

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 13 September 1983

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

TEMPORARY REDUCTION OF REMUNERATION (SENIOR PUBLIC OFFICERS) BILL

Assent

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

ANIMALS: DOG ACT

Review: Petition

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

To the Honourable Members in Parliament Assembled, We, the undersigned, wish to draw your attention to the fact that the recommendations put to the Minister by the Dog Act Review Committee, May 1983, are a serious menace to our civil rights and accordingly hereby request that you reject, in its entirety, the reported recommendations of that committee, and as in duty bound, your petitioners shall ever pray.

(See Paper No. 253.)

ANIMALS: DOG ACT

Review: Petition

On motions by the Hon. Margaret McAleer, the following petition bearing the signature of one person was received, read, and ordered to lie upon the Table of the House—

To the Honourable Members in Parliament Assembled, We, the undersigned, wish to draw your attention to the fact that the recommendations put to the Minister by the Dog Act Review Committee, May 1983, are a serious menace to our civil rights and accordingly hereby request that you reject, in its entirety, the reported recommendations of this committee, and as in duty bound your humble petitioners shall ever pray.

(See Paper No. 254.)

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

During questions without notice the President made the following statement—

STANDING ORDER No. 212

Statement by President

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths): Honourable members will be aware that one hour has now elapsed since the time set down for the commencement of business of the day. I wish to make a couple of comments in regard to the state of affairs we have now reached.

Members will know that until quite recently it has never been necessary to invoke the provisions of Standing Order No. 212. I have been interpreting it in the same way, on the odd occasion that the situation has occurred in recent times and applied to it the same provisions as I have for Standing Order No. 181. I have been looking at Standing Order No. 212 and it occurs to me that it is worded slightly differently from Standing Order No. 181.

In future, commencing now, it is my intention not to initiate the seeking of leave to proceed with whatever we are doing at one hour after the commencement of the House. I will leave it for some honourable member to seek leave to proceed with what we are doing. I will draw to the attention of the House the fact that the time has been reached. I will continue with the same procedure in regard to Standing Order No. 181 as I have in the past.

I draw to the attention of honourable members the fact that one hour has elapsed.

[Resolved: That formal business be continued.]

ELECTORAL AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [5.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill contains a number of proposals which form part of a range of electoral reform undertakings presented to the electors by the Labor Party at the 1983 general elections.

Firstly, it makes provision for the establishment of a working relationship between the State and the Commonwealth to enable electors to complete only one claim card to achieve enrolment on both rolls. This is a benefit that has been denied Western Australians while being available to the elec-

tors of most other States for many years. It presents an arrangement that will extend to the co-operative processing of claim cards so as to make more effective use of manpower and reduce costs to the taxpayer.

Our present operating costs are approximately \$300 more per 1 000 electors than the five Australian States average.

It is proposed to authorise an agreement between the two Governments which will provide that a single claim card be first lodged with the Australian Electoral Office. That office will check the qualifications of claimants and then communicate the data to the State Electoral Department, which will enrol the person for State purposes.

The possibility of the State and Commonwealth operating a joint electoral roll has existed in section 31 of our Electoral Act for years. However, the concept in this Bill is not one of joint rolls such as is operated in some Australian States. Both the Commonwealth and the State will maintain separate rolls for their respective purposes.

This approach has been favoured because State rolls are used for a number of purposes which are not the concern of the Commonwealth. In other words, the Government wishes to preserve some measure of independence for the State in this matter. The arrangement will retain the electoral databank in Western Australia and permit us to use this information to serve all State purposes.

Such an arrangement demands that the qualifications for enrolment be the same for the State and the Commonwealth. The Bill, therefore, contains amendments which will align State enrolment qualifications with those now applying under Commonwealth law.

One of these is the additional three months' qualification for enrolment by Western Australian electors, which has been a hindrance to Commonwealth-State co-operation since it was introduced in 1948. It is necessary also to change certain other matters which would otherwise provide a hindrance to a joint working arrangement.

The previous Government agreed with the Commonwealth and other States to delete references to "British subject" as a qualification for enrolment and to substitute a requirement that the claimant be a natural born or naturalised Australian citizen. This Bill provides for the change to be introduced on a proclaimed day by arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States and in this regard, negotiations are in progress.

There is a provision to preserve the right to enrolment for persons already enrolled who may

currently claim to be British subjects but have not yet acquired Australian citizenship.

Other matters which require to be deleted from our current law include the requirements concerning the witnessing of initial enrolment claims by a very small group of specified persons. In future we will require only that a witness be a person qualified for enrolment. This is the position under Commonwealth and other States' legislation. This was always the case until the Kimberley Court of Disputed Returns, after which amendments were introduced making it more difficult for citizens in remote parts of the State to enrol.

Although this was done by the Government, at the time it did not produce evidence that there were any abuses of the system which made such a restrictive move desirable.

A further amendment repeals the law passed in 1981 which demands that a claim be submitted to the Electoral Registrar within 31 days of completion. This obviously is a big disadvantage to those who live in remote areas of the State, and apart from there never having been any real need for such a law, it would now act as a bar to the establishment of co-operative working arrangements with the Commonwealth.

The Bill contains also a number of improvements which will eliminate some of the causes of criticism which have been voiced loudly in the past.

Claim cards have previously been rejected if lodged within 14 days of the issue of a writ for a general election. Cards will now be accepted up to 6.00 p.m. on the day of issue of the writ. The names of those claimants will be included in the rolls for the pending election. This means that citizens will have 14 days from the time an election is announced in which to enrol, instead of Governments being able to close the rolls suddenly for political advantage.

This Government is pleased to be the first Government in Australia to give electors the courtesy of two weeks' notice of the closing of rolls for an election or referendum. This will introduce a new time factor affecting the preparation of the rolls, and to compensate for this a minimum of 14 days will be fixed for the closing of nominations for an election following the issue of the writ.

While our current law has done little to simplify the process of enrolment or to encourage citizens to enrol, stringent provisions have been provided for the striking off of persons who fail to vote at an election and who do not reply to a notice sent to them by the Chief Electoral Officer. It may not be their fault that they have not replied.

A postal error may be involved or the information on the electoral card may be wrong or out of date.

With the introduction of co-operative arrangements with the Commonwealth, the State will gain the benefit of the house-to-house canvassing conducted by the Commonwealth. This is the most effective means of keeping rolls in good order, both in relation to the number of persons enrolled and the accuracy of the information.

The Chief Electoral Officer will not in future have to obey a mandatory provision requiring the striking off of a non-voter's name. He will have a discretion which will be related to the new facility to investigate each to establish that a person is or is not a resident at the address for which he or she is enrolled.

The Bill will adjust also certain deficiencies in the form of the claim card. There are persons in the community who do not know their exact birth date. Such people find difficulty in completing the card as required. In future it will be sufficient for them to establish that they are at least 18 years of age.

People living in remote areas where there is no mail delivery service have experienced problems in obtaining delivery of electoral matter sent to them by the Electoral Department. This applies particularly to people who seek postal votes. The claim card will make provision for the claimant to provide a postal address. This information will not appear on the electoral roll but will be used by the department when sending this type of communication to the elector, thereby guaranteeing delivery.

Once the working arrangement is concluded with the Commonwealth, the Chief Electoral Officer will be required to enrol all persons whose names appear on the Commonwealth roll but not on the State roll. This should help to make up the deficiency in numbers which has in the past been revealed from a comparison of the numbers enrolled for the Commonwealth and the State.

Ongoing arrangements for joint enrolment processing should then guarantee that the figures should remain reasonably comparable. The Chief Electoral Officer will be required to undertake this addition of names within a period of six months from the date of operation of the scheme.

The Bill includes an amendment to provide 48 hours' notice to be given to candidates when a mobile polling booth visits a hospital or institution.

The right to vote is fundamental in any country claiming to be a democracy and these reforms will make it easier for people to be enrolled and to exercise their democratic right.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. P. G. Pental.

CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan—Attorney General) [5.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the Constitution Acts Amendment Act and is consequential to the Electoral Amendment Bill in regard to the proposed changes in the qualifications of electors. It follows that the amendments to sections 7 and 20 will become necessary for similar changes to the qualifications for members of Parliament to be effected.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. P. G. Pental.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 17 August.

HON. N. F. MOORE (Lower North) [5.56 p.m.]: I wish to use this debate to draw to the attention of the House my very grave concern at the trend towards separate racial development that appears to be happening in Australia today. Firstly I will refer to moves that are in the process of being made to acquire huge tracts of land right across Australia for some Aboriginal people; the so-called land rights movement.

Secondly, I will refer to moves towards the development of separate laws for Aboriginal people. Thirdly, I will refer to the proliferation of organisations that have developed right across Australia for the administration of Aboriginal affairs. Finally, I will discuss the methods being used by the perpetrators of the separate racial movement to achieve their end.

In recent times the land rights debate in Western Australia has heated up because of the change of Government. However, this issue has been in the political area across Australia for a number of years, and probably gained its greatest momentum during the Whitlam period. Coming out of that was the land rights legislation in relation to the Northern Territory which was passed by the Fraser Government.

I will outline the different types of land rights legislation implemented in Australia since the initial legislation affecting the Northern Territory. I will talk about each particular State in turn for a

moment, and then I will focus my attention on the present situation in Western Australia.

The land rights legislation relating to the Northern Territory is essentially in line with Federal Labor Party policy and with State ALP policy as it was before the State ALP came into Government.

When the legislation was implemented in the Northern Territory, the existing Aboriginal reserves were converted to inalienable freehold title for Aboriginal people. Unoccupied Crown land then became subject to claim. Aboriginal groups may make a claim, and if they can convince the land commissioner that they have a traditional or particular reason for owning that land, they can have it granted to them under inalienable freehold title. Pastoral leases which were owned by Aboriginal communities, and subsequently any pastoral leases purchased by Aboriginal groups, could be converted to inalienable freehold title, provided the communities could convince the land commissioner that they had some traditional ownership of the land.

The position that has arisen in the Northern Territory is that about 47 per cent of the land area is now either owned by Aboriginal communities through Aboriginal lands trusts, administered by land councils, or is presently subject to claim. The sort of freehold title which has been made available to Aboriginal communities has certain provisions attached to it which are not available under other types of title held by other people in the community. For example, there is significant control over the activities of mining companies. There is ample evidence of up-front payments being required for mining companies to go onto Aboriginal land.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Rubbish!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Let me finish. Provision exists for royalties to be payable to the Aboriginal lands council which administers a particular piece of land. Entry restrictions apply to non-Aboriginal people wishing to go onto Aboriginal lands, and fines of up to \$1 000 apply for unauthorised entry onto Aboriginal land by non-Aborigines.

Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Prior to the suspension I was discussing the land rights issue as it applies in Australia and particularly in the Northern Territory and the legislation that exists there. I talked about the controls that exist over mining in the Northern Territory and I mentioned the restrictions on entry onto Aboriginal land applying to all persons other than Aborigines. I mentioned the stiff fines payable in the event that someone en-

tered onto Aboriginal land in an unauthorised way.

The inalienable freehold title in the Northern Territory is held by the Aboriginal lands trusts which are set up for each particular area of land under land rights title. As a consequence, there really is no individual ownership of Aboriginal land by Aboriginal people; we have this "nice" socialist way of doing things, where everything belongs to the community and nothing belongs to the individual. In fact what we have is land being returned to Aboriginal communities and not to Aboriginal individuals.

The administration of the land held under these titles is carried out by the various land councils set up under the Act. In effect they are huge new bureaucracies. I understand that the northern land council in Darwin employs up to 80 public servants to carry out its activities. So this legislation has provided a nice employment area for bureaucrats to carry out the sorts of activities in which we all know bureaucrats are involved, such as making life difficult for people and ensuring everything takes twice as long as it should.

We also have the situation in the Northern Territory which has come to note of late, something that is particularly important; that is, the question of sea rights. Rights to the sea are contained in the Northern Territory legislation. Recently in the Northern Territory *Government Gazette*, G30, 29 July 1983, there appeared an announcement that in the Milingimbi locality, Arafura Sea, a two-kilometre area of the sea around the Milingimbi Island is to be given as sea rights, if we like, to the Aboriginal community in that area. So we have the situation where about 47 per cent of the Northern Territory is either controlled by Aboriginal groups or is in the process of being transferred to their ownership under this inalienable freehold title I discussed earlier.

South Australia has legislation for land rights which is different from the Northern Territory legislation in the sense that each piece of legislation is specific to a particular area. In the Northern Territory it is open-ended; the claims can continue on and on, so there is really no end to it while claims are being made. In South Australia each piece of legislation relates to a particular area of land, so in that sense it is not open-ended.

So we have that huge area of South Australia which was given over to the Pitjantjatjara people in the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act of 1981. This legislation is even more restrictive in respect of the entry requirement than is the Northern Territory legislation. It provides for a fine of \$200

for unintentional entry onto Aboriginal land. It provides for a fine of \$2 000 plus \$500 a day for entry onto Aboriginal land in an intentional way. It provides for a fine of \$10 000 plus \$1 000 a day for unauthorised mining on Pitjantjatjara land.

Hon. C. J. Bell: This is in Australia?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is interesting in this situation to realise that what we have is legislation which is saying that some Australian people are not permitted to go into certain parts of Australia without obtaining permission and being subject to these horrendous fines if convicted under the legislation.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Like the North-West Cape or Pine Gap.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not know about Pine Gap, but that is a defence installation. In respect of 10 per cent of South Australia and 47 per cent of the Northern Territory there is restricted entry to Australians, not on the ground that it is a defence establishment where secrecy applies for the protection of Australia; this is land given over to another group of Australians simply because they are Aborigines.

This is one of the reasons I am so opposed to the concept of land rights: It provides title to land for a group of people in the community and not for others. However, I will carry on describing the South Australian legislation.

That legislation is sensible in the sense that it provides for arbitration in respect of mining; it does not have an automatic arrangement as in the Northern Territory legislation where mining can be stopped simply by a resolution or a decision of a lands council.

In South Australia at least provision is made for an arbitrator to consider the different arguments of the miners versus the Aboriginal people, if there is some question about whether mining should go ahead. As in the Northern Territory legislation there is provision for royalties to be payable to the Aboriginal people, as well as to the Government, for any mining that takes place on Aboriginal land.

The land is controlled by a body corporate set up to administer the land which is the subject of the legislation. At present approximately 10 per cent of South Australia is covered by land rights or inalienable freehold title given to an Aboriginal group.

Various types of land rights legislation are found in New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania. In New South Wales the idea is relatively new and it has been roundly criticised by Aboriginal groups because they believe they did

not get enough land. The Wran Government believes it gave them sufficient. That State's legislation is open-ended in the sense that a certain proportion of revenue received from land tax will be used to buy land. So that State has an open-ended arrangement.

I am not totally familiar with the proposed Victorian legislation, but I think it is something along the lines of the New South Wales legislation. The argument in Tasmania is that there are no Aborigines and therefore there should be no land rights. In Queensland the situation is similar to the arrangement in Western Australia, in that Queensland has various forms of reserves established for Aboriginal people.

I come now to the situation which applies in Western Australia at present. We have reserves, set up under the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act, which cover about 8 per cent of the State; that is, about 218 000 square kilometres.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Do you require permission to go onto those reserves?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Yes, and I will talk about that, too.

That huge area, most of which I might add is in my electorate and so I know it well, is owned by the Crown through the Aboriginal Lands Trust. There is a restriction on entry as Mr Stephens has mentioned. There is also a provision for consultation with the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs in the event of possible mining. We also have pastoral leases which cover about 38 per cent of the State, or 950 000 square kilometres. We have unoccupied Crown land covering 40 per cent of the State or about 1 million square kilometres. We have freehold land which is land held under normal, fee-simple freehold, covering 172 000 square kilometres, or six per cent of the State. That is the existing arrangement for land use which applies in Western Australia.

If we look at what the new Government is likely to do in the area of Aboriginal land rights in Western Australia, we must go back to what it has actually said.

Hon. Tom Stephens: That we will have an inquiry.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: First, in the ALP State platform, operative from 1 September 1982, on page 102, the following can be found—

Accordingly, a Labor Government will introduce legislation to apply to Western Australia provisions similar to those of the

Northern Territory Aboriginal Land Rights Bill initiated by the Federal Labor Party.

It might have been initiated by the Federal Labor Party but, regrettably, it was introduced by the Federal Liberal Party. If we then look at what the ALP said prior to the election we must consider what was said by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Burke. We then get an even clearer picture, or in some ways a less clear picture, of what the ALP was all about at that time.

In November, a group of Ngaanatjarra people from my electorate and from parts of the Northern Territory and South Australia came to Perth on the so-called long march to ask for land rights. I know a lot of them came down certainly not of their own volition. Certainly they did not save their money to come down as was reported; many were offered money. They camped at the Claremont Showgrounds and were addressed by the then Leader of the Opposition. The following was reported in *The West Australian* of 17 November, 1983—

Mr Burke, told a smaller gathering that the Labor Party was committed to an Aboriginal land-rights policy.

Speaking with the aid of an interpreter, Mr Burke promised the Ngaanatjarra people freehold title to the entire central reserve area—and more.

The Labor Party, he said, recognised their claim that their traditional lands extended beyond the reserve boundaries.

Point of Order

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: Is it possible for the member to be asked to identify the document from which he is quoting so that at the end of his speech it will be possible to ask for it to be tabled?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Would the honourable member please identify the document?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am quoting from a pamphlet which contains a photocopy of a newspaper article. It is from *The West Australian* but the date is not included. It is a direct copy of the newspaper article. I will be happy to table it.

Debate Resumed

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Burke promised these Aboriginal people, who had come all the way from the central desert area of Western Australia to put forward arguments about land rights, that he would give them freehold title to the central reserves, and more. He said he believed they were

entitled to traditional lands outside the reserves. That promise was made. He said that when he became Premier, that is what he would do.

So when we look at the ALP platform and Mr Burke's promises, we would assume that upon taking office the ALP would introduce legislation based upon its platform, which is quite specific and clear and which was to introduce legislation based upon the Northern Territory model. That is what the ALP was all about, yet it has decided to have an inquiry. Before I talk about the Seaman inquiry I would like to translate into the Western Australian situation what would have happened had the Labor Party decided to abide by its platform. I am waiting for it to tell me why it did not go ahead with its platform, but I am sure its members will have a good answer. I have a few ideas of my own. If the ALP had introduced its land rights legislation based upon its platform, this is what we would have got in Western Australia, bearing in mind what I have said previously about the situation in the Northern Territory.

