

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 24 October 1984

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

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Postponement

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan Leader of the Government) [4.35 p.m.]: I move —

That questions without notice be taken at a later stage of the sitting.

The reason I have moved that motion is to allow the questioners to come into the House so that we are all in a better position to ask questions and to answer them.

Question put and passed.

CENSORSHIP OF FILMS AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Minister for Administrative Services), and read a first time.

MINES REGULATIONS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan Attorney General) [4.37 p.m.]: I move —

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has been prepared in response to requests from the mining industry and the mining division of the Australian Workers Union for full representation on the Ventilation Board, and conforms with the Government's policy of industry and union representation on boards and committees which deal with the health and safety of the work force.

The Ventilation Board was established under section 23C of the Mines Regulation Act 1946 to deal with all matters connected with the safety and protection of mineworkers in so far as those matters relate to ventilation or environmental atmospheric control and the health of those workers.

Under existing Statute, the five members of the board are Government officers drawn from the Mines Department and the Health Department. It is now proposed that the size of the board be increased to seven members. Of the two additional members, one will be nominated by the mining

division of the Australian Workers Union and the other by the Chamber of Mines of Western Australia (Inc.).

The amendments require that the nominated persons be experienced in ventilation technology so as to retain the technical composition of the board as prescribed in section 23C(1) of the Act.

As with the existing five member board, two remain statutory appointments under the Act, those being the State Mining Engineer and the Senior Inspector of Mines for the State. The remainder will continue to be appointed by the Minister following nomination by the organisations as designated. Provision has now been made for the Minister to request nominations from the respective organisation when a vacancy occurs for a representative from that organisation. Provision has been made also for the Minister to appoint a suitably qualified person, of his own choosing, in the event of any of the designated organisations failing to nominate a member.

The two new members will have full voting rights and all nominated members will now be permitted to resign upon written notice to the Minister to that effect. Consistent with the increased membership, a quorum will now require attendance of the chairman and three other members.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Margaret McAleer.

CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

HON. J. M. BERINSON (North Central Metropolitan Attorney General) [4.41 p.m.]: I move —

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to increase the Governor's salary and fix it at 70 per cent of the salary of the Chief Justice of Western Australia.

The Governor's salary is currently fixed at \$25 000 per annum by the Constitution Acts Amendment Act as amended in 1974. The last increase in salary from \$17 000 per annum to \$25 000 per annum under the 1974 amendment to schedule IV of the Act had effect from 1 May 1974.

Since 1 May, 1974, the Governor's remuneration has been varied as follows without any amendment to the Act —

On 1 January 1977 an expense allowance of \$10 000 per annum was introduced to meet the cost of entertainment and functions at Government House other than that associated

with visits of Royalty and the Governor General.

This provided total remuneration of \$35 000 per annum.

On 1 January 1979 the special expense allowance was increased from \$10 000 per annum to \$13 500 per annum, lifting the Governor's total remuneration to \$38 500 per annum.

On 1 January 1980 the special expense allowance was increased from \$13 500 per annum to \$16 500 per annum to give total remuneration of \$41 500 per annum.

On 1 January 1982 the special expense allowance was increased from \$16 500 per annum to \$21 500 per annum to give total remuneration of \$46 500 per annum.

The special expense allowance has been adjusted since 1 January 1977 generally in line with the extent of national wage case increases.

The system had developed of having the basic salary of \$25 000 per annum laid down by Act of Parliament in 1974 and any required adjustments since 1 May 1974 have been made by way of the special allowance. The adjustments to the allowance have recognised increases in salary which usually would have been implemented. Both the basic salary and the special allowance are tax free.

A suggested increase in the special allowance from \$21 500 per annum to \$25 000 per annum from 1 January 1983 was not implemented due to the climate of restraint established under the Salaries and Wages Freeze Act 1982, which was assented to on 23 December 1982. If that increase had been given effect, a total remuneration of \$50 000 per annum would have been payable from 1 January 1983.

A comprehensive review of the Governor's remuneration in this State was undertaken in the period from March to June of this year prior to the swearing-in ceremony of Professor Gordon Reid on 2 July 1984. The review included a special report by the then Chairman of the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal (Sir Kenneth Townsing) and an examination of the system of remunerating Governors in other States.

The Premier held discussions with the Governor designate about the proposed changes to the system of remuneration and agreement was reached with Professor Reid before he was sworn in as Governor.

A public announcement of the new basis of remuneration was made by way of news release on 27 June, 1984.

Salaries and allowances paid to the Governors of other States are as set out in the table I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard*.

Incorporation of Material

By leave of the House, the following material was incorporated—

	Salary		Allowance		Total
	\$		\$		\$
South Australia	39 400 (1/7/84)		64 500 (1/7/84)		103 900
New South Wales	40 000 (1/10/75)		78 371 (1/10/83)		118 371
Victoria	44 500 (1/9/82)		93 000 (1/9/82)		137 500
Tasmania	54 986 (1/7/83)		27 175 (1/7/83)		82 161
Queensland	70 000 (1/1/84)				70 000
	\$		\$		\$
Western Australia	60 993 (2/7/84)		30 000 (2/7/84)		90 993
(under proposal in the Bill)					

Debate Resumed

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: The operative date of the last adjustment is shown in brackets.

No allowance is payable in Queensland as all of the costs associated with Government House, including entertainment expenses incurred by the Governor, are met by the Government from a special Budget allocation.

It is difficult to compare the allowances paid to Governors in other States because of different arrangements for recouping certain outlays on domestic staff, entertainment, and travel expenses, and the different numbers of staff employed.

The Government's decision to fix, by an amendment to the Statute, the salary of the Governor at 70 per cent of the salary of the Chief Justice has the following advantages—

- (a) It provides a sound basis for future adjustments which will have the authority of Parliament. The Chief Justice's salary is fixed on the basis of a report by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal under section 8 of the Salaries and Allowances Act 1975.
- (b) Linking the salary of the Governor with that of the Chief Justice will keep the Governor's salary in touch with community standards and provide for regular adjustments enjoyed by others such as members of Parliament and senior public servants.
- (c) Regular adjustments would be made to the Governor's salary thus avoiding some of the time lags which have characterised the fixation of the Governor's salary in the past.
- (d) It would not be necessary for the Parliament to deal with the regular adjustments to the Governor's salary.
- (e) The new system represents a move towards more consistency in fixing the

salaries of Governors in Australia. A similar approach was taken by the Tasmanian Government in 1982 when, by legislation, the salary of the Governor was fixed at 70 per cent of the salary of the Chief Justice of Tasmania.

It has been decided also to replace the special expense allowance with a special Budget allocation of up to \$30 000 per annum to cover spending at Government House in the course of Professor Reid's meeting his official responsibilities as Governor. Previously, the tax free allowance was paid to the Governor to be used at his discretion. There was no system of accounting for expenditure from the allowance.

The Governor will be able to draw on this special Budget allocation at his discretion, but information about the expenditure incurred will be provided to the Department of Premier and Cabinet at the end of every month. This system has been introduced at the request of the Governor in the interest of demonstrating the use of the allocation. Under the new arrangement, any moneys not spent from the appropriation would be returned to the Consolidated Revenue Fund at the end of each financial year.

The second purpose of the Bill is to delete from schedule IV of the Act, reference to payments of \$1 000 and \$700 to the Private Secretary and Clerk of the Executive Council respectively.

The need for the retention of these two payments has been examined. Neither of the amounts has been adjusted nor paid for many years. The functions and methods of operation of the Private Secretary and Clerk of the Executive Council have changed significantly.

On his appointment as Governor from 2 July 1984, Professor Gordon Reid decided to have a position of private secretary on his establishment rather than one of aide-de-camp. The position of private secretary has been established as an office under the Public Service Act and the salary is payable from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The duties of the Clerk of the Executive Council are now performed by senior officers of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, officers whose classifications and salaries recognise that responsibility.

Under these circumstances, there is no need to retain reference to the Private Secretary and Clerk of the Executive Council in schedule IV.

The Bill provides a sound approach to the problem of fixing the Governor's salary. The level of remuneration which results represents a reasonable amount when compared with the remuneration of Governors in other States bearing in mind

that there has been no adjustment to our Governor's remuneration since 1 January 1982.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Margaret McAleer.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from 23 October.

HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [4.49 p.m.]: I welcome the opportunity to address a few words to members concerning the Budget and other matters pertaining to my electorate. I welcome any expenditure within my province, as all members would; and like my colleague, Hon. Phillip Pental, I am of the opinion that if the Government makes an extra 13 per cent in State taxation, it is easy to hand money out. As a matter of fact, that is what has happened on this occasion.

However, I draw to the attention of the House something that is lacking in the State Budget, and that concerns a water scheme in Carnarvon. Members will be aware that some months ago a very severe drought affected the river flow in Carnarvon. Some 22 months went by, and we had insufficient water for the plantations. As members will be aware, the plantation industry in Carnarvon is very important for the production of fruit and vegetables for the State.

The concern about this matter was so deep that a public meeting was called to discuss the enormous problem facing the provision of a continuing water supply and the plight of the plantations. I attended that meeting, and so did my Federal counterpart, the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr Graeme Campbell). We decided that the problem was above politics; and after meeting we decided to conduct a radio campaign on radio station 6LN to try to raise some money to consider the feasibility of methods of storing water for the town.

Mr Campbell and I attended the radio station the next day and started the campaign. From a town with only 7 000 people, some \$11 000 was raised to investigate a water storage called Yandoo Creek. The money was needed to pay a consultant to examine whether this area was feasible for the storage of water in the future. Obviously the sum of \$11 000 was only enough for an initial feasibility study to decide whether a further should be undertaken. It was found that the area was feasible for storing water, and that an extra study should be conducted. However, the cost of the extra feasibility study—approximately \$100 000—was obviously well out of the reach of the already generous town of Carnarvon.

My Federal colleague and I agreed that, once again, we would keep politics well and truly out of it, and he would make every effort to secure the funds in Canberra. We agreed to work together. I publicly give Graeme Campbell a hefty pat on the back, because he approached the task of raising the money with great dignity, and he has done his extreme best.

I am therefore very disappointed that the present Minister for Water Resources did not take up an offer I have been told this, not by Mr Campbell, but by other sources--of \$100 000 from the Federal Government with absolutely no strings attached. Because of the Minister's lack of knowledge of the area, he did not take up that offer. That means that the feasibility study, which should have been taking place at the moment, cannot go ahead because of the lack of funds.

I understand that Mr Campbell is still doing his best to try to do something about the problem. I am taking the unusual step in politics today of siding with Mr Campbell and condemning the Minister for Water Resources for the undisciplined way that he approached this problem. I feel, and I know many people in Carnarvon feel, that we have been badly done by, particularly when the people have put their hands in their pockets and provided the money for the initial feasibility study.

One of the fortunate things that happened no credit is due to the Minister for Water Resources or to anybody else for this was that it rained earlier this year. We are fortunate to have a considerable amount of excess water at present; and the problem that was so bad in January and February is not as bad now. However, the problem will recur. It is sad that although the Minister was offered the money by the Federal Government to carry out the feasibility study, he did not take up that offer. He stands condemned for that. When he sees a copy of this speech, I hope he is able to come up with an answer and say that the information I have been given I regard it as very reliable is wrong, and that he is able to obtain the money.

I know that Mr Campbell is disappointed; I know the people of Carnarvon are disappointed; and I am disappointed.

I turn now to a subject that is starting to become a matter of concern to me, and that relates to the emergence of minority pressure groups. I was appalled to read the recommendation by the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal that the advertising of liquor on television at certain hours should be curtailed. Members have heard me

speaking in this Chamber about what seems to be an all-out assault on the liquor industry the employer of a considerable number of people. It does not matter which way the industry turns, it finds that State Governments raise charges, or the Federal Government does precisely the same thing, or the unions lower working hours, or the price of liquor rises; and the point is being reached where many liquor outlets are becoming not viable. I know that the Australian Hotels Association is concerned about the problem, and it has taken every step to try to lower the road toll with such things as the "skipper" campaign that it has advertised regularly. The industry has always been willing to provide money, not just for sporting organisations, but for any organisation it believes will benefit from that money.

That is why I am appalled that, once again, because of pressure from minority groups, the liquor industry has been placed in the situation in which it cannot advertise its products. It is my view that if children could be corrupted by watching liquor advertising on television, the problem rests firmly with the parents and their lack of discipline. If parents cannot control their children and their habits, they do not deserve to be parents. It is not fair to single out any particular industry such as the liquor industry when the people who market salt probably do 10 times more damage to the health of people than the liquor industry does.

