ingoing tenant will be contacted today.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Bridgewater Importers

2557. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is he aware of the activities of Bridgewater Imports which conducts a home sales operation with introductions by means of letterbox leaflets or personal letters followed by home visits?
- (2) Is he also aware of the practice of these sales people to sign people up for contracts for goods worth several hundreds of dollars without allowing any cooling off period?
- (3) Will he have these practices immediately investigated by the Consumer Affairs Bureau with a view to legislating to prevent this attempt to avoid existing provisions of the existing Act?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The practices have been investigated. Any complaint providing sufficient evidence of a breach of the Door to Door Sales Act will be used in action for prosecution. The present legislation covers the matter adequately.

TRANSPORT: BUSES

Middle Swan

2558. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Transport:

Would he carry out a study with a view to ascertaining the viability of a bus service along Spring Avenue, Middle Swan?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The viability of a bus service along Spring Avenue is being investigated by the Metropolitan Transport Trust. I will let the member know the result.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN:

MINISTER FOR FUEL AND ENERGY

Attendance at Meeting

751. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has his office today contacted Mr Barry Walsh, President of the Lake Grace Shire Council, and the man to whom it

was incorrectly related that the Minister had lost his pair and would be unable to attend a meeting in the area today?

- (2) If his office has contacted Mr Walsh, could the Minister please inform the House of the details of that contact?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) If I thought it was any business of the Leader of the Opposition he would be the first to know.

ELECTORAL: ROLL

Door-knock

752. Mr SIBSON, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Is he aware of the article in today's *The West Australian* headed "Door-knock to boost poll roll"?
- (2) Is it correct that the canvass will apply only to the metropolitan area?
- (3) If so, when is it intended that a door-knock will be carried out in regional country areas—Bunbury City, for example?

Mr Carr: All country areas.

Mr SIBSON: All areas are in regions. My question continues—

- (4) Is the Minister aware of the very high turnover of people coming to and going from Bunbury City?
- (5) Is he aware also of the unusually high number of people remaining on the State Bunbury roll after leaving the city?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) to (5) It is not possible to extend house-to-house canvassing to country areas with the staff now available. However, publicity such as that to which the member refers will be widely promoted through the media operating in country centres.

ELECTORAL: ROLL

Dual

753. Mr BRYCE, to the Chief Secretary:

My question is supplementary to the question just asked by the member for Bunbury. I ask—

- (1) Does the Chief Secretary appreciate that if we have joint Commonwealth-State rolls, that problem would be overcome?
- (2) Is it the Minister's intention to introduce legislation to remove the obstacles to the enrolment of coloured people built into the Electoral Act?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) The Government's position in relation to joint Commonwealth-State rolls has been made very clear and the reasons for our not having a joint roll have been explained. In giving those reasons, I have also referred to the fact that in some of the States where joint rolls have been instituted, it has not proved entirely satisfactory.
- (2) I deny again—as has been denied on many previous occasions—that any provisions have been inserted into the Electoral Act for the purpose of preventing “coloured people” from enrolling. Enrolment conditions apply equally to all persons of this State, except that Aboriginal people have the option of whether to enrol.

HEALTH: NURSES

Roster

754. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Health:

I refer the Minister to his answer to question 2553 on today's notice paper and in particular to his statement that the introduction of a fixed rotating shift roster system will not effectively prevent nurses in country hospitals in particular being able to arrange their shift roster to allow for more than two consecutive off-duty days. My question is as follows—

Will he take immediate action to ensure a further notice is sent out to public hospitals—particularly in country areas—to clear up the misunderstanding that many nurses currently hold that the new fixed roster system will mean the abandonment of the “request book” which allows for the rearrangement

of rosters in accordance with the occasional need for a nurse to have more than two consecutive off-duty days?