The eight per cent of Western Australia which is held under Aboriginal reserves—the 218 000 square kilometres—would automatically become Aboriginal land with inalienable freehold title. The unoccupied crown land—40 per cent—of Western Australia would be subject to claim and if the claim was justified in court to the land commissioner it could also be granted as inalienable freehold title.

There are people in the community who argue that the Aboriginal people are entitled to all the freehold land and they could therefore argue also that the unoccupied Crown land should go to Aboriginal groups. Drawing a long bow, 48.6 per cent of Western Australia could be subject to claim immediately legislation was passed.

I refer now to pastoral leases, which cover 38 per cent of the State. As soon as an Aboriginal group or community bought leases they would be subject to claim as well and they could be transferred to inalienable freehold title in the same way as unoccupied Crown land.

The Aboriginal Development Commission which is funded by the Federal Government—there never seems to be any shortage of money for that group—spends millions of dollars acquiring land, and it has acquired a large number of pastoral leases for Aboriginal groups. There is no reason to suggest that this would not continue every time a pastoral lease was purchased; it could be converted to inalienable freehold title. Only six per cent of Western Australia

is freehold land; this surprises me because I thought it would be much more.

It is interesting to note that if freehold land were purchased by Aboriginal groups it could be converted to inalienable freehold title. It is wrong for people to assume that this sort of system would apply only to remote areas in Western Australia. It could apply to any part of Western Australia. It is interesting also that Mr Seaman who is conducting the inquiry has said that the only headaches he expects will be in respect of the South-West Land Division. That is what we have to consider when we talk about translating the ALP platform into the Western Australian situation. What did the Government do? It did not go ahead and introduce its platform by way of legislation; instead it introduced an inquiry—a technique used by Governments when they cannot sort out a problem. The ALP set up an inquiry the terms of reference of which were restrictive. It almost presupposed the legislation.

The inquiry is not an inquiry as to whether there should be land rights; the inquiry is to determine what sort of land rights should be imposed. When the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs announced the inquiry he said that land rights would apply to all reserves which are held under various Acts of Parliament and which are controlled by Aboriginal people. The Minister has said already that there will be land rights but we now have an inquiry which will decide how land rights will be implemented, what sort of title will be applied, and what other land ought to be included.

It is clear from the terms of reference that the Government predetermined the sort of conclusion that could be reached. Mr Seaman has been restricted in his ability to produce a report which canvasses the whole question of Aboriginal land rights across the board. In fact, it is a very good opportunity for the Government to put to rest, once and for all, the question of whether land rights are acceptable to Australians, and Western Australians in particular.

I refer to a recent survey conducted by the Morgan-Gallup poll and published in *The Bulletin* on 2 August 1983 on the question of land rights. It gives a clear indication of the beliefs of the Australian people in respect of land rights. It is my contention that 80 per cent of Australians are opposed to the granting of land rights as they apply in the Northern Territory or South Australia.

Hon. Tom Stephens: How do you relate that to the Morgan-Gallup poll?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will explain it, and I quote as follows—

People surveyed were asked: "In your opinion, should Aborigines have more, the same or less land rights than other Australians?"

The result was—

13 per cent of Australians said "more".

72 per cent of Australians said "same".

8 per cent said "less".

and 7 per cent were undecided.

"Land rights" as I interpret it and as I have explained tonight, means more title, or a different entitlement. Seventy-two per cent of the population agreed that there should be the same rights and eight per cent said there should be less rights. If one adds 72 per cent and eight per cent one finds 80 per cent of the population are opposed to my conception of "land rights" and to the conception most people have of "land rights". Eighty per cent of the population believe that Aboriginal people should not have a better title than anyone else and that, for the benefit of Mr Stephens, is what the Morgan-Gallup poll indicated. I believe that the poll was badly worded and it did not indicate what "land rights" meant. It interpreted "land rights" as meaning the same rights to land as anyone else, but that is not correct.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Presumably you are conducting another poll which will outline questions in more accurate terms.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: What I am saying is that the Labor Party has prevented an opportunity for the Seaman inquiry to have suitable terms of reference.

Hon. Tom Stephens: We could give them another term of reference such as "Do you think we should have a Labor Government?"

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Is Mr Stephens not suggesting to me that the Labor Party has a mandate to introduce land rights legislation?

Hon. Tom Stephens: That is our policy.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Of course, but surely Mr Stephens is not trying to tell me that everything in the Labor Party's platform is what the majority of the people want?

Hon. Tom Stephens: For what parts of our platform do we have a mandate?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not know, but this is one area for which the Government does not have a mandate.

The Morgan-Gallup poll shows that 80 per cent of the people do not agree with the Labor Party policy and if that is not an indictment of the

member's argument, I do not know what is. The Labor Party has had the opportunity to decide whether Aborigines should have land rights. The inquiry will cost the taxpayers of Western Australia a great sum of money, and it should include the whole principle of land rights. The Labor Party was not prepared to do that; but now it says that it has a mandate to do it.

Hon. Mark Nevill: The Gallup poll also says that 40 per cent agree with mineral rights for Aborigines.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Sixty per cent of the population say that they do not agree with it. I am arguing about the principle of land rights and the Labor Party had an opportunity to conduct an inquiry on this basis. The ALP knows that the figures in the Morgan-Gallup poll are right and that is why it does not have legislation before this House similar to that of the Northern Territory land rights legislation. It knows very well that the people of Western Australia do not want it.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You are confusing figures when you say that 60 per cent of the people do not agree with it.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I want to look at what the Federal ALP is all about. As we all know, the decisions made by the Federal ALP are "superior" to those decisions made by the people on the other side of this House at their conferences. The ALP Federal policy on land rights is stated in its "1982 Platform Constitution and Rules" on pages 4 and 5 under the heading "Land Rights". It says a Labor Government will—

(I Grant land rights and compensation to Aboriginal and Islander communities, using the principles and recommendations of the Aboriginal Land Rights Commission (Woodward Report) as a basis for legislation) subject to a continuing review.

The Woodward report recommended the Northern Territory land rights system which was implemented by the Fraser Government.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Not entirely.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: No, not in its entirety; but the Federal Minister at the time had some common sense and his amendments were generally well accepted.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Do you support him?

Hon. Tom Stephens: He was not supported by your party in this State.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: In our party we are entitled to different points of view and I am making mine now. The platform of the ALP is binding on all members of that party. It supports land rights legislation based on the Northern Territory

model, which would mean that initially 50 per cent of Western Australia would be available for land right claims and it could allow for a much greater percentage in the long term.

We are not only stuck with the ALP Federal platform, but we are also stuck with the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, who is certainly considerably worse than some of his predecessors. I will quote some of Mr Holding's comments on the question of land rights to indicate where the Federal Government stands on this particular matter. In the *Weekend Australian* of 6-7 August, 1983 on page 3 the following statement appears—

LEGISLATION granting Aborigines land rights in every State is to be introduced by the Federal Government within a year.

The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Holding, said yesterday the Government not only had an election mandate to grant such rights, but the High Court ruling on the Tasmanian dam issue also showed it had the necessary powers.

Mr Holding's attitude is that within 12 months of 6 August national land rights legislation will be introduced into the Federal Parliament.

I quote also from what Mr Holding said in *The Sydney Morning Herald* on 25 July, on page 5. It reads as follows—

Mr Holding said consensus was what he would be aiming for in the talks with the States culminating in uniform land rights legislation to be introduced in the Budget session next year.

I refer to the word "consensus". We seem to have heard it quite often since the beginning of March this year—the spirit of consensus and national reconciliation. He went on to say, "I don't want to twist anybody's arm but there may be occasions when we have to break a few". This was a comment made by the Federal Minister when referring to consensus and national reconciliation and told the people of Australia that they will have uniform legislation across the board. He will have to think first, before he breaks or twists anyone's arm.

Hon. Tom Stephens: He will probably break an arm if Bjelke-Petersen is still in Government next year.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: He certainly will be and probably with increased numbers.

Hon. D. K. Dans: What side are you on?

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Queensland Liberal Party has an unfortunate attitude and it does not deserve to do better than it is doing now.

Mr Holding talks about consensus, and claims that he has the power under the Constitution, and if people do not agree with him he will use those constitutional powers to make them agree. Is that not fantastic, when we look at the whole idea of consensus and national reconciliation so espoused by the Prime Minister? Not content with saying those sort of things, Mr Holding has now introduced an inquiry into the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act and I would like to quote from the terms of reference. He says—

I ALLAN CLYDE HOLDING, Minister of State for Aboriginal Affairs, hereby appoint THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JOHN LESLIE TOOHEY, a Judge of the Federal Court of Australia, to make a general review of and report on the provisions and operation of the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976, and to recommend amendments to that Act and changes to any other legislation where appropriate, having regard to the following principles which the Government sees as fundamental in relation to Aboriginal land rights:

So, once again we have this restriction on an inquiry, based on the principles that the Government sees as being important. Those principles are—

- (1) Aboriginal land to be held under inalienable freehold title;

That is the title about which I talked earlier, which is not available to anybody else, except Aboriginal communities. To continue—

- (2) protection of Aboriginal sites;
- (3) Aboriginal control in relation to mining on Aboriginal land;
- (4) access to mining royalty equivalents;
- (5) compensation for lost land to be negotiated;

It then goes on to give the terms of reference of the inquiry. They are the principles under which Mr Holding intends to provide uniform land rights legislation across Australia. As far as I am concerned, that is the most worrying aspect. Here we have a Federal Government which is saying to the States, "If you do not co-operate and do what we say with respect to this important issue—the issue of land ownership and land title—we will legislate for you". That is exactly what Mr Holding has said on several occasions, and I have quoted only two examples tonight. He has made it

quite clear that the Federal Government will be legislating if the States do not do as it wants them to do. I have read to the House the principles under which Mr Holding is operating.

Hon. J. M. Brown: Is Mr Holding conducting the inquiry, or Justice Toohey?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Justice Toohey is conducting the inquiry under the restrictions which have been placed on him, and by which he must abide.

Hon. J. M. Brown: Yes, under those guidelines, which you have denounced.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will give Mr Brown a copy; probably, he has not read it. Mr Holding then sets out the terms and conditions under which the inquiry will operate; if that is not restricting the inquiry in the same way as the Seaman inquiry has been restricted, I do not know what is.

Hon. Tom Stephens: If your Government had set up an inquiry such as this, wouldn't you have given the inquiry some terms of reference?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am talking about what this Government and its Federal colleagues are doing with respect to land rights in Australia, and I am saying to the Hon. Tom Stephens and to the House that the Federal Government intends to introduce land rights legislation if the State Government does not. I would have thought the Premier would have been loud in his condemnation of Mr Holding for presuming to interfere in an area which, in my judgment, is paramount in the States' rights argument; namely, who controls the land? It is arguable whether the Commonwealth in fact has the power under the Constitution to do so. Most constitutional lawyers say it has, and that the High Court decision with respect to the Franklin Dam makes it even clearer. However, I would be very interested to see what the present State Government would do if Mr Holding decides to carry out his threat—which is all it is—and to see whether the State Government would tell him to mind his own business, or whether it would meekly stand aside and let the Federal Government make laws which are rightly the responsibility of the State.

The Federal Government also has placed a restriction by way of a time limit on the Seaman inquiry. Mr Holding talks about such legislation being introduced in the Budget session next year. So, presumably, the Burke Government will have to make some decisions with regard to the Seaman inquiry by that time, otherwise perhaps Mr Holding will break their arms, as well.

I have talked about land rights. If I could go back to my initial comments, I am talking not just

about the acquisition of land for Aborigines, but also about the whole movement towards separate development in Australia based on race. I turn now to the movement designed to provide separate laws for Aboriginal people, laws which would apply only to them and to nobody else.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Do you mean the ones initiated by the former Attorney General and your leader in this House?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will not get into an argument about that because I do not necessarily agree there should be separate laws for Aboriginal people. However, if Mr Medcalf and I happen to disagree on this matter, that is an indication of a divergence of views within our party and an indication of our ability to stand in this place and to express our points of view—unlike members opposite, who must obey their Caucus, and who are not permitted to make statements which do not accord with Labor Party policy. For example, it would be interesting to know how many speeches Mr Stephens has made in this House disagreeing with the policy of his own party.

The Australian Law Reform Commission has been reporting on the extent to which Australian law should accommodate Aboriginal laws, and is expected to bring down its report about March of next year. Mr Justice Kirby, that well known judicial figure who comments on a whole variety of social issues, was reported in the Monday, 16 May 1983 edition of *The West Australian* as having this to say—

One possible solution was amending the legal system so that day-to-day law-and-order matters involving Aborigines could be dealt with through the traditional tribal laws.

Those laws might be administered by community justice systems set up in Aboriginal communities. More serious and rarer matters, such as murder, might still be dealt with by conventional Australian law.

Mr Justice Kirby said that because of cultural differences, Western law was not suitable for dealing with Aboriginal problems.

Marriage, child custody and child fostering were among many matters that might be handled better by the traditional tribal laws.

That gives a rough idea of the sort of line the Australian Law Reform Commission is taking in its inquiry into this matter. In effect, it is saying there are some areas where Aborigines perhaps should be "tried"—for want of a better word—under tribal law rather than under the law which applies to everybody else. I am worried about this because I do not believe we should have two sets of laws in Australia. It is hard enough for

a member of Parliament to work out one set of laws which are acceptable to everybody. If we are to have two sets of laws, one for Aboriginal people and one for other Australians, we could get to the stage where we could stretch the point to include other ethnic groups. For example, perhaps we could have laws relating only to recently arrived Italian migrants, who do not like the sort of laws we have in Australia. Mr Piantadosi the other night referred to our terrible neglect of new migrants; perhaps a better way of handling the situation would be to provide each of these ethnic groups with their own laws.

Hon. Tom Stephens: I agree with something Mr Brown said to me a moment ago: We do have two sets of laws in this country—one for the rich and one for the poor.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Are you going to make a speech on the Address-in-Reply, Mr Stephens? Give me an answer, yes or no.

Hon. Tom Stephens: No, I am not.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Mr Brown knows very well there are not different laws for different people; there are the same laws. Whether some people think they get a better deal than others is a matter of judgment.

Hon. J. M. Brown: You have very little judgment on the matter.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is interesting to look at the situation which still exists in Australia, where some Aboriginal people are judged by their peers under tribal laws. The advocates of separate Aboriginal law talk about what a wonderful Aboriginal society was here before the coming of the white man, and of how their laws were perfectly attuned to their way of living. They claim that the introduction of "our" law—referring to the majority group in society—has been to the great disadvantage and detriment of Aboriginal people. However, I refer members to *The West Australian* of 17 August this year where, at page 11, the following appears—

The driver of a vehicle that rolled over last week, killing a woman passenger, faces the prospect of further tribal retribution for the accident on his return to the Cundeelee Aboriginal community.

Richard Brooks (about 30) received two small spear wounds in a leg in retaliation for the fatality. . . .

That is traditional tribal law—the sort of law with which I do not go along. We have laws which apply to the driver of a motor vehicle in which a fatality occurs, and they certainly do not involve a person's being speared.

Recently, in Kalgoorlie, an Aboriginal person was found trying to break into the gaol. After an interpreter had been brought from the central desert area, from where this person came, it was established that he had committed some crime against tribal law and was likely to be subjected to severe punishment by his elders. The only place he could go to get away from that punishment was the gaol, so he was trying to break into the gaol. That may be an amusing story, but it makes it clear many Aboriginal people do not approve of traditional tribal law.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Plenty of white people do not like traditional white law, either.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I would go along with that, except to say that an offender against our law is not likely to be speared for being involved in an accident.

I do not consider myself to be anywhere near an authority on this subject; I do not know the whole area of tribal law. I rely on other people, who know better than I. One person who is regarded as being an expert on Aboriginal law and the way of Aboriginal people is Professor Strehlow who, for many years, lived at Hermannsburg Mission, in the central desert area. He died several years ago, but during his lifetime was regarded as an authority on matters pertaining to the Aboriginal people. I wish to quote from the *News Weekly* of 27 September 1978 where at page 9 we get some idea of what Professor Strehlow thinks about traditional tribal law. The article states—

But, despite the undoubted glories of aboriginal culture and religion, and the beneficial effects of "tribal law" at its best, the difficulties posed by an excessively dry land could never be disguised for long; and the harshness of "tribal law" was only too well perceived and feared by the younger generations of black men and women. Moreover, the savage punishments (mainly death) for all breaches, even unwitting ones, against religious observances ("sacrilege") led from time to time to the commission of what were felt to be deeds of horrible savagery against whole groups of innocent people.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Tell me, Mr Moore: Do you support capital punishment?

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: You can make a speech whenever you are ready. You said last week, "I will speak when I am ready, and not before". You will have your opportunity. If you do not intend to speak in the debate, you should not continually interrupt the member on his feet.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The article continues—

As far as many young black people were concerned, the prospect of escaping from the harsher provisions of tribal law proved virtually irresistible. In Central Australia, at any rate, aboriginal society was destroyed largely because the young people deliberately deserted their own people.

What he is arguing is that when white people turned up in the central part of Australia, the Aboriginal people welcomed them because it meant they could get away from the harshness of the tribal system. The coming of the white people provided them, first, with food—because, with the droughts, they suffered terribly from deprivation—and also with some form of security. It also got rid of some of these dreadfully harsh tribal laws which many young Aboriginal people were not prepared to put up with but to which they were subjected. So, Professor Strehlow makes it quite clear he does not see the situation which existed before white man came as being the most wonderful type of society which could possibly exist. In fact, he argues quite strongly in many of his writings that the coming of the white man was a great advantage to many Aboriginal people.

So, I worry that in Australia, we are going to have a system of law which applies to Aboriginal people only, and that those laws will be different from the laws which apply to the wider community.

I want also now to mention another area which concerns me with respect to the matter of separate development in Australia based upon race, and that is the creation of numerous organisations established specifically to deal with matters relating to the Aboriginal people, which have not been set up to work for or on behalf of other organisations within the community. We have the Aboriginal Medical Service of WA Inc., which is in addition to the medical service available to everybody else in the community. We have the Aboriginal Legal Service (WA) Inc., which is in addition to the legal service provided to everybody else. We have the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, which seems to have a policy directed towards ensuring that, in the long term, it will be run totally by Aboriginal people and that nobody else will be employed in that department. In fact, that very trend is gaining pace now there is a new Minister; I can see the day coming when that entire department is run by Aboriginal people. We have the Aboriginal Development Commission, an organisation which receives something like \$60 million a year to spend on its various activities and which, essentially, is run by Aboriginal people.