Hon. D. K. DAns: I agree with you, Mr Lockyer.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: We should not have these minority groups thrust upon us. When I speak of minority groups, the one that comes to mind at present is the group camping at Heirisson Island. Any member of this Chamber who set up a camp on Heirisson Island this afternoon would wake up tomorrow in the slammer, yet we are faced with the situation in which we have a race of people bringing disgrace upon themselves by sitting there on Heirisson Island. All the yahoos of Perth drive past in their cars, yelling out to these people and insulting their race, all because Mr Burke will not go down to talk with them.

I agree with Mr Burke; he should not go down there to talk with them. What should happen to them is what would happen to any other member of our society; in other words, they should be dragged off to the slot. What they are doing is just not good enough; it is a very poor way of getting across their points of view. There must be a simpler way, and I put it to members that they have not earned the sympathy of the public; in fact, the reverse is the case. These people have brought disrepute upon themselves. They have these yahoos going past and calling them the most atrocious names. There must be a simpler way for

them to go about their task. This could be classed as racism in reverse. People have said that we would not be able to do it, and just because they happen to be a different colour, they can do these things. These things happen, and I am not a racist.

Hon. Kay Hallahan interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Perhaps Hon. Kay Hallahan might like to try it, but I would not want to. She may support these minority groups, but I do not. The public are getting sick and tired of having pressure applied by groups such as this one. As I said, they are not getting their points of view across. All they are doing is getting their grubby little photographs in the paper. They are doing themselves no justice whatever.

This weekend I was in the goldfields and many people asked me what was going on down at Heirisson Island. Many of their people in that area were quite disgusted with the situation. The time has come when we should stop mistaking noise for numbers. If the Perth City Council does not have the power to act effectively, as I understand to be the case, perhaps legislation should be introduced so that the council can act. Minority groups can get across their points of view in many different ways rather than by the outlandish actions adopted by this group.

I might add that I believe that the equal opportunities legislation we debated last night—although I did not speak to it—was introduced as a result of pressure from minority groups. That legislation really is a bit of a laugh around the place, although I know that some people are sincere in their endeavours.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: What is the laugh?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The member does not see the laugh because she takes it seriously. If she read this morning's edition of *The West Australian*, she will have read some of the letters to the editor and will have noted that some of the people were very concise in their comments on this issue. The great majority of people feel the same way. I do not doubt Hon. Kay Hallahan's sincerity; she is probably one of those who takes this matter more seriously than do most people.

In North Queensland, people who call themselves Men of Trees, I think, are trying to stop a road going through a forest because it might mean one less gum tree or whatever is grown there. They are doing this even when the councillors, who have been elected to do what the people want, agree that the road should go ahead and when these councillors know that they can be dealt with through the ballot box.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They don't know what damage they are doing.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I cannot agree with that statement, and I am surprised that a person with the member's great intelligence would try to suggest that elected councillors do not know what they are doing. If the people do not agree with what they are doing, they will vote them out.

Roxby Downs is another example.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: What about Burswood Island?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The member and I might have to disagree on that one; he does not have a punt like Mr Dans and I do.

At Roxby Downs, we had people—this "rent a crowd", who were also in Tasmania—protesting because the Federal Government had agreed to the go-ahead for the Roxby Downs uranium project as it thought it would help to keep Mr Bannon in power in South Australia, although the rank and file of the ALP do not want uranium mining. These people went to press their minority view onto the majority. All they did was to cause immense expense, because bus loads of policemen had to be sent to the area and the company had to double the guard. All these things are very obnoxious to our society. I could give further examples if the House wanted them.

In my own province, before I became a member, we had the "Tour for Freedom". These people went to Exmouth to object to the base at North-West Cape. They were taken as a joke initially, and there was no violence until they burnt an American flag outside the gates of the Harold E. Holt communications base. The Australians and the Americans took extreme objection to that action. All these people did was to bring enormous condemnation onto themselves.

Hon. Kay Hallahan interjected.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The member is making me very suspicious, because whenever I get onto these things, she seems to be able to comment. I will have to check on the photographs, because people like her start to concern me. There would be many people in the area who would be interested to know that a member of Parliament was among that group, although I do not think she was. But these people who caused the trouble were not appreciated by the residents of Exmouth. Their cause was lost by the flick of a match. If they tried the same thing again, I would be able to assure them of a very warm welcome, and I do not mean "warm" in a congenial way. I will leave it to members to work out what I mean.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Did you say that the legislation for equal rights last night was a joke, or that the minority groups were?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Both. I thought the legislation was unnecessary. Many people, like me, will take absolutely no notice of last night's legislation, none at all.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): I am sure the member will take no notice of interjections.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Many people, including Mrs Hallahan, are very sincere about this sort of thing, but many other people think it is silly. I am sure she will not agree with me because she is really sincere about what she is doing, but she is probably one of the minority. The member will probably call me a male chauvinist pig.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: You are electorally out of touch.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: We will see about that at the next election.

I will comment now on Government departments and organisations which at times take actions without considering sufficiently the human aspect. The M. G. Kailis Gulf Fisheries Pty. Ltd company conducts a prawning operation at Learmonth, and has done so for a number of years. It has a seasonal work force and directly or indirectly employs between 300 and 400 people. The Department of Fisheries and Wildlife—it may now be the Department of Fisheries—closed a section of the fishery to prawning, because it considered that the prawn stocks were being depleted. I am no scientist and I do not claim to have any particular knowledge of this industry, but I am informed that the decision was taken because the people felt that they were doing the right thing. The departmental officers felt that the only way they could stop the depletion of the prawn stocks was to lock up the area for a while. I understand that the department has been presented with some very strong scientific information which is contrary to its point of view and that, because of the department's decision, many jobs have been jeopardised. In fact, the entire viability of the operation at Learmonth is under review and the operation could close at any time.

While I respect deeply the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife and the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife, I feel they need to review this decision and take cognizance of scientific information available to them through an alternative source. The testing of these fishing areas needs to be increased to make sure that what the departmental officers are doing is not wrong.

These fishing operations, such as that of Kailis at Learmonth, employ people who find it difficult to get work elsewhere. Many seasonal workers are employed and many are females. I do not know

whether these people will be able to obtain other jobs if this operation closes. That thought terrifies me, not just because of the number of jobs to be lost by process workers, but also because of the number of skippers and deckhands—

Hon. D. K. Dans: What you are saying is that the decision was wrong.

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I was not going that far, but I was saying that the decision needs to be reviewed, in the light of alternative scientific information which is available to us. I am informed that the decision, which was taken on the information before the departmental representatives, is open to question. The department must look at this problem again. I understand that a meeting will be held in Exmouth some time in November. I hope that meeting is not too late. I know the people concerned are anxious to ensure that the industry survives.

Members probably read in the newspapers this week of a tragedy in Mt. Magnet where a local boy lost his life in a traffic accident. This tragedy brought an outcry from his family about the lack of a doctor in the town.

While I really feel for the family, as one always does when there is a bereavement, I must agree with them that this is a problem. However, I do not level criticism at this Government, the previous Government, the Mt. Magnet Shire Council, or my colleagues who have tried desperately over the years to attract a doctor to the town.

We read in the papers from time to time that a surplus of doctors exists in the western world at present. Yet, there seems to be some difficulty in encouraging doctors to isolated areas, even though a very high salary is offered.

The time is nigh for the Government of the day, in conjunction with the AMA, the Medical School of WA, and tertiary institutions, to strike a formula under which doctors with four or five years' experience can be employed in isolated areas. I have used Mt. Magnet as an example, but it is only one of many towns which feel the lack of a doctor. I am sure some of the country members of Parliament have the same problem in their electorates. I know that at times the medical department uses these isolated areas to place a doctor who comes from overseas and does not have complete qualifications; until he is fully qualified he may practise in that area. Some steps must be taken to ensure that isolated areas are provided with doctors.

I know that the Flying Doctor Service provides medical care in these areas, but I want to make it clear that that service was meant basically only for emergencies. Unfortunately, it seems that the ser-

vice has almost become a charter company which carries out clinics around the country. That was not the original purpose of the service.

I do not think that it is the role of the Flying Doctor Service to provide a doctor to isolated areas. The role is to provide a service to people who are seriously ill and in some isolated place in this State, so that patients can be propelled to medical services such as specialist hospitals in Perth.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You appreciate the difficulty of your idea, because of the need to have an experienced doctor. Have you some ideas which might overcome that?

Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I appreciate that Mr MacKinnon is calling on his great reserves of knowledge from his years as Minister for Health. I was not saying that a doctor fresh out of his first year at a hospital should be placed in an area such as Mt. Magnet, but that a system—along the lines of the legal aid system, under which experienced lawyers are sent all over the State—is needed. The Aboriginal Legal Service (WA) Inc. sends lawyers to all areas in the State in order to give a service to people in the isolated areas.

We need to look at a similar scheme under which experienced doctors can be persuaded to go to isolated areas for a year at a time, as long as there is some continuity of service.

The ideal situation, of course, is to have an experienced doctor in a town. My town of Carnarvon is well served, because it is in a coastal area and it is a convivial place in which to live. Not many doctors want to live in a place like Mt. Magnet, because the climate is harsh—hot in summer and cold in winter. There is not a lot to do there other than to work. I thought that this problem should be brought to the attention of the House.

I wish to close my remarks by bringing to the attention of the Parliament the situation which exists with Agnew Mining Co. Pty. Ltd at Leinster. Members who understand the goldfields industry know that the price of nickel at present is such that organisations like Agnew Mining have found it necessary to put off a number of workers. That situation concerns me because Leinster was a viable little town some years ago. People living there are concerned about their jobs.

The Government must watch closely these mining operations. These companies must be given every encouragement, because they employ a large work force. If such an operation were shut down suddenly, an enormous number of people would be on the unemployment market.

I recognise the fact that State Governments are not in the business of handing out money, but these companies must be examined in order that a way might be found to ensure that they are kept viable. I fear that when one of these major nickel towns closes, it could be some time, if ever, before it is opened again.

Apart from the fact that 13 per cent taxation has been passed on, I welcome the money which is to be spent in my electorate. I will watch closely that it is wisely spent. If there are any short-comings in the Budget, I will certainly bring them to the attention of the Parliament.

I support the motion.

HON. S. M. PIANTADOSI (North Central Metropolitan) [5.20 p.m.]: I also welcome the opportunity to be able to speak on the Budget papers. The whole thrust of this Budget, as the Premier outlined last week, is to continue the economic revival that has occurred since the Labor Party took office. I most welcome this because the North Central Metropolitan Province covers the suburbs of Balga and Balcatta, two areas where unemployment, especially amongst the young and the migrants, is high. I fully support the initiatives taken by the Government to ensure new opportunities, and the Government's plan to give all members of the community—and a number of people who live in my area—those opportunities.

I would like to point out some of those measures because I am a firm supporter of the Government's proposals. The Government has made it quite clear that in one area it accepted some of the points that the Opposition has made over the last few weeks and that is with respect to unemployment amongst the young. It is a problem area, and there is some disagreement as to how the problem should be approached.

The need for employment prospects to improve in that area is recognised. Some of the proposals mentioned were job placement, a skills' campaign, and apprentice employment. The Premier has stated that \$500 000 has been allocated to the State public sector to ensure that at least 100 additional apprentices will be employed. I think that step is quite a clear indication of the Government's intention of the role its own departments can play and the steps that can be taken to assist unemployment. The Government has also offered incentives to the private sector as well to secure further apprenticeship opportunities. Some of these incentives relate to workers' compensation, payroll tax, and opportunities for further promotion. Another \$250 000 has been allocated for

this purpose and to generally inform the community of future employment prospects.

Having been involved with the community youth support area for some months, I have daily evidence of some of the problems the young face. Part of the information filtering across to families and the community at large, is an idea of the opportunities available.

The Community Employment Program is further evidence of the Government's proposals of ensuring to the community that further job opportunities will be made available, not just for the young, but for all.

Some \$2 million has been allocated towards the programme of community employment ensuring that a total grant of some \$26 million will be allocated to new projects which will provide approximately 2 600 jobs. What must be pointed out is the benefit that a community programme scheme brings not only in providing jobs, but also in helping the community to prosper from that programme, and being able to implement within community groups schemes that would not have been possible under normal circumstances. Those programmes assist the community at large.