Mr YOUNG replied:

I have received no notice of this question but I will examine the wording of it to see if any action is necessary. In case there should be any doubts in the mind of any member, my understanding of the matter raised is that the Nurses Federation of Western Australia negotiated on behalf of the nurses with the Hospitals and Allied Services on this matter. I understand there was some lack of co-ordination or co-operation between the federation—the union—and country nurses. It seems to be more of an internal matter between nurses than a problem between the nurses and the Hospitals and Allied Services; but I will examine the matter.

TELEVISION: MARGARET RIVER

SEC Interference

755. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Is the State Energy Commission aware of interference to television reception in the Margaret River area from the State Energy Commission mobile radios?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The State Energy Commission's communications staff are aware of the fact that there is some interference to television reception from their mobile radio base station in the Margaret River area.

The interference is caused by the fact that Margaret River is a television fringe reception area.

The State Energy Commission is using licensed equipment maintained in perfect working order, in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Communications.

Tests of television interference in the area have confirmed that this problem exists, and the State Energy Commission now plans to relocate the base station to avoid any problems with existing television receivers.

Completion of the relocation will be achieved by the end of January 1982, to

ensure the earliest possible relief from the present problems.

I understand there is an amount of \$25 000 to \$30 000 which has to be spent because of the situation existing. I understand as late as yesterday evening the television station in Bunbury received complaints, and the member for Vasse has followed them up very quickly. It will take until the end of January to make sure the matter is rectified adequately.

EDUCATION: TECHNICAL

College: Claremont

756. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that the continued failure of the Government to make a decision on the future of the Claremont Technical College, allied to the floating of the proposition that the college may be affiliated with the Claremont CAE, is endangering the ability of those people who have established the Claremont Art School Foundation to raise funds, and has led to a projected withdrawal of some potential sponsors of that fund which is essential for the continuation of the college on either model?
- (2) Would he now withdraw the proposition for affiliation with the Claremont College of Advanced Education which is causing all the difficulty and move rapidly to resolve this situation on the Wembley Technical College affiliation model?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) I assure the member and the staff and students at the Claremont Technical College that there is no occasion for concern. Last week we examined a proposal to annexe the college to the Wembley Technical College. Last Friday a proposal was put forward to have the college taken over by the Claremont Teachers College.

Mr Pearce: Who put forward that proposal?

Mr GRAYDEN: It came from several sources. The students and the staff at the Claremont Technical College will realise the necessity, when a proposal like the one put forward is received, to

examine it thoroughly before a recommendation is made to Cabinet. Cabinet could not possibly reach a decision about the annexation proposal unless it also had all the pros and cons affecting other proposals. The matter is as simple as that.

There is no occasion for concern. I assure the students and staff that once this study has been completed—we are endeavouring to do it this week—we will have further discussions with them, and all aspects of the matter will be explained thoroughly. They will be in a position to provide an input at that time.

Further, I have asked the Chairman of WAPSSEC to go down to explain the situation to the staff and students. He endeavoured to do that during the afternoon tea break but this was not convenient for the college. He will now be going down during the recess period tomorrow morning. He will explain the position and emphasise that there is absolutely no occasion for concern. I can assure the member for Gosnells that this person will reassure also those members who have formed this foundation, a step which I applaud.

Mr Pearce: It is being wrecked by indecision.

Mr GRAYDEN: If we make a decision it must be the right one and we cannot make the correct decision until all the facts are before us.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Ltd.

757. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

- (1) Is the Premier acquainted with a metals intelligence newsletter which comes daily from Tokyo and which on 15 October discussed the closing of the Kwinana blast furnace and said that opinions were split among business concerns in Japan.
- (2) It pointed out that people backing the possibility of a shut-down have said that, "BHP took part in the voluminous international buying tender for foundry pig totally 100 000 tonnes of SAIL International, India, early in October". Is that report correct, and when is BHP closing down its own works in Kwinana?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) I would be surprised if BHP were tendering to buy pig iron from any other country when it has a surplus capacity not only in this State but also in other States of Australia. If it were not for that surplus capacity, it could possibly arrange some interchange within Australia which would be beneficial to all concerned. I do not know the particular newsletter to which the member has referred. I know of no situation under which BHP would be tendering in this way. I do know BHP has been roaming the world for weeks, with our full knowledge, trying to find an outlet for pig iron from Kwinana, if necessary at a discount price, to try to win orders for Kwinana. It should be borne in mind that because of Australia's high cost structure it is not competitive on the world scene. As part of the arrangement the company has with us it was to tender, at a discount if necessary, to find orders outside Australia to replace the Chinese orders.