Another is the National Aboriginal Conference or, as some people call it, the "black parliament". Here we have a parliamentary system of sorts, for Aborigines, running parallel to the parliamentary system that applies to the rest of Australia. If that is not separatism, I do not know what is. The budget of the National Aboriginal Conference was doubled from about \$3 million a year to over \$6 million a year, in the last Federal Budget. I wonder why it needs another \$3 million. I wonder what our Parliament costs. Perhaps somebody might tell me—it is around \$2 million a year, I think.

The National Aboriginal Conference has been set up and fostered as a black parliament—a parliament of the Aboriginal people. They have electorates; they have elections; and they have members who represent the electorates for a period of time.

A variety of Aboriginal bodies have been set up for various reasons. We have Aboriginal housing bodies, Aboriginal child care organisations, and Aboriginal sports organisations.

Hon. J. M. Brown: Aboriginal police aides.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is different, because a separate organisation has not been established. They work within the Police Force and it is a very good idea. They are policemen firstly, and Aboriginal policemen secondly.

Hon. J. M. Brown: But it is a good idea.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: We have the situation developing in Australia in which a range of different organisations have been set up specifically for the Aboriginal people. When that is combined with what I have already talked about—Aboriginal land and the restriction of entry to non-Aborigines; a separate Aboriginal law; a separate Aboriginal parliament; and all the separate Aboriginal organisations—one could almost make a separate Aboriginal State. That is what many people argue about in respect of this issue.

Many people see those behind the land rights movement and the promotion of the types of organisations of which I have been speaking as people who want to divide Australia into two nations. I do not know whether that will happen, or whether the people even want that; but the sorts of things about which I have talked so far indicate that the ground work is being done. That causes me great concern, and that is the reason I have raised the matter tonight in the House.

Let us consider how people promote this division—because that is what it is; it is a division in our nation. Interestingly, when a certain person was charged in South Australia under the Pitjantjatjara land rights Act with being on

Pitjantjatjara land without authority, Mr Justice Millhouse ruled that the legislation setting aside the Pitjantjatjara land was invalid because it was racist, against Federal legislation—I cannot think of the name of the Act at the moment—and against an international agreement on race relations. In my opinion, land rights and the development of separatism for the Aboriginal people is racist because it makes laws based upon the different colour of people and upon their race.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: They have no alternative. You have separated them already.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: What rubbish.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Of course you have. You have not accepted your responsibility in what you have done to those people in the past.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Obviously the gentleman will argue that white people—

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Certain elements.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The country was settled by white people, alongside the Aboriginal people.

Government members interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: In international law, it is generally accepted that there is no right to compensation, and no right to the land either. That applies only when some form of conquering takes place, or when the land is taken by force.

Hon. D. K. Dans: They took the land under a treaty registered in Spain, did they not?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will not go into that. The present situation has been arrived at because numerous people within our society, including members of the Government, argue and use various tactics to promote separatism and separate development in Australia. They do it through the education system.

During the last Federal election, a pamphlet was published by the Australian Teachers' Federation. Being a former schoolteacher, I regret to say that that organisation is an absolute disgrace, when one considers that it supposedly represents a group of people in the community who are educated in a way different from the average. It is the most left-wing, biased organisation one could imagine. The pamphlet released during the Federal election indicated that Aboriginal education was an election issue. One does not have to be too bright to realise that the colours of the pamphlet are the Aboriginal land rights colours.

A pamphlet issued by a federation of teachers should contain only a minimum of bias. One would expect that an organisation representing professional people would not be seen to be totally biased. However, the pamphlet compares the Australian Teachers' Federation policy, the then Fed-

eral Liberal-National Country Party Government's record, and the Australian Labor Party's policy. I will read a couple of aspects of this, as follows—

Australian Teachers' Federation Policy

1 000 Aboriginal teachers trained and in employment by 1990.

Australian Labor Party Policy

Labor will set a target for the training and employment of 1 000 teachers by 1990.

Surprise, surprise! It is exactly the same. Then it says—

Federal Government (Liberal/National Party) Record

Refusal to respond in positive terms to NITE Report recommendations.

It would appear that the policy of the Australian Teachers' Federation is identical to the policy of the ALP, and opposite to that of the then Government. It says, "Our Aboriginal children need to win this election"; and it implies, "We have got to have a Labor Government so we can implement ATF policy." That is quite a scurrilous pamphlet, if I may be permitted to say so.

The education system is being used by left-wing activists to promote division, as I have just pointed out. The churches are also being used in this respect. The following appeared in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, 14 June 1983—

The Roman Catholic Church has given its blessing to the State Government to legislate for Aboriginal land rights.

We have since heard that the Anglican Church and the Uniting Church have supported land rights.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: They are all Communists!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not saying the people in those churches are Communists. What I am saying is that they are being used by people with left-wing attitudes. "Anglicans concerned for Aborigines" is, I gather, a committee of the Anglican Church of which the chairman is Bishop Challen. Unfortunately the bishop was not at one meeting of that committee; but the minutes show—

We were asked by the fringedwellers if we could arrange for a vehicle to be loaned to them for two weeks, while a film was being made near Kalgoorlie. Jan Roberts was involved in the film and some of the fringedwellers were taking part.

That is part of the minutes of an Anglican Church subcommittee on Aborigines. The people

who wanted to borrow the vehicle from the Anglican Church went to Laverton, of all places, to make a film on so-called downtrodden fringe dwellers who live in that particular town. It is interesting to note that the visitors were told by the fringe dwellers themselves to go and get lost. The fringe dwellers are sick of people coming from so-called "do-gooder" organisations, wanting to take films of them all the time.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Perhaps if the Catholics had gone, they would have been better received.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will deal with the Catholics in a moment.

Government members interjected.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You sent the Anglicans into a Catholic area, and the Catholics into an Anglican area.

Hon. J. M. Brown: What about the Protestants?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: At the same meeting of the Anglican subcommittee, the people who went to Laverton were mentioned. They were Scott Christie, whom I do not know, CAA people, and Margaret Jeffries. CAA is Community Aid Abroad; I understand Jan Roberts is involved with that. She is probably known to the Hon. Tom Stephens as somebody who supports his point of view on this matter; and she could not be considered to be a God-fearing Anglican who went along to the meeting because she had a basic concern for the Aborigines of Laverton. She wanted to make a film for obvious propaganda purposes, to put across the point of view espoused by these people. However, they were told by the fringe dwellers in Laverton that they were not welcome, and that they should not take the film.

That committee of the Anglican Church has supported land rights, and it is working with people like the ones I have mentioned. I suggest the members of the committee probably do not know to what extent they are being used.

We all know about the visit by the delegation from the World Council of Churches in 1981. We have heard about the delegation's predetermined report. It came here with the intention of writing a report which supposedly indicated that we have racism in Australia. It is interesting to consider who was on the committee. One member of the committee was Elizabeth Adler from East Germany. She was from a country in which rights of any sort are at a premium, and she came to Australia to tell the Government and the people of Australia how they ought to be running their own affairs.

Another member of the committee was Dr Anwar Barkat from Pakistan, who was recently appointed as the director of the World Council of Churches programme to combat racism. The programme to combat racism is, undoubtedly, a Communist front. There is no question about that. It is part of the World Council of Churches—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Pakistan is a right-wing dictatorship, so you have a good cross section of opinion, with one from East Germany.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is true that there are Communists in Australia; and we have a right-wing Labor Government.

If one reads the literature on how the programme to combat racism has spent its money, one learns that money has been spent in Australia on various disturbances that have occurred in recent years. For example, in relation to Mornington Island and Aurukun, a grant of something like \$10 000 or \$15 000 preceded the controversy. At Noonkanbah, the people received a grant from the World Council of Churches through this particular unit. If we consider most of the controversies and incidents which arise in respect of racism, usually they are preceded by a grant from the World Council of Churches programme to combat racism.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It is good to see the church sticking by people, standing up for them like this.

Hon. John Williams: Rubbish; you know it is rubbish.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The following appeared in the Press release at the time of the visit of the delegation from the World Council of Churches—

The purpose of the visit is to:

1. observe and assess the situation of the Aboriginal people,
2. guide and consult with the churches of Australia,
3. express solidarity with the Aboriginal people, and
4. draw international attention to their concerns, including Land Rights.

The members of the delegation came here with preconceived ideas. Their report was preconceived. The whole idea was to draw international attention to what they considered to be racist matters in Australia.

Another very interesting document put out by the churches is entitled "Mining! A Pictorial Story of Mining Companies and How They Get to Mine on Aboriginal Land in Australia ... incorporating RED HEART ... no. 2", prepared by the Catholic commission for justice and peace

and the Uniting Church of Australia commission for world mission. I do not propose to go through this comic in detail; but it was distributed to Aboriginal people and it is a most scurrilous publication. It is totally inaccurate and totally one-sided. It is interesting to note that as soon as the church leaders learnt about it, they stopped its distribution. The copy I have, members will note, is a well-worn photocopy of the original.

That is another area in which the churches are involved. The tenor of that comic is against mining of any sort in Australia, but particularly mining on so-called Aboriginal land.

The people promoting this division use international forums as a place to try to promote their points of view. They rush off to places like Geneva every time there is a relevant conference. Recently Robert Riley and a few others rushed off to Canada to talk about land rights. They go on international forum shopping expeditions to put their points of view, along with people from other countries. They seem to work on the basis that they can tell the rest of the world things that are supposed to have happened in Australia and that everybody will put pressure on Australia so that they can get their way, even though the countries to which they go to put their arguments have less rights for people than does Australia by a long way. As I mentioned earlier, the following article appeared in *The West Australian* of 17 August 1983—

A DELEGATION has left for Canada seeking international support for Aboriginal land rights and cultural independence.

High on the list of priorities on the trip will be a sympathetic hearing from the International Commission on Folk Law and Legal Pluralism in an attempt to have Aboriginal tribal law accommodated in Australia's legal system.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: Who paid for that?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I would be interested to know that. The point of this article is that these people knew they would get a sympathetic hearing before they went. It was high on the list of priorities. All of these international conferences are held to give a forum to people like Robert Riley who want to argue their points of view. These people want to denigrate Australia in international forums.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You don't know that he denigrated Australia.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It was said that they would get a sympathetic hearing on the rights of Aborigines, and I take it that Australia was denigrated.

Hon. Tom Stephens: What you said is misleading.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I presume that he said that Australia does not have laws acceptable to Aborigines, and that Australian Governments have prescribed unacceptable laws for 200 years. He would have said that it is about time white Australian Governments gave Aborigines what they wanted. I know what his point of view is. The other night I spent an hour and a half on the radio arguing with Robert Riley. He believes that land ought to be given to Aborigines, and that is what he would be telling the whole world. As the member has said, I was not at the forum.

Various organisations have been set up around the world—

Hon. Tom Stephens: Here it comes!

Hon. N. F. MOORE: —to put forward particular points of view. There is the organisation called the World Council of Indigenous People which held a conference in Canberra in 1981, and I will quote from a book called *Red Over Black* which refers to that conference. It would be known to some people.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It would be well known to the Liberal Party.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It was written by Geoff McDonald, a former member of the Communist Party. He is a union official who believes that the Aboriginal land rights movement is manipulated by Communists. He has spent a lot of his own money to try to work out whether this is so. Having been a member of the Communist Party he is familiar with its tactics.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Which Communist Party? There are seven or eight of them. Which Communist Party is supposed to be doing the manipulating?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not know to which Communist Party in Australia he belonged but I can find out; and I do not know which Communist Party he believes is manipulating this land rights movement, but I can find that out too. He believes that Communists are behind the movement.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Does he sleep under your bed?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Oh, come on! No wonder the member gained a record minority in Murchison-Eyre when he stood for that seat when one considers comments such as that. Mr McDonald says this—

In April and May, 1981, the Soviet-manipulated World Council of Indigenous Peoples' Conference was held in Canberra, and backed a resolution from what is titled

"The National Aboriginal Conference," calling for economic and political sanctions against Australia on the fabricated charge that Australia denies "the freedom and rights of the indigenous people." The World Council of Indigenous Affairs quotes as the basis for its expanding programme, "principles" proclaimed by the Charter of the United Nations, and its declared objectives are identical to those put forward by Communists over a long period. The Canberra, 1981, conference was its third General Assembly, at which it agreed in principle to develop an "International Law on Indigenous Rights." It calls for the right of indigenous people "To associate their territory and institutions with one or more states in a manner involving free association, regional autonomy, home rule or associate statehood as self-governing units."

That is indisputable, whether it is quoted from this book or not. It was decided by that conference in Canberra in 1981 to call for things like home rule.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It sounds like a line from an Irish song, "Home rule for Ireland".

Hon. N. F. MOORE: If we relate this point to the point I made earlier we realise that various organisations have been set up internationally to be used by various bodies to promote certain points of view. I turn now to another device used, which is, of course, the media.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I think we should banish reading at schools.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Some time ago on Channel 2 the programme called "Women of the Sun" was broadcast, in four separate segments, relating to Aboriginal women in particular, and Aboriginal people in general. I saw only the first two segments, so I cannot comment on the second two. The two I saw were brilliant productions; they were extremely subtle in getting their messages across. They promoted the Aboriginal lifestyle prior to the coming of white people as idyllic; the children were well groomed, with well brushed hair and white teeth. Everyone was happy and laughing. Aboriginal life was depicted as one good thing after another, but then came white people into this idyllic situation, which was depicted as occurring, I believe, in Victoria.

When white people came the problems of Aboriginal people were shown to begin. Terrible things like spearings, shootings, rapes, and all sorts of deprivations were said to come along with white people. The second programme was about an Aboriginal woman who lived with some white fellow, who treated her very badly. She killed him and

left with her child, and the programme went through a whole rigmarole of how terrible was the mission system. It showed that system as separating parents from their children and instilling a terrible fear of some sort of demonic god, if one likes to use that term. The programme depicted some sort of dreadful devil that caused all sorts of problems for Aborigines if they did not do as they were told. Every possible argument put up about the mission system was somehow incorporated into this one or one and one-half hour programme.

When I say that this programme was brilliantly done I mean that it got its message across very well, but it was an enormous propaganda exercise to make white Australians consider themselves as the reason for Aboriginal people suffering problems today. It attempted to instill into us a feeling of guilt; that we somehow needed to purge ourselves if we were ever to hold our heads high in this country.

The programme was introduced by an interesting lady, Miss Pat O'Shane, the former wife of a Northern Queensland activist, Mr Mick Miller.

Hon. Tom Stephens: She is very distinguished in her own right.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will tell the House in a moment what she is all about. *Red Over Black* at page 2 states—

Miss O'Shane is the former wife of the Northern Queensland part-Aboriginal activist, Mr. "Mick" Miller, and has a long record of involvement in pro-communist activities. She has been involved with the Soviet Front Organisation, The Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament and was prominent in activities against visiting American nuclear warships. She was a delegate to the Nuclear Free Pacific Conference in May, 1960. The December, 1980, edition of *Outlook*, the radical Christian journal, reveals that Miss O'Shane has been a member of the Church's Task Force on Aboriginal Land Rights.

In 1977, Miss O'Shane's booklet, *Law in Disorder Politics, the Police and Civil Liberties*, was published by the Queensland State Committee of the Australian Communist Party. In 1980 she attended the Labor and Communist Movement Conference. She has written for the *Communist Tribune*.

Tribune reports that on October 5, 1981, a delegation had met the Hon. Frank Walker of the Wran New South Wales Government, and nominated Miss O'Shane to become

head of the new Department of Aboriginal Affairs. Miss O'Shane was subsequently appointed at \$48,000 a year. This is another example of Australian taxpayers financing Marxists in Government positions to advance Marxist programmes.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Is she a member of the Communist Party?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not know.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: This is an example of the scurrilous stuff put about all the time.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Isn't she a lawyer?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I have no doubt she is a talented woman, and I think she was the first Aboriginal female lawyer.

Hon. D. K. Dans: She is a rather intelligent lawyer.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: She spoke very well when introducing the programme. She was part of this magnificent production, from beginning to end, designed to make every white person watching the programme feel absolutely guilty for the plight of Aboriginal people and that the only way they could purge their guilt was to give all the country to Aborigines.

I have given the reasons for the development of these land rights issues, the development of separate laws and a multitude of separate organisations. This is the way these things are happening, and they are the things that cause me a great deal of concern. I felt obliged to bring these matters to the attention of the House. I am particularly concerned about the future of Australia and, in particular, the future of Western Australia if we have Aboriginal land rights as promised by the Labor Party prior to the last election. In fact, I think the Labor Party is a bit frightened of the effect of its policy, and that is why we have not yet seen legislation before us to effect those promises.

I am extremely concerned for the future because I can see developing within Australia this division between people based upon race. I have given numerous examples tonight of where this division is being created, how it is being promoted, how it will continue, and the belief that we should have a system of laws based on race.

I will mention a couple of other matters in conclusion. I asked the Minister for Mines earlier this year about Noonkanbah. In particular I asked about the mining company that has been permitted to conduct a seismic survey at Noonkanbah Station bearing in mind that it was not all that long ago that people were led to believe that Noonkanbah Station, from one boundary to another, was a sacred site. When I read the

speeches of members opposite at the time of this dispute, and particularly those speeches of the Minister, who is more clever than some others, I realised that they referred to the sacred site as set out by the Bindon report, which said that only 40 square kilometres were a sacred site. Many people believe that the whole station was a sacred site, but they had been duped. One of the members in his speech at the time referred to a "Nationwide" programme the previous night during which the compere had said that the whole station was a sacred site.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Probably it was a myth stated by the Liberal Party.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is absolute nonsense, and the member knows as well as I do who was responsible for that hoax at Noonkanbah. Probably he knows better than I do because I suggest he was involved.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It was your Government.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I suggest that this member and his friend were involved.

Hon. Tom Stephens: I was proud to stand beside those Aboriginal people.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: He stood beside them as he helped to perpetrate the greatest hoax in Western Australia as it will be proved to be in due course. It was perpetrated for good reason; it has gone into folklore as the watershed of Aboriginal land rights; if we look behind the facade of that dispute it becomes absolutely clear to us that it was a hoax of mammoth proportions.

When I asked those questions in this House of the Minister for Mines he spoke about the 40 square kilometres of sacred site as stated in the Bindon report. He did not talk about the whole station, even though some of his cohorts had. He has now allowed—and I agree with the decision—a company to do seismic work in the area. When we were in Government we thought that the company should have been able to drill as well. It is nonsense for the Minister to suggest that I was opposed to exploration at Noonkanbah.

I now refer to the subject of some questions I asked because of an article that appeared in *The Age*, Melbourne, on 11 July 1983 headed, "Blacks win battle over sacred sites". The article states—

PERTH.—The Aboriginal people of Noonkanbah in Western Australia's far northern Kimberley region, have won their long battle for the right to protect their sacred sites.

Mr Stephen Hawke, son of the Prime Minister, helped negotiate the Aboriginal victory.