The boost to the building industry has been very effective also and most welcomed by the industry generally. Of the people to whom I have spoken over the last two weeks—from brickies' labourers to managers and owners of building companies—the allocation of \$187 million injected into housing has been very well-received by that industry. I think the attitude was that this injection of funds was the boost that the industry needed. It will ensure that the industry continues in a positive vein for many years to come, with further support in future years. This has come about with the Government's overall capital works programme of over \$1 000 million. This programme will be commenced in the very near future and it will further boost the building industry.

Even the Opposition members have not argued with what the Government has proposed and initiated. I think it is a clear indication that the Government is on a winner and indeed, by their silence, it can be seen that the Opposition has been demoralised by the actions of the Government; it is completely destroyed by the Government's argument. Indeed, I heard from some that the Opposition has gone back to the drawing board to see what else it can do to counter the Government. Possibly it might get back to the old rignarole of union bashing.

I think history records it well that during the last election campaign all the Opposition rhetoric did it no good at all. Its proposals were disastrous

and were seen as such by the community. The people did not like what was proposed for the future and what the Opposition had in store for Western Australians. I think its defeat at the ballot box also meant a total disaster for the Liberal Party; the community judged it in that way.

Two other proposals in the Budget which I welcome involve the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and the Equal Opportunity Commission. In both these areas, the Government recognises that laws in themselves are not sufficient to end intolerance, prejudice, and discrimination which has existed in the community in the past and which still exists. The Government places a strong emphasis on the need for community education to ensure that the minority groups have some equal opportunity. I think that was indicated yesterday by some members of the Opposition. There is some consensus about the need to ensure that the community as a whole has a fair go. I welcome that support, but I certainly hope that that consensus in regard to a fair go does not stop there but continues with the Fair Representation in the Legislative Council Bill which is also due to come before this House.

The allocation of \$685 000 for the new Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission is most welcome indeed. For the first time in the history of Western Australia we have a structure that will truly represent the total community. I think the word "multicultural" in the name of the commission is a clear indication that it is indeed representative of the community. Its role is to ensure that the total contribution of the ethnic communities in our State is recognised. It should also encourage people of diverse origins, languages, and culture to participate fully in our community whilst also encouraging the preservation and the sharing of their culture.

The Government has laid the groundwork to enable intolerance to discrimination to be combated. The commission needs all our co-operation to ensure that it will be effective and will fulfil its role. I sincerely urge the Opposition to support the Government and to assist it to achieve that goal.

I point out that, in restructuring the old immigration and ethnic affairs office, the Government has made a saving of some \$800 000. Last week, the Opposition launched an attack on the Government about increases in spending in public areas. It said that all costs had increased; rather than keep to its promises of good management, the Government had increased all costs and charges. The Opposition quoted various figures. However, the immigration and ethnic affairs area is one in which Government spending has not increased,

and this has transpired because of good house-keeping. As I have already mentioned, \$800 000 has been saved by the Government in the restructuring of that department.

In the last few days, the Minister for Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs was attacked by the ethnic communities council because of the proposed expenditure of \$685 000. Those attacks have been completely unfair and unwarranted. Had the Government allocated greater funds at this stage, it would have been quite fair for it to be attacked because it would have been wasting public funds and it would not have been acting responsibly.

What must be realised is that for the first time in this area, a new department is being set up and one needs to look carefully at the structure and composition of the department and staff to ensure their effectiveness and also to ensure that the department will fulfil its role.

Yesterday, when speaking to the Equal Opportunities Bill and referring to the role of the commissioner, Hon. Ian Medcalf stressed the point that one had to be careful about the role of a commissioner and a commission.

The ethnic affairs commissioner was appointed only four months ago, and it would be difficult in such a short time, to set up a department and a full complement of staff. I think all members would agree that the commissioner would need more time in order to set up his department and to appoint his staff. The crucifying of the commission is not warranted. I point out that the progress of the commission will be monitored and should additional assistance be needed in the future, I am sure the Government would give the commission its further support. I commend the Government for its vision and action and I suggest to leaders of the ethnic affairs council that they have the same vision. I invite them also to assist in whatever way they can to ensure that the aims of the commission are achieved. In addition, I urge the Opposition to assist in that regard.

I welcome the allocation of funds for one of the problems which concerns my electorate; that is, the completion of the roofing of the Mt. Yokine reservoir, which is in my electorate and which has been plagued by many problems over the last few years, especially that of bacterial and snail infestation. The tanks had to be closed down for months on end in an attempt to rid the reservoir of that problem. Some years ago, when I was secretary of the water supplies union, I took the initiative to bring this matter to the then Government's attention, and I am sure that that initiative put a little pressure on the then Government to

take action. I am glad that the Labor Government is following the initiatives taken by the Liberal Government and is roofing all reservoirs because of the dangers which exist. A similar situation arose some three weeks ago when problems were experienced at the Bold Park reservoir because seagulls were using it as a stopping-off place on their way to the ocean.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Dropping-off place!

Hon. S. M. PIANTADOSI: That is right. This problem requires the application of different chemicals to that reservoir to get rid of that bacteria. The sooner that any reservoir or any water supply in existence is given some protection, the better off we, as a community, will be.

I certainly hope that in the next Budget, provision will be made for some of the older mains—some of which are in the older suburbs—to be replaced in order that we might be rid of the problem.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my support for the Government's initiatives as a result of which many programmes will be instituted, and on which a great deal of money will be spent, thus benefiting a number of my constituents.

I commend the Government for its initiatives, and I support the motion.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [5.36 p.m.]: I take the opportunity to speak on the Budget and to refer to some of the facts which I think should be pointed out to the Government and to the public relating to the Opposition's concern with the statements made by the Government on the Estimates.

The Treasurer's Budget speech and the figures submitted to the Parliament and to the public were presented as fair and reasonable and certainly that was the impression the Government tried to project. I suggest that the House should look closely at the financial operation of the Government over the past 18 months—the time it has been in Government.

On looking at the way the Government has operated in the Budget area and at its handling of public money, one could assume only that the previous Budget was carefully planned and that this one has been carefully planned and is nothing more than a clever deception perpetrated by the Government. The statements made by the Treasurer and the Government have been the height of deceit, and the Government's hypocrisy is evident in its policy statements and policy commitments which were disclosed prior to the last election. The first year the Government was in office, massive hikes in costs and Government charges were imposed, and, of course, they were

imposed in complete contradiction to the promises made by the Government prior to the election. One realises that some reason must exist for the big hikes in Government charges in the Government's first year in office, and the relatively low increases this year. It is possible that the Government is leaving its options open for an election early next year. I am not saying that an early election will be held, but it would appear to anyone who is a student of these things and who knows the way in which Governments operate that it is a possibility.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You look at the next Budget.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: All I am saying is that it is a possibility. Whatever Mr Dans or the Government says, nothing at all can hide the effect the cruel increases in Government charges had on the public last year. It is worth recalling

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: Can I give you some information.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am talking

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: We saved \$800 000 on one item. You are totally irresponsible.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I know the hikes of this Government and the hikes under these Estimates. When we talk about irresponsibility, let us

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: We saved \$800 000.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Look at the absolute lies told by this Government prior to the last election.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let me say it again, because it is necessary to remind the Government and the public and to have it on record. This was an advertisement placed in the newspaper prior to the last election. It read

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

No increases in Water Rates

No increases in Electricity charges

No increases in 3rd Party Motor Insurance

No increases in Land Tax

No increases in Stamp Duty

No increases in Bus and Train Fares

No increases in Rail Freight Charges

No increases in Irrigation Charges

No increases in State Petrol Tax.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Who put this in?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That was Mr Piantadosi's party.

Yet what happened? Water rates went up by 16 per cent, and electricity charges went up by 15 per cent. Members opposite can smile, but they should be ashamed of themselves. Bus and train fares increased by 33½ per cent; petrol tax by 13.5 per cent; and country sewerage charges 20 per cent.

This all happened in the first year. Country drainage charges went up 18 per cent; SHC rents up 10 per cent; hospital charges up 19 per cent; and gas charges up 15 to 100 per cent.

What I am saying to the House

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Is that if one looks at the increases imposed on the public by this Government over the 18 months which it has been in office, one gets the true picture.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: What happens is this: The Government has carefully got away with it. In the first year, the Government increased charges massively. The Treasurer then came pussy-footing along this year, and said, "We will be fair this year".

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is the old, thimble trick; the Government takes with one hand and magnanimously gives something back next year, but not all of it. Hon. Kay Hallahan said "we have taken so much off FID." 40 per cent or whatever it is.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: That's right.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is right, it has been reduced from 0.5 per cent to 0.3 per cent. That is good.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We know why the Government did it.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Payroll tax—that was a good decision—reduced from five per cent to 4.75 per cent.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: What I am saying is that every Government has recognised that payroll tax is an unpleasant tax.

Several members interjected.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: You made a hash of it when you were Minister.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We did reduce it.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Government members are not even allowing me to say that something is

a good job; they suspect my motives. Nevertheless, when we look at one or two little things the Government has done, we realise revenue payments are up across the board and that employers and businesses will continue to pay increasing costs this year and next year, no matter what the Government does about window dressing. This revenue comes from business, from industry, and from commerce.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We have an increased take. At the same time we have increased spending; capital works will involve increased spending. We have a burgeoning bureaucracy. Its numbers go up and up, no matter what facade the Government puts on; it is not becoming more efficient and cutting down little groups. The Government puts on this front, and it is prepared, for a little publicity, to sacrifice anyone to retain its position. With the senior public servants' 10 per cent salary cut, it tried successfully to overshadow the increase last year.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It was 12 per cent for me.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let us understand what we are on about when we talk of increased costs and increased expenditure. The allocation for the Department of Premier and Cabinet is \$7.5 million—up 135 per cent since the Labor Government took power. This increase is for nothing but to satisfy the insatiable appetite of Mr Burke and his private army, which is there purely and simply to keep him in power at any public cost.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Bryce's department is allocated \$3.1 million—up 2 122 per cent since the Labor Party took power 18 months ago. That is a little high.

Hon. P. G. Pental: It would have to be a record.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let us look at Mr Dans' department. Bear in mind the Government has said, "We are keeping increases generally below the rate of expected inflation". What is the inflation rate?

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: In 1983-84 the estimate for Mr Dans' department was \$11.27 million; this year it is \$13.28 million, up 17 per cent. That is not inflation. If we have 17 per cent inflation, heaven help us!

Last year the allocation for Mr Dowding's department was \$13.2 million; this year it is \$18.44 million—up 139 per cent.

I will give credit to Mr Berinson; he has perhaps applied more restraint and care to his administration. It is natural that he would be cautious and careful. His budget is up by only two per cent, so he has applied very great care. But Mr Dans' estimate and Mr Dowding's estimate have jumped up 17 per cent and 39 per cent respectively. That is not very good.

Where does the money come from? It comes from small business and industry.

Looking at the Estimates we have an almost impossible job to find out what these advisers cost, and what their backups cost, because there are advisers, officers, secretaries, and all that goes with them. Huge costs to the public are involved, but who really knows what this cost is?

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Hon. Kay Hallahan says, "Good results", but I can tell members some of the results are very bad indeed.

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: It makes you look bad.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let me give members an example of a gross waste of money in the Premier's department, where Mr Tom Butler is one of the advisers on industrial relations.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Mr Tom Butler has not resolved one single dispute since he has been there. He has flown up to Geraldton and threatened people into joining the union. He approached a builder involved in a dispute a few days ago and said everything was fixed, but the dispute was worse than ever. Members talk about a waste of money.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Will Mr McKenzie dispute that?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It is not true.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Would you like to come with me tomorrow?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I would love to.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Right, 9.00 a.m. tomorrow, I will talk to the member a little later in the evening.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let me just say this. In some cases—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am not saying there should not be a limited number of advisers.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The appointment of these advisers was to keep people quiet, just to honour promises—jobs for the boys—this is really what it is all about. In many cases this is what is happening. Some of the advisers are a sheer waste of money: Tom Butler is a good example of this.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: That is your limited perception.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The word “limited” is something I would argue about, but “perception” yes! What I am saying is that in many cases we have people in these jobs as payment for services rendered.

I doubt whether Mr Berinson, Mr Dans, Mr Dowding, or the Premier could tell us the true cost of that adviser corps—that private army—to the public. I do not think they have any idea. Indeed, it normally takes two or three days to find out how many advisers there are. When Hon. Phil Pental asked a question on this matter it took days for him to get the answer.