EDUCATION: PRIMARY SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Sex Education

758. Mr CRANE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Did the Minister read the letter in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, 3 November, from a woman in Morley expressing concern at the standard of sex education being taught in some schools?
- (2) Is this the standard acceptable to the Education Department?
- (3) Who is the person, or chairman of the committee responsible for approving such programmes?
- (4) As the letter outlines we have a form of legalised pornography in our schools under the guise of sex education of which many parents would not approve. Will the Minister advise the amount of money which could be saved and channelled into other areas of education if this legalised pornography in schools was curtailed?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

- (3) and (4) Insufficient information is provided to allow a precise reply. In Government schools, the principal is responsible for the programme in the school after consultation with parents. Any complaints of this nature should first be discussed with the school principal.

RADIOACTIVITY: MATERIAL

Disposal

759. Mr BARNETT, to the Premier:

I am not entirely sure this question should be directed to the Premier, but if anyone on the Government side has the answer, he does. I refer to the radioactive waste proposed to be brought from Singapore to Western Australia under the auspices of Western Mining Corporation Ltd. Will the Government fund in part or in full the transport of this waste to Western Australia?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

To the best of my knowledge the Government has no commitment in regard to the transport of that waste. If the member has information to the contrary I would be pleased to obtain it from him.

Mr Barnett: No.

RAILWAYS

Bunbury-Busselton

760. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

Can the Minister advise whether the Government has plans to close in the next two years the railway service between Bunbury and Busselton?

Mr Grayden (for Mr RUSHTON) replied:

I am informed that Westrail has no current proposal for closure of the rail service between Bunbury and Busselton.

**MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT:
FINANCIAL INTERESTS**

Disclosure

761. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

Noting the Government's decision to appoint a back-bench committee headed by the illustrious member for Bunbury to inquire into the matter of pecuniary interests and their disclosure, is the Premier prepared to ensure that in the spirit of co-operation engendered by his deputy the Opposition's motion in regard to the matter of pecuniary interests be dealt with by this House in the next week or so?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

My understanding is that the Deputy Premier received from the Opposition a list of items which the Opposition regarded as priorities to be considered as private members' business. I do not have the actual list in front of me, although the Deputy Premier showed it to me. I understand agreement had been reached on the amount of time to be spent on each item. It is now up to the Deputy Premier to confer with me as to how he intends to handle those items. It will only be a matter of working out between the Opposition and the Government when the items can be fitted in. We have a number of other items to handle in this current session. I understand the member for Gosnells has a Bill which we have undertaken to give him the opportunity to read.

Mr Pearce: I hope you do more than let me read it.

Sir CHARLES COURT: When the member wants to introduce it we will give him time to do so, but when is up to him.

APPRENTICES

*Jaxon Construction Pty. Ltd.:
Retrenchments*

762. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) What are the requirements under the Industrial Training Act and regulations with respect to the notification of apprenticeship transfers?
- (2) With reference to part (2) of question 2516 of 1981, why are the details of apprenticeships transferred from Jaxon Construction Pty Ltd unavailable?

Mr Young (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

- (1) The transfer of an apprentice from one employer to another may be effected with the mutual consent of the parties to the agreement—section 34.
An employer who employs an apprentice by way of a transfer is required to notify the registrar within 14 days of the date that the apprentice commences employment with him—regulation 12.
- (2) Records of transfer of apprentices are maintained on individual apprentice files and not on a master index. To extract the information requested would require an examination of the files of all the apprentices who have been employed by the company in the past two years.