Is it not incredible that someone should refer to an "Aboriginal victory" because seismic work is going on at Noonkanbah Station? I find an irony in that. The article goes on—

Aborigines were forced to stand by as an ancient burial ground was fenced off with barbed wire and drilled for oil—unsuccessfully as it turned out.

I asked in the House whether that took place; whether a hole was drilled through a sacred burial site, and the Minister's reply was that if I gave more details he might be able to give an answer. It was quoted in the newspaper; it said that it had happened. I do not believe it happened and I would like the Minister to tell me in clear, unequivocal terms that it did not happen.

The article goes on—

The head of WA's Mines Department, Mr D. R. Kelly, said: "It's great to see this agreement reached without any confrontation.

"The company has agreed to avoid any interference with Aboriginal sacred sites and this is the sort of thing one would like to see in all future agreements of this kind."

Mr Kelly said Mr Stephen Hawke visited Perth several weeks ago to discuss some aspects of the Aborigines' case with the Mines Department officials.

I asked the Minister for Mines whether Mr Stephen Hawke was involved in those negotiations.

Hon. Tom Stephens: That wasn't the question you asked.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I asked several questions; whether Stephen Hawke talked to Mr Kelly, and I mentioned to the Minister later that I had misread the article and it did not say that he had seen Mr Kelly. I asked if Mr Hawke had seen Mines Department officials about the contract with the mining company and the answer was that he talked to Mines Department officials about a variety of matters affecting Aborigines.

The article to which I have referred gives a very biased point of view and was written by none other than Jan Mayman. I did not know who she was. I presumed she was a reporter for *The Age*, living in Melbourne, who had heard about this and wrote a story for that newspaper. But, surprise, surprise! Someone gave me a list of the policy groups within the lay ALP and in the Aboriginal affairs committee one finds Jan Mayman's name along with that of Tom Stephens, Aubrey Lynch, Frank Donovan and Brian Wyatt and Ivan Yarran—a fine bunch of people who know more

about Aboriginal affairs than anyone else. Jan Mayman is a member of the ALP and of the Aboriginal policy committee and she wrote an article in *The Age* which gives a biased point of view.

This is what happened in the Eastern States in relation to Noonkanbah; people wrote articles which were totally wrong. Now we see why—they were written by members of the ALP.

In respect of Mr Stephen Hawke's latest involvement, an article appeared in *The West Australian* on 16 July headed, "Young Hawke tells of those quiet talks".

The article goes on—

"For a start," he said, rolling a cigarette, "the negotiations were not secret.

"They were ordinary, normal negotiations. We didn't tell the world about them, but it was quite straightforward".

He said that the Marra Worra Worra was asked to represent the two communities involved in the exploration programme.

Also at the talks were representatives of the Kimberley Lands Council, The National Aboriginal Council and IEDC.

"We reached agreement that no drilling was to be carried out on sacred land and that the old Aborigines on both stations will work with an anthropologist to define these areas," Mr Hawke said.

The article goes on—

The Marra Worra Worra is a loose affiliation of about 15 Aboriginal communities in the Fitzroy region. It advises them on land matters, accounting and resources.

My understanding is that the Marra Worra Worra was set up as an accounting organisation. It has been taken over by Stephen Hawke and his cronies and is used as an umbrella organisation.

Hon. Tom Stephens: How contemptuous you are of Aboriginal people.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am not talking about Aboriginal people; I am talking about Stephen Hawke.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You show complete contempt for the Aboriginal people by suggesting they could be taken over.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: A pamphlet was put out a couple of years ago by the Marra Worra Worra explaining their purpose in life and I quoted it in a previous speech in this House. It talks of representing all Aboriginal communities in the Fitzroy River area. It makes a lot of sense for someone wanting to control the affairs of com-

munities to take over the group representing all of them.

Initially it was an accounting organisation designed to help accounting procedures of the various communities—a laudable idea. It was taken over, and now it is involved in mining negotiations. It was involved in respect of Noonkanbah in relation to the current programme and it now advises on land matters, accounting and resources.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It is a resource centre and is funded as such.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is the organisation in which Mr Hawke became actively involved and he has used it as a vehicle to promote his own ends. Those ends have been discussed before; they were to cause trouble in Noonkanbah in 1981 and to organise Aboriginal communities in the Fitzroy River area.

I wish to refer also to an article in *The West Australian* on 3 September which said, "Aborigines in Leonora press for land rights". It goes on—

A GROUP of Leonora Aborigines wants land rights on the town's Aboriginal reserve vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust and mining exploration there stopped.

Some members of the group—the Leonora Aboriginal Movement Body (L.A.M.B.)—want provision for compensation if any mining is done on the eight-hectare reserve or if there is a straight-out sale to mining companies.

A figure of \$2 million has been mentioned.

It goes on to quote the Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, Mr Isaacs, who made a tirade of abuse against mining companies and argued for the land to be given over.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Why are you trying to keep these people down? Why don't you give them some support?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I want to make it clear that I raised this not because I am critical of those people but to make it clear that the people at Leonora are not looking for land rights. The article in *The West Australian* gives a totally false picture of what is happening in Leonora.

A letter appeared in *The West Australian* on 13 September in response to that article. The letter was written by J. Madariaga, Vice President of the Leonora Aboriginal Movement Body. The letter states—

I comment on the report "Aborigines in Leonora press for land rights" (September 3).

I was present at the meeting of LAMB, and the discussion centred on these points:

Ownership of the reserve, and that the mining company concerned give LAMB another block of land to replace the one where drilling is taking place.

At no time was the sum of \$2 million mentioned, and I'm surprised to read that this matter was raised under the banner of land rights.

LAMB is not interested in the land rights issue. Our concern is that suitable housing be made available on the Nambi Road for our fringe dwellers.

At our previous discussion we did consider asking the mining company to assist financially in the housing project, but at this time no discussion has taken place between LAMB and the mining company.

The Department for Community Welfare gave permission for the mining company to drill, but when the Aboriginal people complained they moved off the reserve. In all the years the Land Trust has been in existence, no meetings have been held in the Goldfields, so how can the chairman of the Land Trust comment on the views of the people in the region on land rights and this issue?

That comes straight from the mouth of an Aboriginal woman in Leonora, speaking on behalf of the people who do not support land rights. It makes it clear that the article in *The West Australian* suggesting they wanted land rights is a total fabrication. It is very disappointing that such articles appear from time to time. Significant numbers of Aboriginal people in the north-eastern goldfields are violently opposed to land rights and believe as I do that the issue is divisive and racist. They believe the future of the Aboriginal people is best served by being part of the general community.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: Have you heard of land rights given to North American Indians? Is that so terribly objectionable?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not believe in giving any group of people title to land not available to anyone else simply because they are a different colour.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: You do not believe they would be advanced by having land rights?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: People can be advanced in a system in a whole multitude of ways. Regrettably, people on Miss Elliott's side seem to think that if we give a big slice of land to the Aboriginal people their problems will go away. They seem to

think the Aborigines will return to the tribal way of life and their problems will disappear; they think that white people will keep away because there is a fine for entering those areas. They believe Aborigines will go back to the lifestyle portrayed in the films I mentioned earlier. That will not happen. Aboriginal people in the central desert would be lost totally without the support of the whole community. They would suffer enormously if they did not receive welfare services such as unemployment benefits, various pensions, hospital facilities, doctors' services and all the services that are available and provided by the taxpayer.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Who is suggesting they should be taken away?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: This is the sort of argument put by Dr Coombes. He argues there should be separate countries and a treaty between the Aboriginal people and the white community.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You must be the author of the document circulating in the central desert.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I am coming to that. I am sorry to take so long.

Hon. D. K. Dans interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not believe I am the fount of all knowledge, which is in marked contrast to many of the Minister's speeches which were a complete reading of the notes prepared for him by someone else.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I had not had a speech prepared for me until I came to this side of the House.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Turn it up! I saw the Minister reading from a pad; his speech was typed.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes, I typed it after I wrote it.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The Minister read his speeches.

Mr Stephens mentioned that I may have been the author of a pamphlet circulating in the desert. I make clear to the House that I did not set eyes on one of these pamphlets until Robert Riley gave me one last Saturday night prior to our debating land rights on Radio 6NR. I did not have time on that occasion to take a good look at it. I do not know what is in it. I believe it puts forward a Christian point of view with regard to land rights.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It cannot be considered Christian.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not know what is in it. If the member does not take my word for what I say in Parliament, he will not take my word for

anything. I saw it for a brief moment in a radio station and it relates to land rights in a Christian perspective.

I was criticised in the other House last week by the member for Kalgoorlie who said I was somehow or other capable of making Aboriginal people get up and go to far distant places on election day, simply because I said so. Apparently I have this enormous power and ability to make Aboriginal people go to religious meetings when I want them to. That is quite ludicrous. I do not have that control over anybody, let alone Aboriginal people. My religious background is nothing like that of the fundamental Christians who are doing a lot of good work in the central desert area. The member for Kalgoorlie, Mr Taylor, in a speech in which he criticised me, talked about a report put out by the ALP candidate for Murchison-Eyre, Frank Donovan, called, "The Liberal counter strategy".

I have not seen it because he has not made a copy available to me. However, the fact that it is called a counter strategy makes it quite clear what the Labor Party is all about. The Labor Party has criticised us for having a counter strategy, but it is admitting it is countering its own strategy. Now it is saying that the Liberal Party gave someone \$1 500 to go out in the desert and spread the message.

Hon. J. M. Brown: Was that Teddy Evans?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I do not propose to mention names. Nobody was promised any money, and that is a fact. This argument was put forward by Mr Donovan in the counter strategy. We asked Aboriginal people of our persuasion to assist us in the same way that we ask anyone who is a member of the Liberal Party to assist us in our campaign. The Labor Party criticised us for getting people, of their own volition, in their own time, and with their own money, to campaign for the Liberal Party. There was supposed to be something criminal about that, and yet in Murchison-Eyre, for the 12 months prior to the election in February of this year, Mr Aubrey Lynch, the NAC delegate for that area, a member of the Labor Party, and also a member of the ALP committee on Aboriginal affairs, was working almost constantly as a justice of the peace putting people on the roll at public expense. I do not know whether this went on for a year, but certainly it went on for six months or more. On top of that, the candidate, Mr Donovan, was employed as a research officer for Mr Campbell, the Federal member for Kalgoorlie. Mr Donovan was employed at public expense, and he spent his time as a research officer trying to have himself elected as a member of Parliament.

The man who stood again, Mr Brian Whyatt, is an Aboriginal—the chairman of the Aboriginal hostels group. He spent half his time going around Lower North Province, ostensibly on hostel work, but of course he was campaigning for the Labor Party. So here, for a very lengthy period prior to the election, three full-time employees of the Federal Government were working for the Labor Party; yet the Labor Party has the audacity to criticise us for giving somebody expenses to pay for petrol to drive his vehicle into the desert. The Labor Party has the audacity to accuse us of all sorts of manipulation and involvement in things it says we should not be involved in.

Hon. Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The people of Murchison-Eyre gave a clear indication that they did not want the Labor Party. The ALP members cannot get it through their thick skulls that the Aboriginal people would not vote for them. ALP members have this attitude that it is their God-given right that Aboriginal people will vote for them if they can get them enrolled. The opposite proved to be true in Murchison-Eyre—people who wish to be elected must get out and sell their message. The Aboriginal people did not believe the ALP candidates. The Hon. Mark Nevill would agree with me because the Aborigines did not vote for him either. Labor Party members have this arrogant attitude that as soon as they cause an Aboriginal person to be enrolled, he will vote for them. They cannot take defeat, and that is the reason Mr Donovan produced this counter strategy document.

Mr Donovan persuaded Mr Taylor to make a speech in the other House. This speech, quoted in *The West Australian*, was to the effect that Mr Norman Moore is an arch criminal and that he manipulated all these people. The Labor Party cannot accept that it was beaten fair and square and it will continue to be beaten in these areas while it attempts to manipulate Aboriginal people and to divide the blacks and the whites in the Australian community.

It is time that ALP members stopped squealing and whining and carrying on about the situation in Murchison-Eyre. I suggest that Mr Donovan is very sorry he ever became a candidate. He has been left in the lurch by the Labor Party. His finances are significantly depleted following his attempt to win a seat.

I conclude by again voicing my concern about the divisiveness in the Australian community. Unless we reverse that trend and reverse it quickly, we will finish up having two nations in Australia

and that is against the best interests of the country.

Point of Order

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), in his speech the honourable member identified clearly two documents. One document was identified at my request and, under Standing Order No. 151, I now ask for it to be tabled. The other document was the one which listed the membership of the ALP committee on Aboriginal affairs.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Haven't you got a copy of that?

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. Masters: We will give you a copy.

Hon. TOM STEPHENS: I would like the member also to table that document under Standing Order No. 151.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Is the Hon. Norman Moore able to table those documents?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Certainly, Mr Deputy President.

The documents were tabled (See papers Nos. 256 and 257).

Debate (on motion) Resumed

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [9.06 p.m.]: The Address-in-Reply is the traditional opening debate in the House, and it is normal on this occasion to offer congratulations where necessary. I do not think I should contribute to this debate without acknowledging the changes, and in particular, the changes in this House.

First of all, through you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth), I would like to congratulate the President of the House. At the end of this term, he will have served 12 years in this office and he is getting to the stage of being one of the longest serving Liberal members to have assumed that position. I understand that a free trader—this was in the period before we had the parties that we have today—served for a longer period. Perhaps our present President is the second longest serving Liberal Party President of this House.

In their absence, I would like to extend my congratulations to the Leader of the Government (Hon. Des Dans), the Attorney General (Hon. J. M. Berinson), and the Minister for Mines (Hon. Peter Dowding), on their promotion. I would like to congratulate the Hon. Fred McKenzie on his appointment to the position of Government Whip—at the moment he appears to have re-

ceived a great promotion, because he is sitting in the chair of the Leader of the Government.

I trust that new members on both sides of the House—seven in all—will enjoy their stay here and continue to acquit themselves in the way they have acquitted themselves up to date. I suppose one cannot really congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, but one can at least commiserate with him in what is a new experience for him. He is a very distinguished parliamentarian, and I know he will do a good job for the Opposition in that position. I would like to congratulate also the Hon. Gordon Masters and the third member of the Opposition team, a member who is new to this position, the Hon. Tom Knight.

Hon. J. M. Brown: He is not in his seat!

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No, he is not in his seat. I congratulate also the Hon. David Wordsworth and his Deputy Chairmen of Committees and wish them all the best for the three-year term.

Of course I mourn the circumstances that led to my becoming the Leader of the Country Party in this place. I do not think there is any argument about that—I am the only member so I must be the Leader. I think it was an Australian poet who said—

For good undone and deeds suspect and resolutions vain—'tis somewhat late to tarry.

So *c'est le guerre*—the wheel has turned. I want to remind some members that I have been here for some time, and I have seen the wheel turned a few times. I suggest that no-one should become over-cocky by weight of numbers, by his position, or by anything else. One can be a rooster today and a feather duster tomorrow without any trouble at all. Like me, I imagine other members continue to learn like I am learning, and they realise it is the people out there who put them here. After all is said and done, it is not one's time in this House that will determine one's length of stay here.

The revolution of the wheel has seen a few of my colleagues leave, and in particular I would like to say a few words about the Hon. Winifred Piesse. I believe she was a good member of Parliament, a diligent worker; and a sound and articulate debater. She was frightened of no-one, and she had a tolerance for all—as long as they were not fools. The Hon. Win Piesse spent a term here and she served her electorate well. She is now in retirement at Wagin, and I hope she will get the rest she has earned after all her years of public contribution. She served her district and the State well as a nursing sister and matron. She was a wife, and as a very young widow, she battled with

a farm, paying off probate, and looking after her young family. She became a councillor of the local shire, a very active justice of the peace, a health adviser, and finally a member of Parliament. That is not a bad record for anyone. So if she feels somewhat disappointed that she did not serve another term—that she was not given the privilege of coming back to this House to continue with her work especially in respect of women's affairs—at least she knows she did something many people have not done; in my opinion she made it. She showed us all exactly what a good woman she was and how well she could cope with any problems that crossed her path.

I would like again to pay a tribute to the Hon. Norman Baxter. I will not say much about him because tributes were paid to him before. I do not want to reiterate his parliamentary performance and the service to the State of father and son—his father's and his own contribution spread over a 67-year period. I, and I am sure many others, miss the quiet, friendly, and knowledgeable presence of the Hon. Norm Baxter. This ex-member of Parliament worked very hard up to his last day and although now, like others, he is entitled to certain privileges within this House of Parliament, regrettably many of these people cut themselves off immediately. I am not talking only of my colleagues, but also of other friends I have had over the years. After one has been with these people day in and day out, suddenly they leave, and that is the last one sees of them. Perhaps it is our fault because, as busy members of Parliament, we seem never to have the time to stop and talk with ex-members. If they do come to the House, we seem to be too busy to take much notice of them, and often they go away with the feeling that they were in the way and possibly it would have been better had they not called in.

Perhaps Tom Bateman, MLA, might have the right idea. Recently he called a meeting of ex-members of Parliament and persuaded them to form an ex-members of Parliament association, the first president of which is Sir Ross Hutchinson and the first secretary was the late Jim Cox, previously the Chief Hansard Reporter, who regrettably left us about a month ago. I wish this association well and I suggest that all members, when their turns come to leave this Parliament, try to keep in touch and join that organisation and endeavour to work through it to ensure members of Parliament keep in contact with each other.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association originally was designed not only to assist present members of Parliament, but also to help retired members. Perhaps the CPA has not served ex-

members of Parliament sufficiently well and maybe we are at the stage where we should form a stronger organisation—such as the organisation that has got off the ground through the work of Mr Tom Bateman—and give it the support it needs. I congratulate Mr Tom Bateman for forming that association. I think it will become one of his best remembered feats in this Parliament.

That association may well become important. For example, many private firms, organisations, and unions have retired members' clubs. There is no reason that such a club could not be considered in this House and, indeed, expanded to the extent as has occurred in Queensland.

On Tuesday, 19 July, I noticed a headline in *The West Australian*. It appeared on page 12 and said, "Dingoes find champions". I was a little concerned to read the article, which said—

The dingo—long branded a sheepkiller—has found champions in many of the school children who took part in an Agriculture Protection Board poster competition. Some of the 900 entrants from 35 Perth metropolitan area primary schools submitted posters sympathetic to what one student called a unique Australian.

The winner, from the Coolbinia Primary School, submitted a poster with a slogan, "Dingoes aren't always to blame".