While we are talking about advisers and their effect, let us look at what is happening in this Parliament. Day in and day out we see an increasing number of people whom, in many cases, I have never seen before. They strut around as if they were members of Parliament or, indeed, superior to members of Parliament.

Frequently when the House is in session and a contentious issue is being debated, this place is like Perth railway station at peak hour. People are running backwards and forwards and they do not have any form of identification. I am seriously concerned, as should all members be, that there is no security in this place. People just run around; I do not know them, and nor do members opposite.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Not so long ago I saw one of the advisers in the members’ bar drinking with members. That is not on. It is not proper and obviously the situation needs to be corrected.

Several members interjected.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Wasn’t he drinking with Liberal members?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Time and time again we look at the President’s Gallery—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the members who are interjecting to cease and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to ignore the interjections and direct his comments to the Chair.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Thank you, Mr President. What I am saying is this—

Hon. S. M. Piantadosi: What you are saying is that you support a closed shop.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Many members on my side of the House are seriously concerned about the lack of security in Parliament House and the number of people whom one cannot identify and who wander around the corridors and in and out of offices. I am expressing my view and I am seriously concerned about the matter. I am not looking for a row with Government members. It is my concern and it is the concern of many members.

A number of people move around Parliament House, in and out of the corridors, and in every corner of this building, and I do not know them from a bar of soap. I do not think there is any degree of security.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Let us face it, when I came to Parliament I knew almost everyone on the staff, but there seems to be 3 000 on the staff now, or at least that is how it appears to me.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I do not want a shouting match. I am showing my concern and it is a concern which should be expressed by all members, because if lots of people are roaming around and there is no security in respect of members’ offices, people can walk in and out of them. They do not wear identification tags with their photographs on them. I do not know who these people are and it makes me wonder who is really in charge. What happens at weekends when members are not here or when very few members are here? At different times of the day—not at weekends—I have come through the doors and I have seen people who are not members of Parliament using pass keys.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I threw my key away in case I was tempted to come in on weekends!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Members should be concerned about this, because sooner or later something will go wrong and no-one will know who is to blame. If we are to have these hordes of people—whether they are Government officers or whomever they may be—wandering around Parliament House, they should carry some form of identification. I would be quite happy with that, but we must have more security.

Time and time again while we are involved in debate in this House people wander in and out of the President’s Gallery. I assume they get your permission, Sir, but they come in and out of here very frequently. There is a proper course of action to take when one sits in the President’s Gallery. Whenever I or most members in this place take someone into the President’s Gallery, an approach is made to the President to the effect, “Mr President, may I bring someone into your gallery?” It should be essential that that course be followed. It

should not be possible for people to walk in and out of the President's Gallery without the permission of the President, but I know that is happening now.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I'll bet the President does not know about it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am drawing attention to a very serious matter. We heard Mr Gayfer talking about someone's walking into his office and removing equipment. That is quite wrong. I draw the matter to the attention of the President and the House, because it is something which needs to be looked at.

The number of Government advisers and the way in which they are being used is upsetting many people. It is certainly upsetting public servants who regard the Government's course of action in this respect as a slur on their ability and integrity. From reports which have been made to me, it seems a sort of barrier exists between the senior public servants in the Public Service and the Minister. In the past, regardless of political overtones, departmental heads always had access to their Ministers. Hon. Graham MacKinnon, Hon. David Wordsworth, and Hon. Ian Medcalf as ex-Ministers, would know that. Departmental heads always gave the best advice possible and they were there to protect their Ministers. That was always the traditional role of the Public Service and it will continue to be if public servants are allowed to maintain that practice.

However, now a barrier has developed between senior Government officers and their Ministers. This has been caused by the appointment of advisers. It has even been suggested that some of the advisers are making the decisions, rather than referring matters to Ministers.

What I am saying is that we really have a new breed of people—an army of, in some cases, professional leeches who have moved in and who are building their own little empires and bureaucracies. We have this elite group being formed between the Ministers and their departmental heads.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: You mean a very efficient group.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I do not think so, although it could be in some cases. I am saying there is a new breed—a new elite—and, in many cases, important decisions are made by unelected people rather than by the members themselves.

The Attorney General and the Premier have referred to expenditure. They have said that the increase in expenditure would not be greater than the rate of inflation. We have suggested already that it is and we have given examples. When we

look at the details of Government expenditure we see a very sad picture. It appears from the figures I have that the money set aside for youth training is nowhere near as much as the Minister for Employment and Training (Hon. Peter Dowding) or Hon. Kay Hallahan suggested it might be. Indeed, it appears there has just been a redeployment of funds in that area, rather than an increase.

If that is the case, and I am open to correction, surely that is an astounding inadequacy in the circumstances. Hon. Peter Dowding made a prepared statement the other day and I suggest he ought to seek again the advice of his advisers to ascertain whether what he told this House was correct.

The increased expenditure and increased take on the part of the Government in this area is significant. If we look at some of the figures, we understand that when the Government says it is keeping down Government charges and taxes, we have to look at what it has received as a result of 18 months of increased charges. I do not refer to this year only, but to the previous year also. We must take the position of the two years added together.

As a result of increased charges last year, this year land tax increased by 20 per cent or \$8.5 million. Stamp duty was up by \$18 million or 11.2 per cent. Regardless of the reduction in the financial institutions duty, it will bring in \$18.7 million this year, an increase of 113 per cent. Payroll tax is up by 6.3 per cent or \$17 million. Liquor and tobacco tax is up by 15.4 per cent.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Before the tea suspension I was criticising the Government for what I called its deception in saying that it had kept increases in expenditure within the expected inflation level. That is the sort of statement that has been bandied around, and although Mr Berinson says that is not the case, that is the impression that has been put forward by members of the Government and it would seem, by his own spokesman. I quoted earlier some figures to give an indication of the increased income the Government will receive as a result of last year's increases. In relation to land tax I said the figures we have researched suggest an increased take of 20 per cent—\$8.5 million—in the rate of land tax.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: But will there be any increase?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is the sort of statement I would not have expected Mr Berinson to make. The Government makes a big song and dance about not greatly increasing Government charges—

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Neither we did.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: —but it is gaining a great deal more money which is needed to finance some of the Government's plans and pay for some of the things which are not necessary. I am saying the Government is creating a deception.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Like payroll tax deductions?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have already referred to that and I will come back to it. I said it was a good thing that the Government had reduced payroll tax, and I hope all Governments of whatever colour and persuasion would do the same. I also complimented Mr Berinson on being careful with his own budgeting and I estimated he was only asking for a two per cent increase. I said it was a pity his Cabinet colleagues did not exercise the same caution.

Stamp duty is to increase by 11.2 per cent and FID is to increase by 113 per cent—that could be incorrect, but it is the figure I have calculated. Payroll tax is to increase by 6.3 per cent; liquor and tobacco taxes by 15.4 per cent; public utility charges by 15.7 per cent, and departmental fees by 8.8 per cent. That is the range of increases we have calculated on our examination of the figures. If Mr Berinson says that is not true I will be pleased if he stands up and disputes the figures.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I think you should go back to school.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I would be pleased if Mr McKenzie stood up immediately I finish my speech to explain where I am wrong.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Don't tempt me!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Let us look specifically at the areas of increases, and I point out these figures have been calculated by experts. For example, the Government's take through taxation will have increased during the time of the Labor Government by 39.4 per cent overall. That is the increased take for last year and this year. The increased take in other areas is as follows: Law courts, 29.4 per cent; departmental, 25 per cent; public utilities, 11.2 per cent; an average of 28.3 per cent. That is the increased take this Government has achieved in 18 months in office.

I am sure that must really mean that the public, in understanding these figures—and we hope they do—will recognise that the Burke Government has been very keen to extract money from the public by way of taxes and charges despite the con job it has put forward.

The increased Government take obviously affects the private sector because it makes it harder for that sector to employ more people, to run prof-

itable enterprises, and to establish in business. We are seeing even now a transfer of wealth, if you like, from the private sector to the public sector. We must recognise, and I am sure we all do, that the private sector employs at least 70 per cent of the work force and of that, small business employs between 40 and 50 per cent. Such action by the Government affects those people greatly. The Government is continuing to increase its take from the community.

Mr Dowding made a prepared statement which almost could be seen as a panic move. He talked about a number of aspects in the employment area, in particular the allocation of finance to youth and youth employment. I suggest that when he talked about the provision of \$3.5 million to \$5 million for what he called the bridging-the-gap scheme, it was really a reallocation of funds from one group to another.

Let us take the figures for 1983 for the areas in which money was spent in encouraging youth employment and the like. The transition from work to school scheme was allocated \$2.18 million last year. This year the allocation is nil, although an alternative scheme has been introduced. The special youth employment training scheme received \$140 000 last year compared with \$12 000 this year. Special employment related programmes were allocated \$3.973 million last year and \$469 000 this year. The overall figure last year was \$6.299 million for the areas I have mentioned whereas this year the Government has allocated \$481 000.

I agree that the Government has allocated the bridging-the-gap scheme \$3.5 million, and that it is also outlaying \$2.75 million on apprenticeship schemes, so the figures are about the same.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: From memory that \$3.5 million is for the six months from January to June.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Dead right! It is a bit more than that actually, the total estimated figure for a year is \$5 million.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: A large proportion will come in the first half of the year because of the structure of the scheme.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The allocation this year for the various schemes—although the titles have changed—is about the same or within \$100 000. Mr Dowding quite cleverly promoted the bridging-the-gap scheme as a brand new scheme which would receive additional funds. He tried to lead the House into believing that, apart from the other schemes which would continue, an additional \$3.5 million had been allocated this year. That is not so.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I will leave it to Mr Dowding to correct, but you are subject to correction on that.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course Mr Berinson is not prepared to say so because it is another Minister's portfolio, although I would have thought Mr Berinson had a fair idea, being in charge of the calculations. I accept that these things are complicated and that he has to go home and work it out.

That deception was played on the Parliament by the Minister and indeed the Government has allocated very few dollars more than was allocated last year. I will not criticise the bridging-the-gap-scheme—obviously the Government and the Minister have taken some advice and I know from whence it came—except to say that it appears to the Opposition there may be a decline in training programmes. The money is being put into different schemes, but training programmes will decline. If that is the case we have every reason to be a little concerned.

I have some notes on the Budget speech, as we all have. These refer to the bridging-the-gap scheme and it is not necessary for me to read the notes on that new scheme. I am not criticising the Government. In fact, I commend it for bringing forward new ideas. However, the Government should not tell Parliament that an additional 3.5 per cent or \$5 million has been allocated above last year's appropriation.

Mr Dowding claimed that there were improvements in employment levels and certainly that is true. I am glad to see that. Mr Berinson would agree with me, however, that it is nowhere near satisfactory that 17 or 18 per cent of young people are unemployed. We must continue to try to promote employment, particularly for those in the younger age groups.

I have already mentioned that the payroll tax proposal is a good move on the Government's part. I have mentioned, as Hon. Kay Hallahan has, that the reduction of 40 per cent in FID is a good move. However, only a few months ago we debated the desirability of imposing FID and the Opposition is, in fact, committed to abolishing it altogether. Opposition members said during the debate that it was ridiculous and unfair to the business community to impose a level of 0.05 per cent; we said that the figure, if anything, should be 0.03 per cent. It is part of the Government's deception that only a few months later it has come back to the Parliament with this amendment.

The Government miscalculated how much money it would receive from this tax. It has taken away from the business community, given a little

back, and it is saying what a wonderful Government it is. It has not admitted that it made a mistake in the first place. We know the Government made a mistake and the Government knows it made a mistake, but it claims that it has done a wonderful thing by reducing the tax. In the earlier debates Opposition members said that if there was going to be a tax it should be imposed at the rate of 0.03 per cent, but the Government pooh-poohed that idea. Much later Hon. Kay Hallahan stands up and claims the Government is wonderful for reducing the tax. FID has created many problems in the business area. We have lost a great deal of finance to other States, particularly Queensland. It has cost thousands of jobs in this State.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Prove it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, it has. Far too many members on the Government side have never been in business or involved in business and, therefore, have no understanding of business and the effect these taxes and charges have on small companies. I know, and many other members know, that many businesses changed their methods with regard to financial dealings as a result of the introduction of FID. The additional taxes and charges are having a bad effect on small businesses and more and more of them are closing their doors. I talk to such people every day.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: They are misleading you, Mr Masters.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Hon. Joe Berinson says that they are misleading me. I know he is one of the few people on the Government side who is involved in business, and that he is a good and successful businessman.