At the time I made a few inquiries about this matter in an endeavour to find out what caused the dingo to be sponsored in such a way through 35 schools. I wanted to know the motive behind it. I found the 35 schools were in the north-east metropolitan area stretching out towards Chidlow. The Agriculture Protection Board had visited the schools to point out some of the dingo's characteristics, but regrettably the message did not get over as well as it might have.

I immediately remembered another article I had seen in the paper and I searched for it and found it in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, 26 April, under the headline, "Dingo black market feared". It read, in part, as follows—

WA's only legal "dingo keeper", Mrs Annette Woodhams, of Langsford, believes that a black market trade in dingo pups is operating in the State. She said that pups were being offered at \$400 to \$500 each—about half the price of that ruling in the Eastern States. People sought the pups just to defy the law, she said.

I worried considerably about this matter and my concern led me to recall all the incidents of dingo attacks of which I knew personally in my youth

and the stories passed down by my father. I recalled also many questions asked in this Parliament. Therefore, I went to the library and looked up a few articles in respect of this matter.

Before I deal with those articles, I indicate that the dingo came to Australia approximately 10 000 to 20 000 years ago. Presumably it came from Malaysia with the Aborigines and originally was brought in as a domestic dog. It is a strange trait that people try to keep dingoes just for the sake of keeping them and the situation could well go overboard in the same way that people have gone overboard regarding the keeping of Alsations and other large dogs. A Bill introduced in the other place removed the necessity for male Alsations to be castrated and at present in my home town and in the city one sees large numbers of Alsations, especially on Sundays. Indeed, one has to see them to believe how many there are around.

A number of these huge Alsations are just status symbols. We see them hanging their heads out of the back windows of motor cars or in the backs of station wagons where they are confined by bars so that they are unable to lick the back of the driver's neck. One also sees these dogs roaming the streets. These large dogs have become so numerous that they are becoming a menace in their own right.

I was in Germany recently and when one walked along the street one had to be very careful where one put one's feet. The situation is worse in Amsterdam, as the Hon. Graham MacKinnon would know. One sees shops which sell a large amount of gear for dogs, including pullovers and expanding leashes. When a dog is on an expanding leash and wants to run ahead, one presses a button and the dog has about 50 feet of line. He can charge ahead and scamper up to the nearest telephone pole. Whoever has the leash machine in his hand presses the button and walks up to the dog taking up the slack as he goes. This is a marvellous contraption.

In Germany, in some of the best hotels, I saw Dobermans and Alsations coming down the stairs from their owners' rooms where they were obviously put for the night. Then, while their masters' or mistresses had breakfast, the dogs curled up at their feet.

I also saw the same thing in Hamburg and Italy. I am worried that this trend will catch on here and we will reach the stage where those dogs which are not looked after will cause problems. I can see this occurring in this State in the future. In the cases I have quoted perhaps there is no need for concern, because those dogs are looked after. However, the situation here is rather differ-

ent and a dangerous position could arise if animals of this nature get away from their owners.

I was amazed also while travelling on a Eurail pass through Europe that some people even buy a first-class ticket for an adjacent seat, on which they spread out a rug and on which the Doberman or Alsatian sits. No-one else can sit there as the seat is reserved. Believe me, it is quite an eerie sensation to sit opposite one of those dogs on a train.

However, returning to the dingo, I believe we are in great danger of the dingo becoming a status symbol as has occurred with Alsations and, indeed, boats and launches. Tied up to lamp posts on front lawns around the city, one sees boats with grass growing up to three feet under them, because nobody can get under them to mow it. Some boats have not been used since they were bought. As a matter of fact, I do not think they were bought to go into the water; they were bought as status symbols, not to be used. These boats were bought to show people that their owners have bought them and they just sit on front lawns.

Many of these dog fads serve the same purpose. These dogs are status symbols and in country areas already we are regretting the fact that the Alsatian is no longer castrated. It is okay when people look after their animals; but there are few genuine dog lovers. I have seen the same situation in relation to horses. I have seen kids crying their eyes out saying, "Get me a horse". When they get a horse, who looks after it? Dad does. The children do not have any idea what it is all about.

Miss McAleer has seen this, too. She knows what happens and the same situation occurs in relation to dogs. These days when a kid wants something he gets it.

The school children, to whom I referred earlier, designed posters saying, "Dingoes are not always to blame". Dingoes are not always the ones to pull down the sheep and cause the trouble. Wild dogs do that too, but the dingo is a dog and we certainly do not want to see it proliferate until there are as many as there were in the past. We certainly do not want to encourage the keeping and promotion of that breed.

I have talked to representatives of the Department of Agriculture and, as far as they are concerned, the one licence that is held in Western Australia shall be the only one issued. However, when one reads of the activity that is taking place in schoolrooms with teachers promoting the dingo and saying that, after all is said and done, the dingo is a nice, friendly chap, it is necessary that

we monitor the position very carefully; otherwise we could have a serious problem to deal with.

It is interesting to note also that there is a dingo menace in Mt. Tom Price. It is thought dingoes have been enticed into the town by people who feed them. Dingoes have been fed on scraps by people travelling on the railroad and food has been thrown out of motor cars. As a result, dingoes in that town are baling up cats and small dogs and killing them.

Any person who knows the dingo, realises it will take anything that moves. A person who attempts to snare a dingo by first feeding it, will find it has a very wary character. It takes a long time before it gets used to taking a morsel, but once it is tempted it will go looking for food. That is when the dingo gets a little dangerous. Once a dingo gets that confidence, it usually learns to kill and it will kill at any time.

The dingo usually grabs its victim by the throat and virtually suffocates it. It then goes in through the anal passage or in through the soft flesh of the gut. There is no good our being squeamish about this because this is the fate of all the prey taken by dingoes.

A few days ago in the Press, there was a report about coyotes in San Francisco having been encouraged into the outskirts of the city by people feeding them. I understand the coyotes have even killed some young children there; and the dingo has the same hunting instincts. I am saying all this so that future generations of members here will understand that we could have the same problem in this State if dingo numbers get back to what they were 20, 30, or 50 years ago.

Let me quote now what Patsy Adam Smith wrote about the dingo—

They ate our sheep. Got 800 lambs. You never saw anything so awful. They were tiny. We'd put 800 ewes out to lamb and when we went back in a few days there they were—the lambs born and dead, broken backs on some but most had been used like toys. Dingoes see the little swinging tail and grab it and toss the lamb in the air for fun. We found the culprits . . . a family. Mother, father and pups. The parents had taken the pups out for a training run. There was hardly any blood on any of the little bodies just tails off, or twisted and backs broken. It would break your heart. And they were to have been our next year's flock.

The following quote is from the Fitzgerald family of Nambi who many of us know are still battling along on their station. The heading is 'We Worked All Night' and it reads as follows—

I blame management, particularly on the [Aboriginal] Reservations, because they didn't have staff to hunt the dogs and keep them down. At the last we couldn't afford even one man—we used to have six or seven men after dogs once.

Further on—

. . . you can lose your whole new flock of lambs in a night.

Questions about dingoes were asked way back when the Parliament was formed. It is interesting to note that of recent years one of the most persistent questioners on the dingo problem has been the Hon. H. D. Evans, the present Minister for Agriculture. In 1973, Mr Coyne asked the then Minister for Agriculture. "Is he aware that the dingo menace in the Murchison pastoral area is becoming much more critical?" Mr Jamieson replied for Mr Evans, "It is recognised that dingo numbers are increasing in the Murchison".

I happen to know, through connections I have in the area, that the dingo numbers are increasing and the stage is being reached where they will soon be shifting further south. We should not be treating them as lovable little animals, but rather as the dangerous species which they are. This is the position the APB should be promoting more actively in the 35 schools its officers recently visited.

In 1981, Mr H. D. Evans asked the then Minister for Agriculture (Hon. R. C. Old), "What was the total amount expended in the control of dingoes in pastoral areas in 1980-81?" The answer was "\$1.19 million". That is what the Government expended; there is nothing said there about what was expended by individuals to keep this vermin under control. I well recall the stories my father told of the dingo problem in my own district. I refer to page 77 of the book titled *Corrigin: Pioneering Days and Beyond*. I quote as follows—

The shepherds generally took to rounding up their flocks at night, which meant they had closer control over them. But the new pioneer, having cleared a patch of land for his small flock—possibly fenced, often not—could not always spare this night watch. And that was when the damage was done. "The dingo was a difficult and wary customer to trap or poison," comments Robert Lutley of Babakin, observing that early attempts to protect flocks with sheep netting fences failed because the wiring was not buried, and the dingoes always managed to find a weak spot, such as a creek or gully.

The Larke family, for example, went to the considerable trouble and expense of erecting a six foot fence around about two-thirds of their property—a good fourteen miles all in.

Further on—

Harry Gayfer considered the dingo menace so bad that he opted to go in for cattle and horse breeding from the outset, and it was not until 1918 that he began to establish his Peppin flock of sheep. His concern was so great that he had a brace of special pistol grip shotguns made specially for use "on the run", say from horseback or out of an early motor tourer. The weapons were made to his own specifications at the Vickers arms factory in England in the early 1920s.

Still further—

The Overheus of Lomos were among those beset by the dingo menace and according to son Charlie, eighteen of the wild dogs were caught in almost as many months. Traps were kept constantly set with poison on the jaws, and countless bottles of strychnine were used on kangaroo meat baits.

Further on—

One of the off-shoots of the dingo menace was the formation of the Corrigin District Sheepowner's Association in 1927. In that year the number of sheep in the district was estimated at 29,554, and attacks by dingoes were causing considerable concern to owners.

Further on—

In the first year of its existence forty dogs were killed and in 1928 thirty-two. For every dingo caught the association matched £1 for the same amount paid by the Government and Road Board.

This illustrates the concern felt in 1928 about the problem posed by the dingo.

The story does not finish there, because if one looks at the position throughout Australia, relative to the dingo menace, one finds a considerable amount of money has been spent in the Eastern States to alleviate this problem, especially in New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia where miles of dingo fencing has been erected by those Governments and private landowners in an endeavour to keep the dingo at bay. It might not be known by many people in Western Australia that the owners of the Balgair Station on the Nullarbor together with the APB are erecting a six-line electric fence inside the Western Australian border 64 miles long in an attempt to keep out the dingoes which come across the Nullarbor from the Eastern States.

Regrettably many city people at present have become pro-dingo in their attitude. If they only knew the history of this matter, how the problem was introduced here in the first place, and how it took so many years to get rid of the problem, they might begin to realise that it could happen all over again. Fortunately we have been able to rid our continent of the rabbit and dingo menaces. I hope and pray that the dingo menace does not recur and that we are not faced with the problem of not so many years ago. The quotes I gave about Nambi Station dealt with the 1950s, which is not all that long ago.

At the commencement of my remarks, I congratulated a lot of people, because we have seen a change of Government as a result of the will of the people. Members who used to sit on this side of the House are now in Government; they are supreme and are the lawmakers now. They are well entitled to receive these comments because the people have put them in Government.

I have said before that I am not against the will of the people being expressed; if I were I would not be in a democracy. However, I am a little frustrated and a little put out by the methods used by some people to get into office. Pre-election run-ups involve a lot of glib promises by all parties. When the dust settles and a count is made, it is usually the people themselves who are hurt because of their expectations which are not met by the Government of the day. I have seen this happen before and this applies to all parties and all candidates. So many utterances are made in the period prior to an election but the promises made by a party should be kept when it becomes the Government. If the promises are not to be kept, they should not be made in the first instance.

In August last year, I stood in this place and told members about the state of the Gwambygine Bridge. I passed around photographs showing the terrible condition of that bridge and I asked some questions of the Minister representing the Minister for Transport. All this caused considerable interest among the television stations and the Press. I think Channel 9 and Channel 2 and *The West Australian* newspaper sent along representatives to look at the bridge.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They had to find out how to spell Gwambygine.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That could be so.

The question I asked concerning the bridge was as follows—

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the condition of the Gwambygine Bridge in the York Shire?

The Hon. Gordon Masters replied, "Yes". The question continues—

- (2) Is the Minister aware that following complaints from parents of children who use the school bus, the York school bus committee, the local police sergeant, the York District High School principal, and a shire representative, inspected the Gwambyne Bridge?

Again, the Hon. Gordon Masters replied, "Yes". The question continued—

- (3) Is the Minister aware that if the bridge is closed the school bus would have to travel an hour longer each day?

The Minister replied—

- (3) It is appreciated that the school bus could have a longer journey in the eventuality of this bridge being closed.

The question continued—

- (4) Is it correct that the Main Roads Department has no plans to upgrade the bridge before 1988?

The Minister replied—

- (4) The Main Roads Department has no specific plans for the replacement of this bridge at present because of the apparent limited need and the very high cost involved.

The last part of the question read as follows—

- (5) As there is a danger of the bus wheels slipping off the wheel-track boards, could immediate action be taken to at least replace the rotten decking?

The answer from the Minister was—

- (5) Replacement of the decking would not be practical without the replacement of the whole superstructure. However, discussions will be arranged with the local authority concerning the immediate problem of confining traffic to the running planks.

I can tell members a little about the history of this bridge. It is an old bridge and, in 1967, running planks—parallel planks—were installed in order that vehicles might be driven over the bridge. At the same time, the bridge was listed for replacement by the Government of the day.

During that period, the Main Roads Department carried out test drilling for a site for a new bridge and the land required was resumed in 1967. In 1972, a five-tonne limit was placed on the bridge and, in 1975, the Main Roads Department indicated that the replacement of the bridge would be included in its programme; but regret-

fully the funds set aside were transferred to other works. In recent years, the bridge has been the subject of a number of inspections by the Main Roads Department, and this included test borings for pylons for a new bridge. In October 1981, the Main Roads Department determined, "The general condition is very bad".

In 1982, the Main Roads Department recommended that gravel be placed on the decking to stop the deck from splintering further, but this could not be done because once the gravel had been placed, it would have fallen through the planks in the centre of the bridge.

In mid-1982, the Main Roads Department advised of the possible replacement of the bridge in 1988 and full support for this replacement was given by the district officer of the Main Roads Department situated at Northam.

Following my question to the Minister on 4 August and the subsequent press coverage, I fired another question at Mr Masters—he may well remember it because he was very good at giving terse answers and he did not at any time give the answer I would have expected him to give. My question was as follows—

In the interests of the safety of York school children and others what progress has, or is being made in respect of reconstruction of the Gwambyne Bridge at York?

This was in October—remember this is months after my original question—and he replied as follows—

As indicated in my earlier reply to question 330, the Main Roads Department has no specific plans for the replacement of this bridge. The department has, however, been carrying out investigations to determine the repairs necessary to keep the bridge in service. When these investigations have been completed, the matter will be discussed with the local authority involved.

I interjected and said—

They will have to hurry up because the bridge will fall down.

Mr Masters might care to know that the bridge is still standing, but there is no traffic on it. It would have been better for my case tonight had he given a more specific answer at the time I asked those questions; and there the matter lies. Nothing was done. Liaison was to take place between the members of Parliament and the shire council, but this did not occur. On 8 February, there suddenly appeared to be a little bit of activity in regard to the bridge. I do not know what triggered off the activity, but I suspect that with the election on the hor-

izon, this was a possible hot potato, as it were, and everyone was sharpening his pencils. In *The West Australian* on 8 February, under the headline, "School fear of bridge collapse", the following article appeared—

PARENTS at York fear that a bridge near the town may collapse if the local school bus continues to use it.

It is a long article which outlined the condition of the planks. It continued—

The principal of the high school, Mr Barry Dennis, said that the new route added at least 30 minutes' travel time for some of the children.

Further on, the article stated—

The MRD hoped to arrange discussions with the York Shire Council this week.

A new bridge would cost more than \$250,000.

In the *Daily News* on Thursday, 10 February, an article under the headline, "Minister to see 'danger' bridge" read as following—

A State Government Minister was due to look at a dangerous bridge this afternoon.

Mr Warren Durack, a farmer, said today the bridge 11km south of York and 19km north of Beverley was so dangerous the local school bus committee had banned the school bus from crossing.

Late this afternoon the Minister for Resources Development, Mines, Fuel and Energy, Mr Jones, and Mr Mick Gayfer, MLC were to inspect the bridge—one of two between York and Beverley.

"The school bus now has to travel about 25km farther each trip," said Mr Durack.

"Four years ago, fixing the bridge was given a high priority. Now everybody in a position to do something about it appears to have forgotten about it—it has no priority at all."

He said the Main Roads Department seemed unwilling to allocate funds again because traffic counts showed that not enough vehicles would use the bridge.

But Mr Durack said reliance on traffic counts was ridiculous.

"There's a five-tonne limit on the bridge and everybody in the area knows about it so nobody uses it," he said.

"If heavy vehicles were able to use the bridge, there would be a lot more traffic and the route would probably meet the MRD requirements for upgrading."

He said the new bridge would be expensive, but even a spoon drain type of crossing would be better than the existing bridge and would be usable at least 350 days of the year.

That was on 10 February; and the *Northam Advertiser* on 17 February reported under the heading, "Parents' son brings bridge action", as follows—

After a school bus was banned from using a bridge near York, Government action has been prompted after two Government ministers inspected the bridge.

A meeting of York parents decided to ban the use of the school bus over the Gwambyne bridge which is about 11km south of York.

Parents say the bridge is unsafe.

They refuse to let their children ride across the bridge in its present state.

Some 15 years ago there was a load limit placed on the bridge which was due for replacement in 1972-74 but the funds were re-allocated.

On February 9, the bridge was inspected by the MRD and York Shire Council.

Next day the Minister for Fuel and Energy, Mr Peter Jones, inspected the bridge during a visit to York and on Saturday the Minister for Transport, Mr Rushton made an inspection.

Because the school bus is not using the bridge it means that it has to make a 20km detour on each trip and children are being picked up on each side of the river and set down on alternate schedules.

York has had five bridges closed in the past 15 years.

On Monday, Mr Rushton said the Government had decided to replace the bridge during the coming summer.

The important aspect that evolves out of this is that a Minister of the Crown, on inspecting the bridge on 17 February did, in fact, say it would be replaced in the coming summer. He issued the following media statement—

The Deputy Premier and Minister for Transport, Mr Cyril Rushton, yesterday (Saturday) inspected the Gwambyne Bridge near York.

He was accompanied by the Deputy President of the Shire of York, Mr Warren Marwick, the Shire Clerk, Mr Lindsay Delahunty, and endorsed Liberal candidates

for the area, Mr Tom Richards (Avon) and Mr Gordon Atkinson (Central Province).

Mr Rushton said that during his on-the-spot inspection the council representatives and Liberal candidates all stressed the need to replace the crossing.

They all agreed that it would be a waste of money to repair the existing bridge, and that a replacement low level crossing would be less costly than a new bridge.

The Main Roads Department had estimated that construction of a new bridge would cost about \$250 000. The low level crossing was expected to cost considerably less.

The shire representatives told Mr Rushton they believed the crossing could not be built until next summer.

Mr Rushton said he agreed with the council contention that the crossing should be replaced.

Mr Rushton has asked the Commissioner of Main Roads, Mr Don Aitken, to negotiate with the shire of York the form of the replacement crossing which is to be constructed, timing of the works programme and the financial arrangements which needed to be agreed upon.

This was done and some \$90 000-worth of material was, in fact, estimated to be required from Government sources. The labour component was to be supplied by the York Shire Council. The Hon. Gordon Atkinson will remember this despite the fact that it was before the election.

I refer now to an article which appeared in the *Beverley York Express*, headed, "Bridge and Avondale—key issues at meeting." The article reads as follows—

The future of York's Gwambyine Bridge and Beverley's Avondale Research Station dominated question time at the 'Meet the Candidates' political rally held in York last week.

Candidates for the Avon seat, Ken McIver M.L.A. (A.L.P.), Tom Richards (Lib.) and Max Trenorden (N.C.P.) addressed about 100 farmers and town residents from as far south as Pingelly at the York Hotel.

Although sitting member, Ken McIver was subjected to a barrage of questions over the state transport system and Labor's supposed link with the union movement, most discussion centres on agricultural research and the future of Gwambyine Bridge, which, only last week was closed to the school bus.

Cutting through most of the political rhetoric, all three candidates agreed that the scaling down of operations at Avondale Research Station was not to the benefit of agriculture in the Avon Valley.

Mr Richards (Lib) said that despite the scaling down, Avondale was continuing with research but with a different emphasis.

"After discussions with the Department of Primary Industry, I believe that three more men could be employed at Avondale in the future," he said.

Although failing to give any assurances on the station, Mr McIver said he remembered the public meeting held in Beverley soon after the Government's decision.

"At that time, Beverley people were told it was purely a matter of economics, but now we find the Government spending \$1 million on land for research near Busselton," he said.

According to Mr Trenorden the Government seemed to think that because the Avon is doing well in terms of agriculture, it can afford to scale down research.

"But unless research is maintained, this well-being will degenerate. We need to make sure that it is kept in the area to keep production above farming costs," he said.

The Gwambyine Bridge which was recently deemed too hazardous for the local school bus to cross by the Parents and Citizens' Association, also was discussed at length.

When York resident, Arthur Jenkins called for assurances from all three candidates, the replies were encouraging and yet predictable.

Max Trenorden: 'I don't know about the bus, I wasn't game to drive over it. I believe that replacement is a priority and if I am elected, and I think I will be—

He was wrong. The article continues—

—then it's replacement will be right on top of the priority list.

It seems to me to be just another case of Government bureaucracy.

He was referring to the length of time.

Tom Richards, the Liberal candidate, said—

I can confidently expect funds to be allocated to the bridge's replacement within 12 months.'

He was going on the Minister's announcement that the decision would be made on that day. The article continued—

However, the only question appears to be: how much will the York Shire Council be expected to contribute?

Ken McIver: 'We have continually made representations for the local P. & C. and the York Shire Council, but we have been told there is no money available. I say, without a shadow of doubt, that if the Government is returned, nothing will be done and the bridge will be permanently closed.'

The Government was not returned, but the bridge has been closed. Nothing is being done. As far as the people are concerned, the whole matter is veiled in a mass of political promises made before the election. Consequently, on 4 August this year, I asked the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport the following question—

In the interests of the safety of York school children, and following much publicity last year, and the fact that both the Government and Opposition parties made pre-election utterances that a new bridge or crossing would be constructed at Gwambyne across the Avon River, when is the work to be implemented?

The Minister's answer was as follows—

There are a number of bridges over the Avon River between Beverley and west Toodyay of which Gwambyne is one that have reached the stage where consideration must be given to their replacement or otherwise.

So far as the overall road system is concerned, a crossing of the Avon River at Gwambyne is considered to be of much less importance than other locations.

The replacement of the old bridge over the Avon River at Gwambyne by either a new bridge or a flood crossing has been considered. Due to the high costs involved and the very low potential usage, the expenditure is hard to economically justify.

Alternative arrangements have been made for the operation of the school bus which is no longer dependent on crossing the river at Gwambyne.

Notwithstanding the above, the matter is still under active consideration and I hope to discuss the matter with the member shortly.

Prior to that, the Minister for Transport, in response to a minute from the Minister for Works, had caused a letter to be written to Mr Delahunty, the Shire Clerk of the Shire of York, in the following terms—

The Minister for Works, the Hon. Ken McIver, has drawn to my attention the request for replacement of the Gwambyne Bridge.

It is my understanding that Council has discussed this matter with my predecessor, the Hon. Cyril Rushton, and that Mr. Joe Butorac, Principal Engineer (South), Main Roads Department has also been involved.

I further understand that the cost of replacing the bridge—some \$250 000—cannot be economically justified.

Whilst the expenditure of \$190 000, the M.R.D. estimate for a low level flood crossing, is also economically unjustifiable, I am attracted to the suggestion that use of Shire labour and plant could achieve such a crossing at a substantially lower cost.

On 24 March, the York Shire Council replied with the following letter—

Council wishes to thank you for your interest in the above subject and would advise that Council's views would concur with those expressed by yourself.

It is, however, a fair amount of time since any word has been forthcoming from the Main Roads Department, therefore Council would appreciate a little prompting on its behalf to ensure these consultations get under way as soon as possible.

The undersigned has been in touch with the District Engineer of Northam on the matter, however his hands are tied until some communication from Head Office is forthcoming. Without an acceptable design recommendation from Head Office it is impossible for any preliminary cost work to take place, therefore the project at this stage is at a standstill.

Council would take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment and look forward to a most amicable working relationship.

Yours faithfully

L. O. DELAHUNTY
SHIRE CLERK

Nothing has happened; there has been no indication by the Minister to me that the project is to go ahead. I am told there is some indication that the Northam office of the department told the councillors in council that the proposal was a "no goer". On 30 August this year, I received at my office a copy of a letter written to the Editor of the *Beverley-York Express* by a user of the Gwambyne Bridge, which stated as follows—

I would appreciate some space in your paper to make comment on the Shire President report to Rate Payer in your 10th August issue, and the reply The Hon. H. W. Gayfer received when he asked a Question in the house on Thursday 4th August 1983, reported in your 24 August issue. Re Gwambyine Bridge. Mr Monger reported that the M.R.D. were still looking at the proposed crossing, but said that it did not have traffic flow to warrant an expenditure of 150-180 thousand dollars.

Perhaps some one can tell me why the Gwambyine bridge have a top priority as the Gwambyine East Road was sealed plus land resumed for bridge approaches. Added to this the approaches or intersection on the Great Southern Highway were surveyed three time plus the river bed drilled twice for foundation, and today has none.

Further how does one get an accurate count of traffic using the Bridge when it has been closed to heavy traffic for a number of years plus the fact residents have been trying to preserve the bridge for the benefit of the school bus.

The Hon Mr K McIver Minister for Works and Member For Avon said at his pre election speech that if re elected would give Gwambyine Bridge Top Priority. To date all The Hon Member has done is see that the people between Perth and Fremantle got their train service so that he was able to play trains with the Minister for Transport Mr Grill. The Hon H. W. Gayfer has also requested a Meeting of Mr McIver and Mr Grill with himself to have a meeting to discuss the Bridge but to date this has not happened. I think it is high time Mr K McIver did something for his electorate as he has been in office for Six Months.

The minutes of the York Shire Council meeting of 26 August have the following to say concerning the bridge—

Cr Marwick expressed concern at continued delays in response to Council's moves in relation to the Gwambyine Bridge.

MOVED Cr Marwick seconded Cr Lee that concern be expressed to Hon K F McIver, MLA at continued delay in response to Council's approaches regarding replacement of the Gwambyine Crossing and that unless action is reported within seven days, the President and Shire Clerk be authorised to express Council's concern through the press.

Carried

A telegram was received by the Council on Wednesday 31 August from Mr McIver, which stated as follows—

Received on Friday your letter of August 19 regarding Gwambyine Bridge. I can appreciate Council's concern and reiterate my previous comment that I have continually urged my colleague the Minister for Transport to finalise details of this project. Recently I sought an appointment with Mr Grill in company with the Hon M Gayfer, MLC to discuss this matter first hand. I will again contact Mr Grill and can assure you that a definite decision will be conveyed to Council in the near future.

We have gone around and around this problem. I am convinced the Minister for Transport in the previous Government promised the people of York that a bridge would be built. There is no question about the need for the bridge; we can forget about that argument. However, I have presented ample evidence that the bridge has been promised to the people. Therefore, if the bridge is not now to be built, it means either that the promise is not to be honoured, or that somebody has removed it from the list of priorities, following the election—and I do not believe that to be the case. I know Mr McIver is as anxious as I am to have the bridge built; it is in his electorate. It is also in my electorate, and in Mr Atkinson's electorate. For heaven's sake, if, before the election promises were made to construct a new bridge in the interests of the children of the area, let us not turn this issue into a political football. I maintain that the promises must be honoured and the bridge built. Under no circumstances should we members of Parliament, regardless of which side of the House we sit on, be able to promise people certain facilities before an election—facilities which concern the safety and well-being of their children—and not honour those promises.

Although I have spent a considerable time on this matter, I believe I had to raise the subject in this forum. I am not chastising Ken McIver or members opposite any more than I am blaming my own side. However, somebody must be responsible for this matter. If that is not the case, to use an expression often used by John Tonkin, this is a clear case of political subterfuge, which should not occur in a matter as important as this one.

I inform the House that this speech will go back to the York Shire Council; I believe I need to be as ruthless as everyone else has been. I ask the Leader of the House to immediately request his colleague, the Minister for Transport, to liaise

with the York Shire Council and officials of the Main Roads Department. We do not want to hear that the bridge cannot be built; we have already heard that it can be built. We know the crossing cannot be constructed until the river lowers; however, at least the plans and specifications can be drawn up so that, come next year, the children of the area will not have the problem—especially during the months of daylight saving—of travelling an additional 30 kilometres to school simply because they cannot get across a bit of water.

We must do something. We are too far in to get out; I am sure that if the Government looked at the matter in that light, instead of resorting to the technique of writing letter after letter and saying the matter will be looked into, something will be achieved. The talking has been done; let us now get out and build the bridge.

Regrettably, the issue has become a sore point with the York Shire Council. Members of Parliament could retain some of their dignity as far as promises are concerned if something is done soon.

This matter has not been denied by the present Government. Members should not get me wrong on that. If they do, I will go through what everybody has said in connection with the matter, and I am sure the House does not want that.

I have presented a case that maintains the status quo. I have asked that a crossing or a bridge be erected, to meet the Government and Opposition promises and statements made.

I had another interesting little exercise the other day with the gendarmerie—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Not another one!

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Another one! I am not pointing the bone at the police; the police officers involved were very polite.

Hon. D. K. Dans: They had heard about you.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: They might have recognised CR-500; I do not know. I am most concerned about the circumstances surrounding this occurrence. I will not say where it occurred, because those interested can check it out—either the Minister for Police and Emergency Services or a member of the Police Force—simply by checking my name at the Police Department. If they do, they will find the summons and my cheque attached to it; and I am not complaining about that.

I am not pointing the bone at the officers or at anybody else because they did their job; but I am as sure as I stand here that the instrument they used was wrong.

Hon. D. K. Dans: What kind of instrument was it, and where did they use it on you?

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I would not have had to go much further to have a cup of tea with Jim Brown; but I will not say exactly where it was. Never mind about that.

I was going along a long, straight road in my motor car, which is a fairly sophisticated piece of equipment. I have driven it for 350 000 kilometres, so I would have been through many speed traps; I have driven it around the place a terrible lot, in and out of the city. In fact, I have been caught for speeding on numerous occasions, and I have always accepted willingly what has come to me as a fair cop.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Your lights were working?

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: At the present moment, regretfully, my licence has a few endorsements on it. I do not mind a fair cop; that is not what concerns me. However, when the equipment is out of order, in my opinion, I have to say something.

The fairly sophisticated piece of equipment that I happen to drive has what is called a cruise control. The cruise control has been on the car as part of the equipment since it was new. When one sets the cruise control, one takes one's foot off the accelerator and the car maintains the set speed at all times—around a corner, up a hill. The equipment is governed, and the speedometer will not move. The car just sits on the figure that is selected.

My wife was beside me; and the figure I selected was 108 kilometres an hour. I had been to a district show; and everyone knows that when one goes to a district show, one has to be doubly careful what one does. Country shows seem to attract many other visitors. Nevertheless, I was driving away from the show with my speedometer set at 108, my foot off the accelerator. I saw coming towards me a police car—no problem at all. As it went by, I waved my hand, and looked in the rear vision mirror. All of a sudden, I saw a fantasy of lights. The lights started spinning around; the car did a “U-ey” and came screaming after me. I said to my wife—I will not say exactly what I said, but I admit I was rather surprised that the car was following me. I said, “Look at the speedo”. I still had not touched the accelerator with my foot to disconnect the cruisomatic. I said, “Look at that speedo—108Ks. What the heck's wrong here?”

I pulled up; the police car caught up; I got out and walked back, and I said, “What's up?” A policeman said, “You're speeding”. I saw another chap there, and he got out, put his cap on, and got his book. I thought, “Oh my God!” I said, “What was I doing?” They said, “120 K.” I said, “You're joking!” He said, “No, you were doing 120 K. Come with me”. Of course, he also got

very close to me, for other reasons. He asked me to put my head inside the car and look at the dashboard, and, sure enough, it showed 120 K.

I repeat that the police officers did their job. They were most diligent and friendly people. I said, "Well, okay, but I can't believe it". I said, "Come with me", so I went back to by car and I said to my wife, "We are accused of doing 120 Ks". She said, "Impossible. I saw the speedometer—108". The members, who know my wife, would know that she is not the sort of person who likes to become drawn into any argument; but as I had pointed out to her that I had not put my foot on the accelerator, it was a fair thing.

We stood at the back of the car and had a look at the tyres on it. As I say, the car is a fairly sophisticated piece of machinery; but it worried me like steam all the way home because it means, if the car was out by 12 kilometres an hour at that speed, that I have been either awfully lucky down here in the metropolitan area and in other places, or many cars have gone a terrible lot faster than me, because I do not seem to pass anybody.

That occurred on the Saturday; it was a very good day—Claremont had beaten South Fremantle.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I remember that very well.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: On the Monday, or it might have been the Tuesday, I came down to Perth and went to the Royal Automobile Club. I have been a member of the RAC for some years. I said, "How do you test speedos?" They said, "Well, we put the car on a dynamometer. We run it up and we test the speed". I said, "Well, do that one". They said, "Well, we suggest you go down to Fremantle. Fremantle has a very good machine down there. With a car like that, you shouldn't have any trouble with the speedometer". I said, "Yes, that's what I thought". They said, "Are the tyres standard?" I said, "Yes. There is nothing wrong with the tyres. They are the same tyres that have been on it since I bought it; and it has done 350 000 kilometres".

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Good tyres!

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Not the same set of tyres, but they have always been the same type.

I have been caught before, and I have admitted what I have done. The speed the police have claimed has been accurate according to what I have been doing. The only difference on this occasion was that the police car was on the move, coming towards me when I was going the other way. That worries me a little.

I went to the RAC at Fremantle; and I have a document indicating the speedometer readings. At

60 kilometres an hour on the dynamometer at Fremantle, the speedo showed 55; at 70, it showed 65; at 80, 76; at 90, 87; at 100, 98; and at 110, 108. If I was doing 108 kilometres an hour when I was apprehended it would mean I was doing something less than that, and certainly not 120.

I do not have a leg to stand on; there is no worry about that. I do not want to try to get out of this. I tried that once before, and it cost me \$2 500, and I walked for three months. I am not going to go through that again.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: How much did it cost you this time?

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It cost me \$20.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Pass the hat around!

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I have paid it; do not worry about that.

I have only my word and my wife as a witness to stand up to two police officers. I saw "120" on their clock; but the stupid thing about it is that it is me who is wrong. It could not be them.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: But you do not know until you go to court.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Don't give me that!

Hon. Fred McKenzie: There are people who have succeeded.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am pointing out to Mr McKenzie that their machine could not possibly be wrong! I have no argument against those boys for doing their job.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: But their machine could be wrong.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That's right! What the hell do you think I am trying to say?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: In fact, I believe you.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am not attacking anybody—the Government, or Mr McKenzie. I am trying to point out that other people have been caught in similar circumstances who possibly would not have gone to the extent I have gone to verify the matter.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You should follow it through for the benefit of those people.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I should imagine that those police officers would deny absolutely that their machine did anything other than record the situation factually; but I am beginning to wonder whether there is a problem in using the machine when one car is approaching another. It may be different if the police car is stationary and the gun is pointed. Perhaps on a long wet road—and it was wet at the time—the reading could be affected and be different. Perhaps the gun is not checked regularly enough. Perhaps the conditions

under which we expect the guns to work are not entirely satisfactory.

There is something very strange about this incident. I do not mind a fair cop, and I have black marks on my licence now to prove it. In this instance, it has cost me a \$20 fine; and it has not even cost me any black mark. I would not have said anything about it if I did not believe a mistake had been made.

If it needs a stack of *Bibles* to be sworn on, I know my wife would come in here and swear that before I pulled up the car, I indicated the speedo and it showed 108 kilometres an hour.

That is all I want to say about this matter. I imagine that the next step is up to whoever reads this speech and who is able to double check this matter does double check it. I believe a case occurred in Victoria in which this type of offence was challenged, and the person charged was able to get off. I understand that in Narrogin there has been a case of a speed gun's accuracy being challenged. A cruissomatic control in a car was part of the story, and the person charged was able to get off. If we as a Parliament allow those instruments to be used and demand that they be right, they must be right, otherwise people will go away with doubt in their minds as, indeed, I have on this occasion.

The speedometer check certified by the automobile club is not considered by the police in court to be an acceptable document—I think that is the term. The only acceptable document is, I believe, one obtained from Tough Instrument Service Co., which would have to take the instrument out of the dash of the car, check it, certify its accuracy, and put it back. The cost is enormous to have the whole face of the instrument panel taken off. The reason I would want such a check is to verify in my mind that there is not something wrong with the police instrument. That is as far as I want to take the matter. No names have been mentioned. A check can be made of the fine sheet—the bluey, as we call it. It would still be available, and it could be worked out which vehicle was used, and a check could be done on its speedometer. If that speedometer proves to be accurate, as the officers believe it to be, other conditions surely must have been wrong because two people observed the cruissomatic control and it was checked afterwards as being accurate. It all rings as a rather strange story indeed.