I am not referring to large companies, but to the small business people in the community. They are faced with continual imposts; not only wages but also 17.5 per cent holiday loading, long service leave, and workers' compensation premiums. We cannot do much about workers' compensation premiums although I understand Mr Dans has plans to resolve that problem.

A Government member: Do you agree with that?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Of course I agree with workers' compensation. I do not know about Mr Dans' plans, but I am happy to talk to him on that issue as he well knows. I may not agree with his plans, but I will certainly talk with him about them.

Additional imposts will be made through the termination and redundancy proposals. The other day Mr Dans stood in this House and proudly said that he strongly supported those proposals and the decisions made in the Eastern States. He said that

the sooner they were introduced in this State, the better. That will be an additional burden. The Opposition has calculated that the redundancy programme and plans, as put forward and supported by Mr Dans, could cost an employer \$486 a year. In other words, if I were an employer, I would have to put that sum away each year for each employee as provision for future redundancy.

The termination proposal is also an impost and we estimate that it will cost \$432 million a year throughout Australia. These are all additional costs placed on businesses, particularly small businesses. There is no shadow of doubt that many of the employers affected will decide to get out of business as a result of these burdens, in addition to their other problems. Mr Berinson may not understand these people, but I do. Many business people are saying that they have had enough and that they cannot cope with additional costs and charges each time they appear to be making progress.

The Government maintains that the reduction in payroll tax will increase the prospects of employment for young and middle-aged people and there is no doubt that it will. However, that reduction is offset by other burdens imposed or supported by the Government.

I refer to another impost in the building industry: the building union superannuation scheme. Unfortunately that scheme has been supported by some of the major industrial groups in the Eastern States who were fooled into agreeing to it. This scheme will cost \$11 a week for each employee. There is no doubt that this scheme will spread throughout other industries and I understand that the metal industry is looking at similar propositions. No doubt employers in other industries will be faced with the same pressures and burdens. Once such schemes are accepted by big business, they soon spread and affect small business.

This superannuation scheme has been supported by major employees in the Eastern States who have ratted on business generally. They think they can pass the burden to the public in the vain hope of industrial peace but they forget the small business people who will suffer as a result of this decision. One cannot buy industrial peace and the big employers should know that. If these employers continue to rat on small business they will create many problems in the future. I am not referring to the Confederation of WA Industry or the chamber of commerce because they have worked their guts out for small business. I am talking about the big boys in the Eastern States who do their own private deals.

This policy of termination pay will involve an increasing burden and, therefore, small businesses will continue to close their doors and get rid of their employees.

I said previously that when I was in business—and this probably applied to other members when they were in business—we boasted about the number of people we employed. It was a matter of pride to tell people at meetings, etc., that one employed, in my case, 20 people. If one goes to business meetings now and someone says they are employing only two people the response is, "You are a lucky devil, how do you manage that?" It is a matter of pride to say how few people one employs, not how many one employs. These additional burdens and costs are crucifying small business.

The Government members, with great pleasure, have told the House that the Government has reduced FID from 0.05 per cent to 0.03 per cent. The tax should never have been introduced in the first place, and certainly not at 0.05 per cent. Our prophecies have proved correct and the Government has admitted that it made a mistake.

As far as the Opposition is concerned, when talking about encouraging employment and trying to persuade people to employ more young people, we put forward a genuine amendment to the industrial relations legislation. It appears that the Government will not accept that, even though we were trying to encourage the increased employment of young people.

On the subject of the cost of youth unemployment and the reasons the Opposition brought forward these proposals, I draw the Government's attention to the youth wage employment and labour force report. I cannot obtain a complete copy of that report; I have only sections of it. As I understand it, the report is not used by the Government, but it contains a number of very important statements as follows—

- (a) Youth employment has been adversely affected by the increase since the 1970s in youth wages relative to adult wages.
- (b) Young people have not benefited from the enormous growth in public sector employment.
- (c) Trade union work restrictions may have an adverse effect on youth employment in some industries.

That is not my report; it is a very important authenticated report. The next quote is as follows—

- (d) Industrial tribunals have not paid any regard to the adverse effects their de-

cisions may have on youth unemployment.

In relation to the levels of youth or junior pay, I quote from *Nature*, volume 309, of 3 May 1984. The heading of the article is "Australian technology: Jones and Hawke make hay". Reference is made to a report prepared by Mr Jones—the draft national technology strategy report—in which the following appears—

Many of the recommendations in this paper are politically sensitive, including the proposal for a review of union attitudes to adult apprenticeships. The effect on training of minimum wages for juniors and the previously sacrosanct doctrine of "comparative wage justice" in which "equal work" attracts equal pay regardless of the industry or its capacity to pay.

That is a very important statement. It makes a strong reference to the high cost of junior labour today, and implies that people simply cannot afford to meet the costs.

When the Government gives further consideration to the industrial relations Bill, it ought to take into account the amendments put forward by the Opposition, and the comments I have made about youth employment. It should take into account the high Government costs and the Government imposts on small businesses. People are saying, "I have made enough money to retire. I will lock the door and never employ people again". That is going on every day of the week. If many of the members of this House who previously employed people over a number of years, were to leave the Parliament, I doubt that they would start a business again and employ many people. I would not. Why should I bother? Why should I have all the problems? That is a sad reflection on our situation.

When Mr Dowding made his statement about employment, he criticised the Opposition. It is a pity that Government members, including the Leader of this House and his colleagues like Hon. Mr Piantadosi, cling to the old ideas and flatly refuse to make any changes. Mr Dowding said that the Opposition just indulged in union bashing at every possible opportunity. Any time anyone on this side of the House has the temerity to say that the system should be changed, one hears screams from heaven saying "You are attacking the unions. You are union bashing". That is not the case. We have a right to criticise—in fact, we have a responsibility to criticise if a system costs jobs and forces thousands of people out of work.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: I like the analogy of the screams from heaven. I suppose you are putting us with the deities.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I hope one day I shall be up there, looking down at Hon. Kay Hallahan stoking the fires!

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are not continually union bashing. We are simply saying that the system must be changed.

Hon. Garry Kelly: You are making a very good impression of union bashing.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We could say that members of the Government are employer bashing or builder bashing, but we do not use those expressions. We are too gentle to make those sorts of statements. We do not think that is the way to improve the situation; we do not agree with bashing. Members opposite should be ashamed of themselves for using those tactics.

Only last week, I attended a meeting in Perth to hear a talk by a very senior officer from a department in Malaysia. He was encouraging people to invest in Malaysia, and he explained what went on. He said, "We will help you. Come to us and we will encourage you. We will guarantee you a good reliable work force". People are going to Malaysia in droves, and some of them are from Australia.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Where are the people going in droves?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: To Malaysia. They are not coming to Australia. They are going to Malaysia from all parts of the world, simply because of the attitude of the Malaysian Government, and its encouragement of people to go to that country. That applies particularly to businesses, because the Government guarantees good employment arrangements, exemptions, and the like.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It seems to me that Malaysian money is coming here. The Malaysians seem to be happy with our investment policies.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is untrue. I am glad the honourable member is back; I hardly recognised him! I suggest to the honourable member and his friends that we should realise how much we are falling down. We must have a change in attitude and a change in our system.

Hon. Garry Kelly: By lowering wages and conditions!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That sort of statement is so pathetic, so stupid, so ridiculous! I suggest that the member should go out into the workplace and talk to the young people who are suffering and

who have no jobs, instead of being so insensitive or thick-headed as not to be able to move from a system which is corrupt and outdated.

Our present system is out of date. In supporting that system, Government members are encouraging a decadent, repressive, coercive, and corrupt industrial relations system.

Several members interjected.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: By their total commitment to this system and their flat refusal to accept any changes, they condemn the most important group in our community to everlasting unemployment.

The sort of statement made by Mr Dowding is not the sort of statement which should be made by a Minister. It simply demonstrates his absolute commitment to this outdated, corrupt industrial relations system.

Hon. Tom Stephens: What will you do?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I have told Mr Stephens what I will do, and when the Bill comes back, I will tell him again.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Apart from the unruly and rude interjections, there are far too many audible conversations. I am finding it difficult to determine to which of them to listen.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Government has undertaken a magnificent con job, which was well-planned and well-constructed. Instead of being very careful about Government charges and taxes, the Government is taking more money from the community, and particularly from the business sector.

There are small payroll tax and FID concessions, which are commendable, but which are nowhere near sufficient to encourage employment, especially of young people, and to help overcome the problems that need to be overcome in our community.

Unless we are prepared to change our system, our methods, and our attitudes, we will be a second-rate nation in the area of the world in which we live; other nations will overtake us at a very fast rate. If Government members have any doubt about that they should see what is happening in Malaysia and perhaps take a few lessons from that country. Perhaps then we will go forward rather than standing still, or perhaps even moving backwards.

HON. ROBERT HETHERINGTON (South-East Metropolitan) [8.01 p.m.]: I am tempted to comment on some of the remarks just made by the Leader of the Opposition, but I will not do that and instead will take this opportunity to correct an impression that was given in the Press this morn-

ing about something I said when talking to the Equal Opportunity Bill. I suppose it shows that one should never reply to an interjection in the middle of a debate.

Hon. P. G. Pental: We will accept your apology and so will the vice-chancellors.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: Sometimes one might not choose one's words precisely and then the Press, by using slightly different words, finishes up with headlines different from what one thought one said and what one meant to say. In the centre of this morning's edition of *The West Australian* the following can be found

MLC blasts university heads over bias on campus

The heads of the University of WA and Murdoch University were "biased, discriminatory and back in the dark ages" . . .

I have been contacted by the vice-chancellors

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I would have thought that when a member was trying to correct something like this he would not be subjected to that sort of raucous nonsense from the other side of the House. I have learnt not to expect much better from Mr Wordsworth.

I have been contacted by the two vice-chancellors and I assured them both that in neither case was I referring to them individually or at all. What I said last night was--

The people at present running universities in this State are discriminatory, biased, and way back in the dark ages in many ways.

I was referring to the collectivity of the people who run the universities, because universities are not run by any one person. Certainly last night I had no evidence at all of the attitude of either vice-chancellor towards women and discrimination against women. I am a little better informed now because I have spoken with both of them.

Professor Willson believes that his attitudes are not those the Press article said I attributed to him.

Professor Street has informed me that he has quite positive attitudes, not unlike my own, about the need to encourage the employment of women in universities. I was pleased by that and he gave me ample evidence to support his statement, so I was very glad to accept his assurances that this was his attitude.

I make it clear that I was not referring to either Professor Willson or Professor Street when I made my remarks last night.

The attitudes of many of the people on many of the councils of universities—I do not mean the university senates; that is something on which I would not comment at this stage—have biased attitudes and ideas which tend in some ways to be back in the dark ages.

I hope the Press might be prepared to point out that I did not mean to cast aspersions on either vice-chancellor, because had I meant to do so I would have been quite specific. In this case I have no evidence to suggest that the attitudes of either of those august gentlemen are anything but reasonable.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have already indicated to honourable members that there is far too much audible conversation. I expect them to cease carrying on in that way.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: As I am speaking about universities I will take this opportunity to indicate that we have some real problems with our universities. They are facing a crisis in funding and a similar crisis with students. As the student populations tend to fall because funding is not sufficient to keep up the student population, and as students vary from faculty to faculty, we sometimes find that staff become redundant. This means that universities must take a close look at their role in the modern world. I will not pursue this matter at present, but it is something that has given me great concern.

To go back to what I was saying earlier, someone did say to me rather bitterly, "Do you mean to say that there is no prejudice against women at WAIT or at the WA College of Advanced Education?" I did not mean to say that at all. Hon. Ian Medcalf asked me specifically about universities. I have no doubt that at both WAIT and the WA College of Advanced Education, as in the rest of the community, there is plenty of prejudice against women and plenty of room for improvement in attitudes.

One of the tendencies in our society has been that with the growth of science we have tried to categorise people: in the last 100 years or so we have tended to categorise people and to put the people we find embarrassing out of sight. We like to put them in little boxes and file them away. Nowhere has this been more evident than with the physically and mentally handicapped people in our community.

Hon. Graham Edwards: That will change.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: Yes, and that is one of the areas I want to mention because it is one of the very positive things being done by this Government; it is something that has interested me for some time. As members who

have cared to follow my career would know, during the time of the last Parliament, when the member for Armadale (Mr Bob Pearce) was shadow Minister for Education, succeeding me in that position after I was "demoted" by my illustrious deputy leader here—

Hon. P. G. Pendar: He does not look repentant, either.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: There is no reason that he should be. When I was shadow Minister before Mr Pearce, and when I succeeded him as convener of the State Executive of the ALP's education committee, it was my interest and pleasure to preside over changes to our platform on special education. Since then further changes have come about and I have been able to assist and watch as my colleague, Mr Pearce, has introduced new policies which he announced recently and which are incorporated in this Budget.