I intended to talk at great length about the utterances of Mr Hawke on wages and salaries as reported in this morning's Press. I will not say any more than that I hope the unions will take heed of what the Prime Minister said. The Leader of the

House, who has responsibility for industrial relations, would hope that also. Somewhere along the line we must accept that confrontation will do no good. If some people must accept the wages and salaries pause, everybody must accept it. If workers strike to better their remuneration, it is obvious they are trying only to get around the wages pause. I support what the Prime Minister said, and sincerely hope that, in the north and on our waterfront, any situations of unrest will be settled, at least for the time being, in the spirit that Mr Hawke has asked that the pause be observed. I hope that workers involved in such unrest go back to work, go back to their machinery and perform their duties without tardiness. They must accept like everybody else in the community that the existing conditions must prevail. I will say no more about that subject except to reiterate that I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister, as reported in this morning's Press.

I have a grizzle. Mr President, you will be frightfully annoyed with me when I make this point. Standing Orders refer to unparliamentary language, which we must not use at any time. However, while driving to Perth last Sunday and the Sunday before, I found that at 4.30 in the afternoon the only radio station I could pick up, as a result of the reception through the forest, was 6WN. I like to listen to that station because it plays the music I like, and I am sure other people like to listen to it. But on two consecutive weeks I heard a play on that station which contained expressions such as "shit", "bugger", "bloody", "crap", and "pissed off". The first occasion was bad enough. My wife nearly flew out of the car. She said, "What has gone wrong with this station? It is one the taxpayers subsidise". I did not bother to look up which play was read, but a woman character was talking to her daughter who had used the word "bitch". The woman said, "You know you should not say anything like that", and when the daughter went out of the room she used words such as "bloody", "bugger", and "pissed off". Surely to God people do not have to listen to such words. The radio could have been turned off, but that is not the point. The play was supposed to be teaching little girls that they should not use such five-letter words. The little girl was told that the word "bitch" can be a lovable thing when it is related to a female dog. Surely there is a limit to what should be broadcast over the radio. Are we at the stage that we need to use such words to make headlines or to sell books or plays? We do not need to come out with all that earthy trash.

I was raised in the country. I spent many hours around sheep sheds, and, if a woman or child ventured near the shed, even the roughest of men would not say a word out of place. Yet in that play in consecutive weeks I heard all that language used that I was taught in my years of hawking around the bush. To me this situation is not good enough. Surely some board or inspection group controls these things. Surely we as members of Parliament should express our dissatisfaction at these types of words being allowed, especially at a prime listening time of 4.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. Surely such a programme could be re-

placed. It is an indictment of the people who plan those radio programmes—an absolute indictment. I will protest to somebody, but as yet I do not know to whom. Surely somebody has control over these programmes.

The other matters I wish to raise will keep for another day. I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. P. H. Lockyer.

House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TOURISM

Jarrah Park

282. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Has the Minister received a submission from the Bridgetown-Greenbushes Tourist Bureau for the creation of Western Australia's first jarrah park?
- (2) If so, what is the Government's response to the suggestion for such a demonstration park?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) A submission has been received not as Minister for Tourism but as Minister for Forests.
- (2) The submission is under review.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Station: Kwinana

286. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is the SEC proposing to use North-West Shelf gas in the Kwinana power house?
- (2) If so, is this gas replacing Collie coal?
- (3) If it does replace Collie coal, how much will this reduce the SEC purchase of Collie coal?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (3) Some North-West Shelf gas will be used in the Kwinana power station, but Collie coal will continue to be a major source of fuel for the commission's power station.

The quantity of Collie coal purchased by the commission will ensure the retention of the present manning levels in the industry.

ROTTNEST ISLAND

Kingston Barracks: Consultation

302. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, To the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

Will there be consultation between the Western Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government so that relocation of Kingston Barracks to the proposed alternative site will not reduce the training capacity of Australian de-

fence units stationed in Western Australia?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

See reply to question 237.

The Western Australian Government is fully conscious of the need to maintain and enhance defence capability in Western Australia.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT: STAFF

Replacement Policy

303. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the department administered by the Minister subject to the Government-stated policy of replacing only 50 per cent of staff who have resigned or retired?
- (2) How many employees, formerly with the Minister's department, have resigned and retired since 1 June 1983?
- (3) How many new employees has the Minister's department engaged since 1 June 1983?
- (4) How many new employees have been engaged in the Minister's office since 1 March 1983?
- (5) In what departmental areas were staff savings mainly achieved, if any?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (5) A question similar to this was asked by the member on 17 August 1983, seeking information in respect of all State Government departments for the period 1 March to 30 July 1983.

In accordance with the undertaking given by the Leader of the House representing the Premier, the information requested in the earlier question is being prepared as far as possible, and will be provided directly to the member by letter; but as already advised in the previous reply, the Government is not prepared to divert staff to gather all the detail required.

WATER RESOURCES

Denmark

304. Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What was the maximum salt reading recorded in the Denmark water supply in the last 12 months?
- (2) What is the normal summer reading?
- (3) What is considered the maximum desirable by world health authorities?
- (4) What is the usual reading of tank water caught off a homestead roof in a south coast townsite?
- (5) Has the Government any provision for improving the quality of water in the Denmark town in the near future?
- (6) If so, what are these provisions?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) 1 680 milligrams per litre of total salts. This occurred early last month and was due to an unusually large percentage of the flow in the Denmark River coming from the cleared inland parts of the catchment which discharge high salinity water. As was anticipated, the salinity has improved with greater run-off from the forested areas closer to Denmark and at present the inflow salinity into the Denmark dam is approximately 620 milligrams per litre of total salts.
- (2) Over the last five years the summer salinity has ranged from 600 to 820 milligrams per litre of total salts.
- (3) The desirable current criterion for drinking water in Australia, as recommended by the National Health and Medical Research Council, is a maximum of 1500 milligrams per litre of total salts.
- (4) The Public Works Department does not keep records of the salinity of tank water from roof run-off in south coast townsites. A test from a rainwater tank in the Ocean Beach area of Denmark on 1 September 1983 gave a salinity of 120 milligrams per litre of total salts.
- (5) and (6) The salinity of the water being supplied from the Denmark water supply will quickly improve as a result of the reduced salinity of the flow into the Denmark dam. The water being supplied on 8 September 1983 had a salinity of less than 1 000 milligrams per litre.

MINES DEPARTMENT AND STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Staff: Replacement Policy

305. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Mines, and Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Are the departments administered by the Minister subject to the Government stated policy of replacing only 50 per cent of staff who have resigned or retired?
- (2) How many employees, formerly with the Minister's departments, have resigned and retired since 1 June 1983?
- (3) How many new employees have the Minister's departments engaged since 1 June 1983?
- (4) How many new employees have been engaged in the Minister's office since 1 March 1983?
- (5) In what departmental areas were staff savings mainly achieved, if any?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (5) A question similar to this was asked by the member on 17 August 1983, seeking information in respect of all State Government departments for the period 1 March to 30 July 1983.

In accordance with the undertaking given by the Leader of the House representing the Premier, the information requested in the earlier question is being prepared, as far as possible and will be provided directly to the member by letter, but as already advised in the previous reply the Government is not prepared to divert staff to gather all the detail required.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION: PAYMENTS

Loss of Hand

306. Hon. I. G. PRATT, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) In Western Australia what is the maximum benefit payable under workers' compensation for the loss of a hand?
- (2) In Queensland what is the maximum benefit payable under workers' compensation for the loss of a hand?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) \$54 189.60
- (2) \$23 570.00.

In view of the fact that the member has previously asked similar questions, I seek leave of the House to table appropriate documents which reflect comparable benefits paid under workers' compensation in Western Australia and Queensland.

The documents were tabled (see paper No. 255).

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Shannon River: Timber and Wood Chipping Industries

307. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests:

Further to my question 230 of Tuesday, 23 August 1983, have trials commenced to ascertain whether there will be a detrimental effect on water supply and fauna if cutting on stream reserves is allowed in the wood chip area?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:
No.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS AND PRIMARY SCHOOLS

North Metropolitan Province

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

- (1) What number of full-time and part-time personnel are employed at each State primary and high school in the North Metropolitan Province, in the following occupations—

- (a) teaching;
- (b) gardening;
- (c) cleaning;
- (d) library work; and
- (e) other?

- (2) What is the anticipated variation of these figures for the 1984 school year?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

In questions 294, 308 and 330 the member has sought the following information with respect to each of the 46 State primary or high schools in the North Metropolitan Province—

- (1) The number of transportable or temporary classrooms in 1982, 1983 and anticipated in 1984;
- (2) the number of full-time and part-time personnel employed as

teachers, gardeners, cleaners, library aides and other categories currently and anticipated in 1984;

- (3) the student enrolment for each school in 1982, 1983 and anticipated for 1984.

Most of this information is not available on computer tape that can be machine processed. Providing the member with the information he seeks will involve a very considerable number of man-hours on the part of officers of my department. It is estimated that it might cost the taxpayers \$500 to obtain the necessary detail.

Might I request the member consider the purposes for which he is seeking so comprehensive a compendium of information so that I might satisfy his purposes without involving my department in the very lengthy and expensive exercise of extracting by hand the information he is currently seeking.

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

Jarrah Park

309. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

- (1) Does the Government intend to create a jarrah national park?
- (2) If so, where?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government has asked that a review of the northern jarrah forest be undertaken in regard to the location and extent of any such park. A decision will be made when the review has been completed.

BRIDGE: BURSWOOD ISLAND

Cost

310. Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport:

In relation to the document titled "*Burswood Island Bridge Review Committee: The Bridge and Its Environs: Its Costs and Viability*, in 1983 costs—

- (1) What is the cost of the major roadworks required to get traffic to flow in a northern direction onto the Mitchell Freeway from the

bridge at the Charles Street interchange?

- (2) What is the cost of new roadworks between Great Eastern Highway and Charles Street?
- (3) What is the future of Weld Square?
- (4) (a) Does the Lord Street crossing require resolving; and
(b) if so, what is the cost?
- (5) (a) Are new bridges required over the railway; and
(b) if so, at what cost?
- (6) (a) Will Haig Park be eliminated in part; and
(b) if so, will the Minister provide details?
- (7) What is the construction cost of the Burswood Island Bridge?
- (8) What is the cost of providing a new railway bridge over the road in the vicinity of Rivervale?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) (2), (5), (7) and (8) The estimate quoted of \$36 million is in June 1982 prices and is an initial estimate based on preliminary design which could vary upwards or downwards to some extent when the detailed design is completed. This figure includes all work necessary for the Burswood Bridge and roadwork connections to it from the Mitchell Freeway and from Great Eastern Highway. The estimate also includes grade separation with the railway in East Perth and in the vicinity of Rivervale.
- (3) Weld Square is not affected by the Burswood project as the initial stages envisage a one way pair system in this vicinity.
- (4) (a) and (b) The Lord Street crossing is not affected by the proposal.
- (6) (a) Yes;
(b) final details have yet to be resolved with the Perth City Council following general agreement some years ago.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS: DEPARTMENT

Staff: Increase

311. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is it true that the Consumer Affairs Department has had hundreds of complaints from farmers over the purchase of farm products?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), how then does it become impossible to make any valid estimate of extra staff required by the Consumer Affairs Department as stated by the Minister in his answer to my question 232 on Tuesday, 23 August 1983?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) That is true. However, because the complaints have not been legally admissible no statistics of the attempted complaints have been recorded.
- (2) Answered by (1).

BRIDGE: BURSOOD ISLAND

Traffic Flow

312. Hon. FRED MCKENZIE, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport:

In relation to the document titled "*Burswood Island Bridge Review Committee*": *The Bridge and its Environs: Its Costs and Viability*, could the Minister advise—

- (1) What are the arrangements for the free flow of northbound traffic onto the Mitchell Freeway?
- (2) Is the bridge over the railway lines permanent?
- (3) What is the position in relation to Swan River Drive—
(a) will it be a freeway;
(b) if so, will it really take 30 years for a freeway to go in once Burswood Island bridge is built?
- (4) (a) How does traffic disperse at the Great Eastern Highway junction;
(b) how much is planned for Orrong Road; and
(c) what effect will it have on Orrong Road?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The project includes the construction of a bridge in the Hamilton Interchange that will allow northbound access to the Mitchell Freeway from Aberdeen Street.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) (a) The area of land reserved in the metropolitan region scheme for Swan River Drive is for a controlled access highway which will not necessarily be a freeway.
(b) as the metropolitan region grows it is believed Swan River Drive may eventually be needed, but there is no way of forecasting accurately when it should be built.
- (4) (a) The Burswood project is planned to tie in directly to Great Eastern Highway at a junction controlled by traffic signals;
(b) No direct connection is proposed to Orrong Road as part of this project;
(c) because a proportion of Great Eastern Highway traffic will divert to the Burswood bridge route, access to Orrong Road should be easier. No significant increase in traffic on Orrong Road is anticipated.

MINING

Bauxite

313. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

Does the Government plan to stop bauxite mining?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

No.

APPRENTICES

Midland Workshops

314. Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In each of the years 1977 to 1983 inclusive, how many apprentices commenced their apprenticeship at Midland Workshops?
- (2) How many apprentices is it anticipated will commence in 1984?
- (3) If there has been a decline over the years, what is the reason?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) 1977—113
1978—124
1979—180
1980—181
1981—144
1982—105
1983—91.
- (2) On a manpower planning basis, Westrail will have sufficient tradesmen to meet its needs until the late 1980s. Consequently, the railways do not have a need to recruit apprentices.
However, in recognition of Westrail's traditional role in training tradesmen for the State, the excellent facilities available in the Midland workshops and the need to provide job opportunities for young people the railways will be taking on 78 apprentices in 1984.
- (3) Because of manpower forecasts contained in the 1977 metal industry survey report and a report by the Department of Labour and Industry, Westrail took on additional apprentices in the years 1979 through to 1981. The additional number dropped slightly in 1981 due to problems in coping with the total apprentices in training.

Revised forecasts resulted in the numbers recruited in 1982 returning to within the more normal range of from 100 to 130 apprentices.

A combination of an excess of tradesmen on the market, forecasts of future tradesmen availability, the general economic downturn and the change in transport requirements resulted in a lower recruitment in 1983 and the even lower figure planned for 1984.

The Government is most concerned with the apprentice training situation and is presently looking at possible initiatives to bring about improvements insofar as Government departments and agencies are concerned.

HOUSING: FLATS

Vacancies

315. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Housing:
How many family-type State Housing Commission flats are currently vacant in—

- (a) each metropolitan region; and
- (b) country areas?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

(a) North metropolitan	37
South-east metropolitan	25
Fremantle	42
	<hr/>
	104
(b) Country	6

Of these 110 units, 83 are currently under maintenance pending allocation, and 27 are on offer to applicants.

EDUCATION: UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Regiment

316. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) Is it a fact that the University of WA Regiment has been refused permission to use the Tone River Camp near Manjimup?
- (2) If so, why?
- (3) Can the Minister tell this House—
 - (a) how many men of the UWA regiment attended the camp last year;
 - (b) how long were they there; and
 - (c) what was their estimated input into the local economy of Manjimup?
- (4) (a) Did the Minister contact any local organisations before refusing permission; and
 - (b) if so, which organisations did he consult?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) The University of WA Regiment was permitted the free use of Tone River Camp in January 1982 and January 1983. The approval for use was yearly and subject to review after each camp. Following the 1983 camp, the approval for free use was withdrawn.
- (2) Accelerated wear and tear of existing buildings and facilities by the regiment was the main reason for withdrawal of the offer of free use.
- (3) (a) It is understood that 360 were there from 3 January to 16 January, and 250 from 17 January to 31 January;

- (b) 3 January to 31 January;
- (c) unknown.

- (4) (a) The only communication was with the 5th Military District Command;
- (b) not applicable.

STATE FORESTS: HARDWOOD

Degraded

317. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests:

Further to my question 103 of Wednesday, 3 August 1983, will the Minister outline the areas of—

- (a) jarrah;
- (b) karri; and
- (c) wandoo;

which are degraded forest, and the priorities for re-establishing each species?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (a) to (c) Examination is still proceeding and maps have not yet been prepared.

FIRES

Shannon River National Park

318. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

Further to my question 181 on Thursday, 18 August 1983—

- (1) When is it expected the working plan will be completed?
- (2) Are the general public being asked for input?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The strategic working plan has been completed.
- (2) The strategic working plan is to be made available to the South Coast Advisory Committee, also members of the working group are available to brief other groups and individuals regarding the plan and management proposals.

Information gained from these discussions will be considered in the preparation of the working plan.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Membership

319. Hon. MARK NEVILL, to the Attorney General:

- (1) On what date were the original members of the Legislative Review and Advisory Committee appointed?
- (2) Who are the current members of that committee, and when were they appointed?
- (3) In each of the years since the committee was established, how many reports recommending disallowance of regulations have been tabled in Parliament?
- (4) Which of those reports have been acted upon?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) 7 September 1977.
- (2) Mr J. Fiocco (Chairman)..... 31/6/83
Mr P. Moyes..... 8/6/82
Prof. E. J. Edwards 1/12/81
- (3) The following reports have been submitted. They do not all recommend disallowance of regulations.
1978—7
1979—3
1980—1
1981—6
1982—2
1983—3
- (4) None of the reports resulted in disallowance of regulations.

APPRENTICES

Metropolitan Water Authority

320. Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) In each of the years 1977 to 1983 inclusive, how many apprentices commenced their apprenticeship with the Metropolitan Water Authority?
- (2) How many apprentices is it anticipated will commence in 1984?
- (3) If there has been a decline over the years, what is the reason?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The number of apprentices who commenced training with the Metropolitan Water Authority are:
January 1978..... 49
January 1979..... 52

January 1980.....	43
January 1981.....	39
January 1982.....	39
January 1983.....	39

(2) 35.

- (3) The number of apprentices that can be effectively trained is dependent on the works programme and the number of tradesmen employed.
The apprentice intake since 1980 reflects the decrease in the available trade work.

APPRENTICES

State Energy Commission

321. Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) In each of the years 1977 to 1983 inclusive, how many apprentices have commenced their apprenticeship with the State Energy Commission?
- (2) How many apprentices is it anticipated will commence in 1984?
- (3) If there has been a decline over the years, what is the reason?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Annual intakes and numbers in training in the years 1977-1983 inclusive are as follows:—

	Intake	Total in Training
1977	51	166
1978	47	177
1979	54	198
1980	68	198
1981	64	227
1982	73*	233
1983	64	245

* includes 6 transferred from AIS.