It is announced in the Budget that provision has been made for an extra 25 teachers and 32 teacher aides to be employed to work with handicapped children. This might seem little enough, but it is a good provision.

Now, one of the things which happened—and I am not saying that people in the Education Department or people in previous Governments are to be castigated or abused about this, because it was perceived wisdom of the times—was that the notion grew that it was an advance when one institutionalised handicapped children and that they should be categorised and segregated in special schools. This is a change which has come about under the previous Government. Now, it is not a change which is criticised by this Government; it is a change which was growing up among the experts who have dealt with special education over the past many years.

I became aware of it when I became specially interested in the Education portfolio. I became convinced that what we should do as far as possible was to integrate handicapped children into the normal community. This is the policy which began, after the last Government, in the Health Department, for people with problems. It was designed to integrate them into society wherever possible. It is a policy which has now been adopted more fully by the present Government, and the present Minister for Education.

I hope that the name "special school" is about to disappear and that we will talk about education support centres, because that is what we need. We need specialists to give educational support to children in need of that support.

The physically handicapped in some ways are simpler to deal with than are the intellectually

handicapped. In some ways, it is expensive; they are either young people or children in wheelchairs. Proper ramps are needed in the schools. Often buildings have to be changed so that children can get around the schools better. Some have various problems and need nursing assistance so support services must be provided in the schools. This costs money, and raises problems.

Of course, with the intellectually handicapped there are even greater problems, and where these problems have been tackled by various schools, they have proved to be worthwhile. I went to one school in my previous electorate and found that they had integrated a class of deaf children into the school. They brought them into the school and made them part of it. This had been done by the principal, against the wishes of the parents. Sometimes public opinion is against one when one does something. However, by the time I was there, the special class—the integrated class—was their pride and joy. The adults were fully supportive and they were glad it had happened.

These people need to be integrated for a number of reasons, firstly for their own benefit. People with handicaps need to lead as full a life as possible. They need to be able to join in community activities, as far as possible. It has been found that it is possible to get intellectually handicapped children who are capable of catching buses and of shopping, swimming, and doing a whole range of things, to the stage that in due course, when they become adults, they are able to live in the community and look after themselves, not, one might think, as well as we do; but at least they have some independence.

The fact that they are associating with normal children—for want of a better word—or non-handicapped children—we all tend to have handicaps at various times so we may say “able bodied”, but I am not sure about “able minded”—

Hon. Graham Edwards: You have to speak for yourself there!

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: That is true. These young people benefit from their association with people who have skills and abilities which are not theirs, but which they may grow towards acquiring.

Just as important is the fact that the able-bodied children in the ordinary schools quite often meet for the first time people who are different from themselves. I had my first experience of intellectually handicapped children in about 1978 when I went to Britain. While I was there, I went around various special schools and met my first group of handicapped children. I say with no great pride that I shrank from them when they wanted

to touch me. I did not really want them to do that, but when they did, I found it did not hurt; I found it was all right and that they were people as I was a person. In some of the schools I have been to since, I have grown to know the children. They are people with their own needs—

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Often they are responsive people.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: Often they are highly responsive and there are all sorts of friendliness which a lot of people do not find out about, because they do not want to go near them because they are strange, different, or not like other people.

I have a holistic view of society. I believe we should integrate our society as far as possible. We should all in some sense be our brother's keeper. We should all put up with each other. It is important that we all do this, because many times our fears are fears of people we have not met. They are often fears of people who in some way are different from us. Sometimes they are fear of people which come out in some racial arguments—fears of people whose skin colour or eye shapes are different from ours. Sometimes it is fear of people who speak a different language and we cannot understand them, and because we cannot understand them and they cannot understand us, we tend to think they are stupid. We have all kinds of fears which quite often melt when we do grasp the nettle and meet people who are different from us.

I was quite interested to meet a young woman once—this may interest Mr Masters—who had travelled a great deal and who came across a lot of wharf labourers who were strong unionists. I asked her, “What do you think of them?” because she was middle class and previously had not met such people. She said, “Beaut people. I like them. I have met them and they have always been friendly and good to me”. She had a feeling only of warmth and friendliness for the people who worked on the wharves.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: It was probably Mr Dans' wife to whom you were talking.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: No, it was not Mr Dans' wife; it was somebody quite different, and someone who was quite young, comparatively speaking.

The Education Department has begun this process of integration. Mr Gayfer will be pleased to know this, and it should not surprise us, that it has proven easiest to begin this process of integration in smaller country towns. This is because people in smaller country towns have a feeling of community when dealing with each other. They are

prepared to tolerate each other and to understand each other's problems.

I am not suggesting that this is an innate part of a country person; I am suggesting that it derives from the kind of community one finds in country towns where people need to rely on each other and to have this feeling of belonging to a community. The lack of this feeling is one of the great losses in big cities. I do not think some people from rural areas always realise the effect of the loss of that sense of community in large developing cities and the problems this brings to people. However, I do not want to go into that aspect at present.

What is happening is that some profoundly retarded children who were institutionalised, have now been put into special schools, and some of the less profoundly retarded children will move into special classes. People will be put where they need to be and will be given the support they need.

In due course, when we have a properly working education system—if we ever get one, because it is very expensive and difficult to achieve—we will have a system which recognises that every child has special needs, and under which those needs will be looked after to some extent, and enable each child to have his or her own programme. That is a long way ahead, and we must work towards it step by step.

I am quite overjoyed about, and I pay full credit unreservedly and wholeheartedly to my colleague, the Minister for Education (Mr Pearce) for his success in beginning the development of this policy. I thought we would not be able to set it in place for many years. I hoped we might be able to work towards it in the next Parliament, but we are moving into it in this Parliament. Whatever Mr Masters might say about the Government's deficiencies, I assure him that in one area, this Government is doing something entirely laudable in my opinion, and it gives me a great deal of joy.

I mentioned last night, and I repeat, that we are worried about the whole problem of the disabled. I do not want to go into this too far because my friend and colleague Hon. Graham Edwards can speak for himself and he is chairing a committee to look into these problems. I think that in one way, we are lucky to have in the Parliament a person with a disability who can make us aware—

Hon. Graham Edwards: What do you mean in one way? In many ways!

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I admit the honourable gentleman is entirely a joy, but I would rather he were not disabled. As he is, he can bring home to us some of the things we take too lightly and too much for granted. He is prepared to speak his mind and that is a good thing.

We all have biases and prejudices and ingrained beliefs with which we have grown up, whether they be in reference to women or any kind of person who is different from us, and we need to do something about it. This was one of the aspects which worried me some years ago in relation to the Tresillian business when people of goodwill took handicapped children from a rather cruddy, but nice home with a homely atmosphere in Nedlands and put them in a situation which a Minister described as having something of the same quality as a first-class motel. Who wants to live in a first-class motel? This was one of the problems. We must not put people in first-class motels, but in homes. We must integrate people in the community and develop a sense of community in our society. This is something we are beginning to do and it is one of the aspects I find laudable in postwar Perth—we are beginning to develop in our local government authorities a sense of responsibility for more than rates and rubbish. They are beginning to develop a sense of responsibility towards people, and they are in one sense, and a good sense, beginning to become the centres of local communities. That is highly desirable.

We need to develop new services in a whole range of areas because in many ways we make life difficult for people as the great dormitory suburbs spread out. People develop needs which perhaps they did not have in simpler, smaller, more compact communities where they had a feeling of belonging and where there were people who would look after them.

One of the things which happens in a place like Western Australia and of which I am aware because I am a migrant from 'other side—from South Australia—is that the children lose their families when they come here. This happened to my children. They had no grandparents and were without uncles and aunts, and I think this was a grave loss to them. The kinds of things which families do for each other, such as the way they rally immediately in times of trouble, must be provided in another way in a society which has a highly mobile population which has lost its immediate kith and kin. This is building up a deficiency. So-called progress is not always necessarily a good thing. Sometimes we have to replace things which get lost along the wayside.

For this reason, I am also tremendously pleased to see provision in the community welfare section of the Budget for 17 more child care centres. I am not claiming that these centres are enough or that they will meet all the needs of the community, but they will go some way towards meeting those needs.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: To the great cost of Ngala Mothercraft Home, unfortunately, despite the assurance of Mrs Hallahan.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: The member has put that twice across the Chamber. It is something I do not know very much about, but I will speak to him later.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: He does not want to speak, because I made that offer to him last night.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: Whether or not he wants to speak to me, I will speak to him. If he will not speak to me, I will speak to someone else.

Hon. Kay Hallahan interjected.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I will still seek the information. There may be perfectly good reasons. I have come across a case, which I will not name, where a perfectly deserving body lost funds it is not Ngala, but somewhere else according to the policies which are good policies, but I think a small anomaly has crept in. I am not sure I can do anything about it, but these things happen. We will probably find that some voluntary bodies which deal with disabled people will get less funds because the department is doing more positive things and spending the money in another way. These are matters we must look at as they develop.

We need to provide a range of services and it is no good our being, as many people are at times, moralistic about parents who go to work and who neglect their children. I hear this story quite often. If some parents did not go to work, they would beat their children because they would be frustrated.

Mention has been made of increased ulcers among working women. We should also mention the increase in neuroses among non-working women. This is one of the things that has been happening in our urban society for various reasons. We therefore need to look at the provision of greater services and support. There are about 5 000 children in the metropolitan area whose parents go to work and leave them at home. They are predominantly working-class parents who urgently need the money. They do not go to work just to improve their lifestyle. They work to get the necessities, and they leave their children locked up at home.

It is no use our saying, "This is not a worry of the State and these people should stay at home; it is terrible that women go to work". If that is happening, we must do something about the children. We cannot force parents who do not want to do something about their children or who are not capable of looking after their children to do so.

We must provide alternatives. In a complex urban society, we have complex urban problems and we must provide individual services which were not necessary in simpler communities. Some of the services may have been necessary, of course, in simpler communities, but we did not recognise the need.

I want to pay credit to the Government. I believe that, in the restructuring of the Department for Community Welfare and matters relating to community services, we may see improvements in our community services. I suppose that we will also see mistakes being made as we develop the policies. Perhaps some money will be wasted as a result of mistakes, and, no doubt, Hon. Gordon Masters will get up and complain about that. No doubt, we will also see improvements in this area under a very concerned and caring Minister in Hon. Keith Wilson who, I think, is doing an excellent job, bearing in mind the enormous workload which he has with his portfolios.

I want to record my pleasure that we are doing some good and useful things, and things which I regard as being highly important. We are moving away from the idea of categorisation and segregation back to the idea of integration.

I was at a primary school in my electorate the other day and some elderly women from a home came in, and children read to them. They spoke to the children about life as it used to be. That is good for the elderly and it is good for the children because children really need to associate with older people who live outside their immediate family. I think an important thing about grandparents is that they tend to back up their grandchildren against the parents and make allies of their grandchildren. They can give each other support and the kind of advice that, perhaps, parents cannot give because I do not think that parents are omnipotent. I do not think that they are all-knowing either!

I was a little sad to hear Hon. Gordon Masters talk about how he could solve the unemployment problem.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I did not say that I would solve it; I said I would go part of the way.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I will not enter into that argument with the member because I have already said it before. However, I am pleased to hear that the Opposition benches are worrying about unemployment. I remember that, in 1977, in one of my earlier speeches, I expressed concern about unemployment. I have watched unemployment figures grow and grow. Somehow we must try to cut those figures back. It will not be simple because, if we are wise, we must do two

things simultaneously. As we develop new technologies, we will obtain more capital equipment which will do the work of many people. One, therefore, cannot but cut down on the work force. This is happening in our society. It will continue to happen although we are creating new jobs in order that the new technology might be built. At the same time, we must face the fact—this is something we must bear in mind—that half the population is not now under 35 years of age. The population is ageing as the birthrate drops. That might be just as well, in due course, because we will have a top-heavy section of the population which will have to be supported by a minority of the population using new technology.

That may mean that we can keep our retired people happy and get back to full employment in due course. I wish we could find a means of getting back to it now.

I have no doubt that, if it were possible to stage a conventional war—of course it is very difficult with nuclear weapons—we could achieve full employment again. However, I think that method is now beyond us.

Hon. Tom Stephens: The Americans, with their build-up of arms, are boosting their economy.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: Yes, that is true.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: What about the other side? What are the Russians doing?

Hon. D. K. Dans: Their economy is very bad.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: All that was said is that America's build-up of arms is boosting its economy. I wish we could find a way, in our kind of society, to boost our economy. After all, we look to the American society because it is the most advanced capitalist society in the world. Ours, too, is a capitalist society. We could solve our problems with a revolution. However, I do not think anybody on this side of the House is suggesting that.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Not while you are in Government, anyway.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: We did not suggest it while we were in Opposition, either.

I know that, within the capitalist framework, we might be able to have a democratic socialist modification of that society. In a democracy, when we achieve one in this State, we must go with the populace. We cannot allow ourselves to get too far ahead of them.

Hon. Tom McNeil: How come you were elected?

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: The gentleman asked how I was elected.

Hon. G. E. Masters: How are you getting on? Are you having a fine time over there?

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: Yes, I am. I was trying to pick up the interjection.

There is a quaint view held by some people, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree, that if someone is elected to govern a country, that country is a democracy. I have pointed out that there was one kind of election in Nazi Germany and one kind of election in Stalin's Russia; they were not democracies. We have a system of elections in this House, yet this House is not democratic in the way that I would define "democracy". I know that, whatever other members might think, the Leader of the Opposition will not want them to define "democracy" because it will take about three lectures to define it and we do not have that time tonight. I will spare him that.

It gives me great pleasure to support the Budget. It gives me pleasure also to pay tribute—a greater tribute than I thought I would pay at one stage—to the Premier of this State who, I think, is a highly responsible and very capable person. We are stepping down a very quiet, sure road in a quiet, modest, and modified way. I think he is leading this Government very surely. I feel confident that we will stay in Government a long time while we have Hon. Brian Burke leading us, because he is one of those interesting politicians who can face the fact that he does not know everything, and he is not unduly arrogant. He is prepared to seek advice. Seeking advice seems to be something which the Leader of the Opposition seemed to think earlier, is not a good thing. I probably know the advisers about whom the Leader of the Opposition was talking earlier somewhat better than he does. I found them on the whole to be very useful, excellent, and sensible people. In other words, I think that the introduction of advisers has proved to be very useful. I believe that it has been one of those things which had to come sooner or later. I am sure that, if the Leader of the Opposition gets back into Government before he retires from this House, he will find it useful to have advisers on his staff.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I said it was useful to have a limited number. I did not talk about an army.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: It is hardly an army. I think some of the people who have been appointed as advisers have proved to be very useful. Many of the people walking around this Parliament when Parliament is in session are not advisers; they are public servants. They are good and capable people in whom I have every confidence. One of the great joys I have found

since I was elected to this Parliament, is that so many public servants in high places used to be my students.

I think the State is in good hands. I commend the Government for its Budget and I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. V. J. Ferry.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Bail Amendment Bill.
Bill returned from the Assembly with an amendment.
2. Acts Amendment (Insolvent Estates) Bill.
Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY BILL

In Committee

Resumed from 23 October. The Chairman of Committees (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) in the Chair; Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

Postponed clause 14: Partnerships—

Progress was reported after the clause had been partly considered.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I move the following amendments

Page 14, line 7—Insert after the words “unlawful for” the passage “6 or more persons being”.

Page 14, line 17 Insert after the word “partnership” the passage “consisting of 6 or more partners”.

Page 14, line 26 Insert after the word “partnership” the passage “consisting of 6 or more partners”.

The Committee will recall that last evening, after substantial discussion on this clause, I undertook to obtain directions on an amendment to this and associated provisions, an amendment which would have the effect of limiting the application of the Bill so far as partnerships were concerned to partnerships with six or more partners. This was intended to bring the provisions into line with the provisions of the Commonwealth sex discrimination legislation.

The amendment to this clause and the other amendments which have previously been circulated to clauses 40 and 57 are all designed to achieve that single purpose, and I need explain nothing further about them.

I take the opportunity to correct an error on my part, an error which emerged during the course of yesterday's debate. I said then that the Victorian legislation did not in any way limit the sort of partnership to which the comparable Victorian legislation applied. That was wrong and I have since been informed that the Victorian Bill is in fact restricted to partnerships of three or more members.

Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I thoroughly approve of these amendments and I commend the Government for moving them. The amendments achieve part of the object which I espoused last night: the object really is that small partnerships, relying as they do on the very close association and the necessary trust and confidence which members of small partnerships must have in one another, should not be subjected to the full force of the Equal Opportunity Bill.

I noted the Attorney's comments about the Victorian Bill. I was not aware of that position, although I was aware that, in some of the other States and particularly in the Commonwealth, small partnerships have been excluded.

These amendments will be beneficial in the sense that most partnerships will now be exempted from the requirements of the Act, as indeed will the smaller businesses and professional partnerships which find it is more difficult in some respects to comply with strict requirements. In the circumstances, I certainly support the amendments.

Amendments put and passed.

Postponed clause, as amended, put and passed.

Postponed clause 40: Partnerships—

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I move the following amendments—

Page 34, line 1—Insert after the words “unlawful for” the passage “6 or more persons being”.

Page 34, line 11 Insert after the word “partnership” the passage “consisting of 6 or more partners”.

Page 34, line 19—Insert after the word “partnership” the passage “consisting of 6 or more partners”.

Amendments put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Postponed clause 57: Partnerships—

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I move the following amendments

Page 46, line 10—Insert after the words “unlawful for” the passage “6 or more persons being”.

Page 46, line 20—Insert after the word “partnership” the passage “consisting of 6 or more partners”.

Page 46, line 29—Insert after the word “partnership” the passage “consisting of 6 or more partners”.

Hon. TOM KNIGHT: I raised these points, and I spoke on them rather strongly last night. I take the information given by the Attorney General and by my colleague, the Hon. I. G. Medcalf as being a step in the right direction. I am not totally happy with the situation because it means that legislation is being imposed on business people in regard to how they will run their businesses and with whom they will enter into business arrangements. However, if I remember correctly, the Attorney General said last night that if we do not accept the proposals that he intended to look at and which are now before us tonight, we would have to operate under the Federal legislation which would cover this particular point. On that aspect, if that is the case, I have no other alternative but to go along with what he said. I would just like clarification on a point. If we do not support the amendments as put before us this evening, would we then be subject to the Federal legislation which apparently is the same as the amendments put before us tonight? Is that correct?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I did attempt to clarify this position yesterday. The position is that if the amendments to clause 14 had not been carried by this Chamber, the same area would be covered by the Commonwealth sex discrimination legislation. However, we are now dealing with clause 57. I indicated yesterday that that is a different area and one which is not covered by the Commonwealth legislation. The reason for making similar amendments to clauses 40 and 57—

Hon. Tom Knight: To tie it in with clause 14?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: —is to keep our own State Bill consistent internally.

Amendments put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

RESTRAINT OF DEBTORS BILL

Assembly's Amendments

Amendments made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) in the Chair; Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments made by the Legislative Assembly are as follows—

Clause 12.

Page 9, lines 22 and 23—Delete the words “bring the debtor” and substitute the words—“cause the debtor to be brought”.

Clause 25.

Page 18, lines 2 to 6—Delete clause 25 and substitute the following clause—

25. A member of the Police Force or other person on whom a power is conferred or duty is imposed under this Act is not personally liable in civil proceedings, and the Crown is not liable, for any act done or default made by him in good faith for the purpose, or purportedly for the purpose, of carrying this Act into effect.

I will handle this as a global amendment.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I move—

That the amendments made by the Assembly be agreed to.

The proposed amendment to clause 12 is to prevent a difficulty in administration which has come to notice since the Bill was before the Chamber. Leaving out irrelevant areas, I point out that clause 12 provides in part that—

The officer in charge of a police station to which a debtor is brought in accordance with Section 11(2)(c) shall—

- (b) except where he releases the debtor from custody under Section 13(a) or (b), bring the debtor before the court specified for that purpose . . .

It has been pointed out that this could require the particular officer in charge to personally bring that person before the court, and that could be a matter of great inconvenience from an administrative point of view. It is proposed to overcome that by replacing the requirement that the particular officer should bring the debtor before the court with a requirement that that officer should cause the debtor to be brought before the court.

It will be obvious to members that this will allow that procedure to be implemented by either the officer in charge or by any other officer.

The proposed amendment to clause 25 arises from the fact that a further reading of this proposed section indicates that the protection provided to members of the Police Force in the execution of their duties under the Act relates only to part of their activities and could leave them at risk in other respects. In keeping with the general approach of the Police Act and others, it is now

proposed that a policeman acting bona fide in the exercise of his authority and duties under the Act should be protected in all respects from civil liability.

Hon. J. G. MEDCALF: The Opposition has no objection to these amendments which have been inserted in the Legislative Assembly. They protect the police and are sensible amendments where the police are carrying out their duties in a proper manner.

Having been deprived of the opportunity of being present when this Bill was considered by the Chamber, I would like to draw attention to the fact that the Bill substantially follows the design of legislation which was prepared by the last Government. I authorised a Cabinet minute in the middle of 1982 for the preparation of this Bill following the report of the Law Reform Commission, in order to carry out that report. Parliamentary Counsel was instructed to prepare the Bill. I have reason to believe the Bill was substantially prepared at about the time we went out of office.

It has been slightly changed by the present Government in that it has added, very sensibly I believe, a part of the Bill which deals with the freezing of assets of people who may be going overseas. This is an interesting area of the law and I think it is proper that it should be included in the Bill.

The amendments are entirely in line with our other intentions in relation to the legislation, and we support the proposal.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments agreed to.

Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

DENTAL PROSTHETISTS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 September.

HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [9.16 p.m.]: In speaking to this Bill, I remind members that it is an important piece of legislation. It is important because it is related to dental health, and as such I believe it demands our attention. I say that it is important, but I do not want members to think that I agree with all that is in the Bill. When we are dealing with health matters, whether dental or medical, we must make that little extra effort to ensure we get good legislation. If we produce bad legislation in the health area, the community is drastically affected. It is

very important that we look at this Bill as a health Bill.

There is a problem with the legislation because in some ways it ignores a very important area; that is, the provision of adequate safeguards for the proper health of those it purports to support. During my study of this Bill in recent days, I came across a report put out by a council of State Governments in Lexington, Kentucky. The report was headed "State Regulatory Policies, Dentistry and the Health Profession". In chapter 3, it discusses a suggested dental practices Act. The task force went on to produce a model dental Bill covering all facets of dental services.

It drew attention to a very important problem which exists when one is considering a Bill such as that before the House. It recognises that a practitioner in the free enterprise system provides a service and that a dilemma exists between the needs of the practice of health and those of the individuals being served. The report goes on to say—

Restrictions on a free economy can bar practitioners from earning a livelihood, create an artificial scarcity of services, and dilute healthy competition.

On the other hand, the report says—

...the unregulated practice of the health professions can endanger the public's health and safety.

In trying to analyse a Bill such as this, the Government was faced with the dilemma of allowing these areas to go free and unfettered and it was also faced with the danger that may be caused to health. There will be a danger to healthy competition if regulations are enforced, and on the other hand, there will be danger to public health and safety if they are not enforced.

Hon. Garry Kelly: What about the other States which have this legislation? How did they get on?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: That is what one would call an intelligent interjection! The member has obviously not listened to what I have said. Firstly, I am laying down the premise for consideration of a Bill such as this. The member obviously does not want me to support it because he is already confronting me about it.

The task force to which I have referred represents 50 States. They came up with a premise for the committee to work on and it is worth listening to it, and giving it some consideration.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Did you say 50 States?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Yes, I did say 50 States because I am referring to a report from Kentucky which is a State of the United States of America.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is a backward State.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The report states that as a working premise, it was decided that suggested legislation on the licensing of dental practitioners should contain only provisions which bear a direct and substantial relation to the protection of public health and safety. It may well be that although it was very quiet in the House, some members did not hear that premise. However, it is an important premise and it is one which was applauded and used to form a model Bill which was presented to a number of States.

Often there is an argument that we should have a model in approaching areas of health. The principles adopted by the task force are very good and they should be considered in the review of this legislation.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Do you say that this Bill does not do that?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I would like to challenge members in this Chamber, in terms of the review of this piece of legislation, that they consider the high ideals which the task force, to which I have referred, had in mind in order to provide for the area of safety and public health.