- (2) It is anticipated that not less than 68 apprentices will be appointed in 1984.
- (3) Annual intake levels have been set to ensure the maximum number of apprentices consistent with the commission's capacity to provide the required standard of training.

STATE FORESTS: PINE

Planting: Programme

322. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests:

Further to my question 178 on Wednesday, 17 August 1983—

- (1) Which shires were involved?
- (2) What expertise does Dr Manca have in forestry matters?
- (3) Does the first part of the answer to (3), mean that the Government does not trust the Forests Department to advise it?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Manjimup
Bridgetown-Greenbushes
Donnybrook-Balingup
Nannup
Boyup Brook
- (2) Dr Manca was appointed to the inquiry because of the importance of forestry in the Bunbury region. Dr Manca is also Director of the South-West Development Authority and will act as a co-ordinator of the work of the inquiry. The Forests Department is represented on the committee and will provide technical advice on forestry as required.

- (3) No.

The member should support the Government's policy to ensure community participation in land use questions. This is the rationale for the appointment of a person with Dr Manca's abilities and standing in the community to chair the committee which has representatives from the shires and the Forests Department.

STATE FORESTS: SHANNON RIVER
BASIN*Coups*

323. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests:

When is it intended that the coups named in question 265 of Wednesday, 24 August 1983, will be cut?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Cutting will be completed by Autumn 1984.

STATE FOREST

Seed Trees

324. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests:

What is the area of the 14 coupes given in answer to my question 263 of Wednesday, 24 August 1983?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

932 hectares.

HEALTH: TOBACCO

Smoking: Campaign

325. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What are the names of the personnel employed to assist with the Government's antismoking campaign?
- (2) What is the classification, title and salary level of each person assisting with the campaign?
- (3) What is the total cost of media programmes to which the Government is already committed for the campaign?
- (4) What portion of the media costs will go to—
 - (a) regional newspapers;
 - (b) national newspapers;
 - (c) television;
 - (d) radio; and
 - (e) others?
- (5) What are the names of the different media organisations used, to date, in the antismoking campaign?
- (6) To date, what is the total amount of the funds committed to the campaign?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Ms Deborah Fisher;
Mr Bob Cribb.
- (2) Ms Deborah Fisher (contract 12 months);
Co-ordinator of Smoking and Health Project;
Classification: C-II-9;
Salary: \$26 755.
Mr Bob Cribb (contract six months);
Press Liaison Smoking and Health Project;
Classification: A Grade Journalist;
Salary: \$23 490.

Members of the Health Education Unit staff devote varying amounts of time to the smoking and health project.

At present this involves four health education officers working full-time on the project and 10 others who devote part of their time at regional offices.

Classification and salary vary depending on which officers are working on the project at a given time.

(3) \$150 000.

	per cent
(4) (a) regional newspapers.....	10
(b) national newspapers.....	nil
(c) TV.....	40
(d) radio.....	30
(e) city newspapers.....	20

- (5) Odgers Advertising;
Ross Goodlett and Associates;
Taimac Video;
Soundwest Recorders;
Magus Photography;
Three freelance copy writers;
A freelance designer;
A freelance media planner.
- (6) \$350 000 which includes \$80 000 to be expended on a schools campaign in the third term of 1983.

LAND: NATIONAL PARK

South Coast National Parks Authority

326. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

Will one of the conservationists who proposed the D'Entrecasteaux National Park in 1974 be the conservation movement's representative on the south coast national parks authority?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The Conservation Council of Western Australia Inc. has been invited to nominate one representative to be a member of the South Coast National Park Advisory Committee.

It will be for that council to determine its nominee.

HOUSING

Defence Services

327. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Minister for Mines representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many State Government houses and units are available for use by defence services' personnel?
- (2) How many of these units are empty at present?
- (3) How many of these units have remained empty for—
 - (a) three months;
 - (b) 12 months;
 - (c) more than 12 months?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) 678 units of housing.
- (2) and (3) Vacant units under this scheme are controlled by the Department of Defence. The State Housing Commission has for some time been concerned about the numbers of vacant units and the length of time some of the units have been vacant and I wrote to the Federal Minister earlier this year requesting the return of non-required units to be expedited. Consequently, over the past six months some 12 units have been returned to the commission.

In a communication dated 8 July 1983, the Department of Defence indicated 49 units vacant in excess of four months. Of these, 12 units are under consideration for return to the commission's normal rental pool. From the information available there are 19 units which have been vacant for 12 months or more.

It should also be noted that there are some 20 units vacant at Bullsbrook, an area where there is no demand for housing commission accommodation. The commission has for some considerable time encouraged the Department of Defence to transfer its personnel to Bullsbrook when vacancies occur to allow a greater number of units to be returned to the commission in the estates where there is a high demand for housing.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: MANJIMUP SHIRE COUNCIL

Land Management Committees

328. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Forests:

Has the Premier and his Cabinet been advised of the Manjimup Council's disappointment with the extremely limited terms of reference of the various committees associated with land management, softwood policies, Shannon basin park and the economies of planting pines on private property?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Yes.

The terms of reference of the land review task force were devised so that the review team would not be prevented from addressing any aspect of land resource management. The other inquiries referred to by the member are concerned with specific land management problems. There are no constraints on the committees which would prevent them investigating the specific problem they are concerned with.

NOXIOUS WEED

Paterson's Curse

329. Hon W. G. ATKINSON, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Will the Government consider, in the light of the recent court decision in South Australia, declaring the weed Paterson's curse a noxious weed, and encourage other States to make similar declaration to enable further research into the biological control of Paterson's curse and possible release of such methods of control by the CSIRO?

(2) Will the Government consider complementary legislation with other States and the Commonwealth Government as a result of the injunction granted as a result of the court decision in South Australia?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) Paterson's curse has been a declared primary noxious weed for many years in Western Australia and Western Australia has always fully supported the release of the biological control agents.

(2) The Australian Agricultural Council at its meeting on 1 August, agreed to the preparation of complementary legislation to provide a framework for research into biological control and the release of control agents where these became available. When this legislation becomes available I will be recommending its adoption to Cabinet.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS AND PRIMARY SCHOOLS

North Metropolitan Province: Enrolments

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

- (1) What is the present student enrolment for each State primary and high school in the North Metropolitan Province?
- (2) At this date, in 1982, what was the enrolment at each of these schools?
- (3) What is the estimated enrolment for each of these schools for 1984?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

In questions 294, 308 and 330 the member has sought the following information with respect to each of the 46 State primary or high schools in the North Metropolitan Province—

- (1) The number of transportable or temporary classrooms in 1982, 1983 and anticipated in 1984;
- (2) the number of full-time and part-time personnel employed as teachers, gardeners, cleaners, library aides and other categories currently and anticipated in 1984;
- (3) the student enrolment for each school in 1982, 1983 and anticipated for 1984.

Most of this information is not available on computer tape that can be machine processed. Providing the member with the information he seeks will involve a very considerable number of man-hours on the part of officers of my department. It is estimated that it might cost the taxpayers \$500 to obtain the necessary detail.

Might I request the member consider the purposes for which he is seeking so comprehensive a compendium of information so that I might satisfy his purposes without involving my department in the very lengthy and expensive exer-

cise of extracting by hand the information he is currently seeking.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: ARBITRATION

System: Government Support

93. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Does the Government support our industrial arbitration system and the role within that system which necessarily must be pursued by the Industrial Commission?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The short answer is "Yes".

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTE

Pilbara: Criticism

94. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

If, in fact, he fully supports the commission and its commissioners in their work, does he support the remarks of Mr Willis, the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, in his strong criticism of the Pilbara strikers for the action they have taken?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

It is not for me to say whether I support Mr Willis. I discussed his statement with him before he made it. The member will recall that I made a similar statement shortly prior to Mr Willis' making his statement. I said that we did not support an extension of a 38-hour week.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTE

Pilbara: Criticism

95. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

If the Minister will forgive me for pursuing this question—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Don't ask for forgiveness, just ask the question.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: —I must ask this: He said he had made a statement condemning a reduction in the 38-hour week, and the Federal Minister con-

demned the strike action for the damage it was doing, so will this Minister now publicly state that he is concerned by and condemns the action of these militant union groups, action which threatens an important industry in this State? I am asking him to say publicly that he condemns this action.

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I have no intention to use this Chamber to inflame a situation which is near resolution.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTE

Pilbara: Direction by Industrial Commission

96. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

It is interesting that when it suits him the Minister makes statements, but when it does not he ducks his head.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question before the House is, "Are there any further questions without notice?" I call the Hon. G. E. Masters.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I direct a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Why has not his Government publicly supported the Industrial Commission? Will he now publicly call upon the strikers and their leaders to obey the directions of the industrial commissioners? He said he supports the commission and its commissioners.

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I do not understand the question. If the member is saying that he wants me to publicly call in this Chamber upon the strikers to obey the commission, I am not sure what he means. I hope he is aware that the only matter before the commission at present is the question of deregistration, and we are waiting for an outcome on that matter. He simply does not understand the system—that is the problem.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTE

Pilbara: Direction by Industrial Commission

97. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Mr Coleman recently stated that Mr Dans did not understand the problem.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Oh, come on. That's another statement.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Can I direct a question—

Hon. Tom Stephens: We are wondering whether you can ask a question.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I ask the Minister this question: In view of the fact that he supports the commission and the decisions of its commissioners and their rights to make such decisions, will he inform this House and therefore the public whether he agrees with the commissioners and whether he will support any direction those commissioners may make for the strikers to go back to work?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I have spent a long time in industrial relations. Mr President, you have allowed the Opposition spokesman on these matters the luxury to make a speech during question time, but I will not speculate on the outcome of the action.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Leader of the House not to reflect on the Chair. I think that on reflection he will come to the decision that the Chair was indeed doing all in its power to insist that the member asking the questions in fact did that.

NATURAL DISASTER: FLOOD

Narrogin: Mitigation Work

98. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Water Resources:

Has any decision been made by or has there been any feedback at all from the Federal authorities in respect of the proposed Narrogin flood mitigation work? I gave notice of this question by phoning it through at 9.00 o'clock this morning.

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question, but I have been unable to get the information for him. I ask him to place the question on notice.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Reports

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

(1) In respect of the answer to part (4) of question 319, as to which reports of the Legislative Review and Advisory Committee had been acted upon, to which the Minister advised that none of the reports had resulted in the disallowance of regulations, is he aware that a number of the reports have been acted upon or dealt with by methods other than disallowance?

(2) Will he make this further information available to the House?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) and (2) I am happy to have a further analysis made, and present it when available.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Northampton District: Upgrading

100. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education

(1) When was it decided to upgrade the Northampton District High School?

(2) What amount of money was allocated for this purpose?

(3) When were tenders for the upgrade first called?

(4) What amount of repairs and renovations money has been spent on Northampton District High School in recent years?

(5) What amount of money had been allocated by the former Government for the upgrading or the provision of a new school?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I thank the member for some notice of the question. The Minister for Education has provided the following reply—

(1) 1981

(2) \$20 000 was approved in the 1982-83 capital works Budget for planning and calling tenders with the balance to be considered as works-in-progress in the 1983-84 Budget.

(3) 18 June 1983.

- (4) Other than for emergency work, spending on repairs and renovations at the Northampton District High School has been scheduled to be carried out concurrent with the upgrading now under consideration.

(5) \$20 000 in the 1982-83 Budget.

MINING: COAL

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd: Writ

101. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Was he informed that the SEC would issue a writ against Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd.; and, if so, when?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Yes, before it was issued.

MINING: COAL

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd: Writ

102. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Did he have discussions with either Griffin Coal Mining or the union before the writ was issued?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I assume the member refers to the Collie Coal Miners' Union, or was he referring to some other union?

Hon. A. A. Lewis: That's the only union, isn't it!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I am at a bit of a loss to know what the member is asking for.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You should have a grasp of your portfolio.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I have a grasp of my portfolio but I do not have a grasp of the question the member is trying to frame. I am trying to help him through his difficulties in expressing himself. I have had discussions with the Collie Coal Miners' Union and Griffin Coal over a number of months about a number of subjects, and in that context we have discussed some of the matters the subject of the writ.

MINING: COAL

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd: Writ

103. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

He has stated he has had discussions with the Collie Coal Miners' Union, but did he put his conclusions from those discussions in writing to the union as he promised he would?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I do not know to which discussions the member is referring. I have written to the union about a number of matters, and I have had a number of discussions with the union. In that context, correspondence has passed between us.

[Resolved: That questions be continued.]

FUEL AND ENERGY

Fuel Tax

104. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

(1) Has the Minister initiated a study into the impact on the SEC's operating costs of the recently increased Federal fuel levy?

(2) What will be the impact, and how will the increased cost be accommodated by the SEC?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

(1) and (2) Yes. When the study is fully completed I will be in a position to answer the question.

The member will know the decision in relation to the levy was changed and whereas it was thought the State would be paying something in the order of \$6.8 million extra, as a result of the Federal Government's subsequent decision that figure is likely to be very much reduced, probably something less than \$1 million.

MINING: COAL

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd: Writ

105. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

I refer to the writ issued by the SEC against the Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd., and ask—

(1) Is it a fact that the writ was issued on a Monday but that no details

were given of the writ until the following day?

- (2) Is this the usual practice of the SEC?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) I did not issue the writ. I was not charged with responsibility for the issue of the writ and I am not in a position to provide the information the member seeks.

MINING: COAL

Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd: Writ

106. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) The Minister does not seem to have any grasp of his portfolio. Is the Minister or the SEC trying to break the contract and lower the tonnage supplied by the Griffin Coal Mining Co. Ltd.?

- (2) If so is this the reason that Western Collieries Ltd.'s contract has not yet been signed?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) I may not have a grasp of my portfolio but the member clearly does not have a grasp of Standing Orders. That matter is *sub judice* and I decline to answer the question.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is wrong, of course.

MINING: ACT

Inquiry: Membership

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

Can the Minister advise the names of those persons appointed to the Hunt inquiry into the Mining Act?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Yes. I will provide the full and correct names to the member. The matter has been the subject of some publicity. I do not carry in my head a couple of the names but I will provide the member with the information tomorrow.

FUEL AND ENERGY

Coal: Reduction

108. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Is it a fact that the SEC is trying to take a reduced amount of coal out of the Colliie coalfields?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The SEC would be delighted to have cheaper coal, which would benefit the people of Western Australia. If the member is referring to the action currently before the court, I have already made it clear that I am not going to jeopardise the interests of either party, and I will not comment on it. I decline to comment on any matter which affects that action. The member ought to know that in the interests of both litigants we ought not to comment on the matter in this House.

FUEL AND ENERGY

Coal: Reduction

109. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

As I understand it, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, he said earlier he did not know what was in the litigation. Is this a move by the Government to reduce the amount of coal that comes out of the Colliie coalfields?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

No.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTE

Pilbara: Direction by Industrial Commission

110. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I previously called on the Minister to make a public comment and you, Mr President, rightly sat him down because he started to make a speech.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members seem to be losing completely appreciation of question without notice time. The honourable member knows, because I have told him on several occasions, that the privilege of asking questions is a long-standing privilege in our parliamentary system. It clearly behoves the member seeking the infor-

mation to simply seek the information, and the provider of the answer to provide an answer. It is not an opportunity for making speeches or giving points of view on what some other member has done.

Ample opportunities exist and there are ample provisions within our Standing Orders for the honourable member to make a speech on the subject about which he was just speaking. It is not to be done in preface to a question without notice.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I ask the Leader of the House whether on behalf of the Government he would be prepared to state publicly that he would be prepared to support a direction of the Industrial Commissioner, or Commissioners, or Commission to strikers in the Pilbara dispute.

President's Ruling

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am starting to lose my patience. The honourable member can correct me if I am wrong, but if that is not the same question he asked earlier this afternoon I completely misunderstand what he is saying. If it is, it is out of order.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I thought the Minister did not reply and I repeated the question because I thought he had not had the chance to reply.

The PRESIDENT: The ruling is that a member cannot ask the same question twice. I have not given any ruling about the answering of it.

Questions without Notice Resumed

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Station: Kwinana

111. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Further to my question 286 on notice today I ask if more North-West Shelf gas is to be used and Collie coal will continue to be the major source of fuel, does this mean all oil-fired generators at Kwinana will be stopped?

The PRESIDENT: The question appears to me to be hypothetical.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

It is intended to reduce the SEC's dependence on oil, not only because it is an expensive commodity, but also because we have a commitment to maintain a proper level of output from the Collie coalfields and because the member's mob, having got us into the contract for North-West Shelf gas—

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Is that a bad thing?

Hon. PETER DOWDING: If there is any pressure on Collie coal it is because of the Hon. Sandy Lewis and his Government which committed this State to a take-or-pay commitment that they must have known would result in great pressure on all the energy sources of this State. If anyone has caused the problem we are in it is the Hon. Sandy Lewis who did not speak up in the party room for his own electorate. That is the problem.

The SEC's intention is to use as much gas as is consistent with maintaining a proper level of output from the Collie coalfields. That will result in a considerable reduction in use by the SEC of oil in Kwinana.

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT:
LEWIS, THE HON. A. A.

Party Meeting

112. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Can the Minister tell me what I said at the party meeting today, as he is so knowledgeable?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

If it was as silly as the remarks the member makes here I do not think it would help anybody.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

BILLS

Marginal Notes

113. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General:

The Attorney may remember that I asked him about this subject and he later answered me by letter. I referred to marginal notes in Bills and amendments coming to this House. The tenor of the

reply was that that system had not been in use for 12 years and he did not think it was needed. As the department has available to it today word processors and more material to enable it better to hold that sort of information, why is it so difficult to provide the sort of information that the department was able to make available in the days when it had to be done manually?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The honourable member has the advantage over me in having my last answer readily available to him.

Hon. P. H. Wells: I have not brought it with me.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: Neither his question nor my answer was so memorable that I have all the details in mind. Nonetheless, I think I am safe in recalling that the indication that it was not intended to resort to the use of marginal notes was not simply based on the fact that they had not been used for some time, but based as well on the fact there was no evidence that the lack of those marginal notes was causing anyone any

real difficulty, and also based, if I recall, on difficulties associated with obtaining marginal notes that were both accurate and meaningful. I think in the circumstances set out in my earlier reply, it is unlikely that there is at this time any real justification for reverting to the earlier practice.

MINING: COAL

Collie: Future

114. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Has he had talks with the Collie Miners' Industrial Union with regard to the long-term future of Collie coal?
- (2) If so, has he confirmed this discussion in writing?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes, I have had discussions.
- (2) I do not recall if I have written a letter about it.