To make certain that members may not go off on another tangent by interjecting like Hon. Garry Kelly did, I indicate that I will not be opposing the principle of allowing dental technicians to undertake dental work on the public if they have adequate qualifications and that the public are adequately protected in terms of safety and health.

I am quite happy to debate various matters with members if they care to interject when I bring forward the points which I believe are important.

In areas where we are dealing with the safety and health of the public, we have a great responsibility. I would like members to rise a little bit over their personal prejudices tonight and to give fair consideration to the Bill which is before the House.

Before I leave the Kentucky report, I would like to quote from sections 404 and 405 on page 23 of the report where it refers to the premise concerning dental auxiliaries, technicians, or prosthetists. It reads as follows—

Secs. 404 and 405. These sections represent the task force's approach to the troublesome issue of denturism —

This word often comes up in literature on dental technicians. The report indicates that it is a troublesome area.

Hon. Garry Kelly: For the dentist.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I expect that we will hear a speech from Hon. Garry Kelly at some later

stage, or has he not read the Bill or done any research?

Hon. Tom Stephens: He does a lot of work on Bills.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The report continues—

It is essentially a compromise, but a compromise arrived at by strict adherence to the self-imposed criteria of measuring any regulatory decision against a public health need.

The report went on to explain the role of the dental technician, firstly in terms of his mechanical ability, and that is the area we are talking about in this Bill; that is, the extended area of dealing with the public.

Members will recognise that there are two areas. One refers to dentists being involved and the other refers to the harm which may be caused to the patient. The report reads as follows—

A patient whose denture does not properly fit will have discomfort at the very least or health problems at worst. *The dentist may fit the appliance or fitting may be done by the dental prosthetic auxiliary, but only under the direct supervision of the dentist. Direct supervision requires that the dentist check and approve the work performed by an auxiliary before the patient is dismissed. This is consistent with the responsibility for overall patient care assigned to a dentist . . .*

That is how one group viewed the situation and dealt with this important area.

One matter which concerns me is that despite the fact that we not only have the Kentucky Council of State Governments example, but also other examples throughout the world—and this research would have been available in regard to this Bill—none of them appear to have been considered. Sadly, in this Bill, no protection has been given or consideration made in terms of public health. The Bill provides for a dental technician who has been operating for the past five years to be registered and allows him to carry out work on patients in regard to both partial and full dentures. That is not what is suggested by those people who have considered similar Bills in other parts of the world.

Hon. Garry Kelly: What about the other States?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: If we are not to lose the premise of the provisions of the Bill which are related to public health, I believe that various sections of it should be amended to ensure that only qualified people can practice. This would mean

that the grandfather clause would have to be deleted.

Certain provisions of the Bill would need to be amended in order that we might recognise that there is a danger of having unqualified people fitting partial dentures. There is good reason to suggest that consideration should be made in the Bill to allow prosthetists to fit only full dentures. Furthermore, I believe we should give consideration to ensuring that people who work in the area of dental health are adequately and properly qualified. Therefore, they should be qualified, and the board has the major responsibility in that area.

I want to discuss these areas to some extent during the Committee stage. However, before reaching that stage we should look at some of the arguments of others in connection with them.

With further reference to the Kentucky report, I point out another statement made about the way in which people in that State dealt with this problem. On page 25 of the document, it states that—

During the 1977 and 1978 state legislative sessions, roughly one half the states rejected legislation that would have provided for the independent (unsupervised) practice denturism.

I am not proposing that the premises in some of the examples should be followed, but it demonstrates that in the United States one-half of the States would have defeated this Bill.

However, I have indicated that I am willing to support the registration of responsible dental technicians who are qualified to operate in the area of dental health. One of the sad parts about this Bill is that it does nothing for the majority of dental technicians. In fact, it does not deal with the majority of dental technicians. It deals only with those dental technicians who wish to operate in the public area. It does not provide for registration or standards of qualification, or ensure any protection for the public from the majority of technicians.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Whom have you been talking to? Don't talk nonsense.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I would have thought Mr McKenzie could demonstrate his point.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Have you spoken to the technicians' society? What did that do?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am talking about technicians who will not become prosthetists and who wish to remain technicians. The Bill provides for the registration and endorsement of those who want to move into the area which deals with members of the public.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They do not have to.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am just defining the area and saying that the Bill does nothing for the remainder of dental technicians.

Hon. Mark Nevill: It does not change the status quo.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: Why not wait until the member has finished his speech?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: It would be interesting to look at the situation which prevails in Victoria, New South Wales, and Tasmania. Those States first established the provisions for registration of all dental technicians and for qualification standards. Thereafter they provided for technicians to progress and to operate within the public area. However, this Bill does not do that. It starts at the other end and provides for people who wish to deal with the public to be able to do so. In this State there are large numbers of dental technicians—I suppose something like 250 to 300.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: There is no way of knowing the figure.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Figures can be obtained from the Bureau of Statistics. One cannot get the exact figure because any bus conductor could become a dental technician, as could any parliamentarian, if he acquired the skills. Anyone can call himself a dental technician.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: In the future, there will be restrictions.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: In which clause?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I will tell you.

Hon. Mark Nevill: If anyone wants to deal directly with the public, there will be certain rules.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: A large number of dental technicians do not want to become dental prosthetists.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Are you saying that dental prosthetists are different from dental technicians?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Has the member read the Bill? If he had read the Bill he would see there is a difference. Before this Bill existed, there were no legal prosthetists in this State. If this Bill is passed, it will establish the definition of a dental prosthetist, as has happened in other States, even though they have different names. In Victoria, they are called advanced technicians. At the moment any person who acquires some skill can put up his shingle and call himself a dental technician. I do not think that is a good idea and it does nothing for the many technicians, who do a professional job. The Bill does nothing in that area.

Hon. Garry Kelly: You did nothing for nine years.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The member is talking about nine years already, but I was hoping that that point would come up later in the debate when I intended to raise it.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It is a good point. What did you do for nine years?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I refer once more to the recommendations from Kentucky; more than half the States of America, and a large percentage of people in the world, have recognised, when dealing with this kind of legislation, the desirability of leaving the responsibility for this type of work under the supervision of a dentist.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Talk about Australia and don't worry about the rest of the world.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I think it would be better to get nearer to home. In Victoria, the approach adopted was first to establish the registration of dental technicians. Having done that, Victoria provided for an advanced qualifications board which specified the difference between the two groups. In 1974 in New South Wales, initially dental technicians were allowed to deal in only limited areas. At a later stage, after having been registered for some time, they were allowed to extend into the area of dental prosthetics.

In South Australia, the legislation was referred to a Select Committee and passed by a Labor Government. The Bill recognised the fact that the dental technicians without qualifications could not move into the area. Initially, it was expected that 15 people would need to qualify under the grandfather clause. However, 20 people came forward and two courses were established to enable them to qualify. Once those courses are completed, the Bill will probably be promulgated. In that way, the South Australian Government is ensuring that people working in the area of public dental health are qualified before doing so.

A major problem in this Bill relates to qualifications. Under the amendments I will put to the Chamber, there will be no need for any dental technician who is adequately qualified to fear that he will not be registered. However, I cannot agree to a person with no qualifications being allowed to be registered as a dental prosthetist, unless someone examines him in a proper way. The dental technicians and the Opposition are not far apart on that matter. In letters they have written and in discussions I have had with them, they have insisted on the inclusion of the grandfather clause in the Bill. They have always indicated that they do not want unqualified people to be registered as dental prosthetists, however.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Under a grandfather clause, they would not be unqualified; they would be experienced dental technicians.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: We are talking about people who are experienced.

A letter I received on 27 August contained the following—

- (1) Grandfather Clause—our understanding is that there will be no automatic registration of any dental technician. An assessment will be made on application and a licence will only be granted to dental technicians who can prove their competence and ability to the standard set by the Committee, and have proved their competence to deal directly with the public.

This is a letter from the Australian Dental Technicians Association, and it continued—

Any applicant will need to have over 5 years experience in addition to trade training.

Some people jump up and down when I say that there is no necessity to require qualifications; but I suggest I am not poles apart from the dental technicians who argue on the interpretation of adequate qualifications. Their argument is that they want the grandfather clause in its present form.

The amendment I will put to the Committee ensures that the people who are accepted and licensed are adequately qualified.

Hon. Garry Kelly: You mean better qualifications?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I did not say "better qualifications". If the member had read the proposed amendments I circulated, he would be able to interject more intelligently.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. Robert Hetherington): You should ignore the member and talk to me.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Thank you, Mr Deputy President. I realise you are more intelligent so I will address my remarks to you.

In relation to the grandfather clause, a number of the health professions have spoken out, and the list is reasonably formidable. It includes the Australian Medical Association, the Australian Dental Association, the University of Western Australia, the Dental Therapy Association of Western Australia, the Physiotherapists Association of Western Australia, the Pharmaceutical Council of Australia, the Royal College of Dental Surgeons, the visiting professor from California, and the Council of Health Professionals. The South Australian Select Committee deliberated on this matter, and a large number of other bodies

have spoken on the subject and said that the legislation should not cover people unless it provides reasonable protection for the public against unqualified persons who would operate on the public.

I will just refer to one of the letters from a group of people involved in the dental area. Dental therapists must study for two years full-time and meet a number of other requirements. The letter from the dental therapists contains the following—

As you are aware, dental therapists have completed two years of tertiary level education at the Western Australian Institute of Technology in subjects such as human biology, histology, pathology, microbiology, radiography, clinical dentistry and dental technology, so that they can work directly on the general public under the supervision of the dentist.

We feel that particular aspects of the proposed legislation which will permit untrained people to carry out work directly in the mouth may lead to irreparable damage and endanger the safety of the patient.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: What has happened in the other States of Australia? Tell me about New South Wales, Tasmania, and Victoria.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I will deal with those in a moment. I will be happy for Hon. Fred McKenzie to take part in the debate later.

The association went on to say—

Our Association feels that the following amendments must be incorporated in the Bill:

- (1) There should be no automatic licensing of technicians without adequate training for those who have been operating illegally on the general public.
- (2) Technicians should not be able to supply partial dentures as incorrectly designed prostheses may damage the remaining teeth.
- (3) The provision of full dentures only after adequate biological training to ensure the safety and protection of the general public.

That letter was signed by Linda Andrews, the President of the Dental Therapy Association of WA (Inc.) and it was written on 23 August 1984. Inherent in that letter is the same type of argument which was used by the task force in Kentucky when it dealt with the safety and health of the clients.

Another important matter I will raise, and for which I will produce supporting evidence, deals

with partial dentures. The argument is whether one should allow a dental prosthetist to work in the area of full and partial dentures, or whether he should work in the area of full dentures only. I received a letter from Dr Robert Bowers, who is a periodontist—a gum doctor, it would seem. He is a consultant periodontist to Princess Margaret Hospital and the Royal Australian Air Force, a clinical senior lecturer in dental therapy at the Western Australian Institute of Technology, and a clinical lecturer in periodontology at the University of Western Australia. He wrote a letter to me on 24 September relating to the provision of partial dentures by prosthetists under the Dental Prosthetists Bill. In the letter, he expressed concern about the Bill, and he said—

I am greatly concerned for the well-being of the public if prosthetists are allowed to make partial dentures. As a periodontist my speciality in dentistry is concerned with the supporting structures of the teeth—the bone, the junction between the tooth and bone and the overlying soft tissues (the gums), and these tissues are directly affected by partial dentures.

In that passage, the specialist identified the area in which he has responsibility. He went on to say—

The condition of the periodontium will determine whether a tooth should be loaded and how heavily. A prosthetist will not be able to determine this.

It may well be that Hon. Fred McKenzie can tell me how he will be able to stop this. That is what the specialist is saying. I will be interested to hear from the specialist whom the Government is able to produce to say that that is incorrect. Dr Bowers went on to say—

The design of a partial denture determines direction of loading of the teeth and whether the tooth will be subjected to forces it is physiologically suited to stand, or whether damaging (rocking) forces are applied. Unless he is suitably trained, a prosthetist will not be familiar with design principles which determine loading.

This is the important area—

Possibly the most damaging forces on a tooth occur when the tooth, or something attached to it, is high in the bite. This will mean that even if a prosthetist does know where a tooth should be loaded he will not be able to provide such a partial denture because, since it will be illegal for him to remove tooth structure,—

Even under this Bill. To continue—

he cannot reduce the tooth to allow the ideal design to be implemented without being high in the bite.

These contradictions make it imperative that prosthetists not be permitted to make removable partial dentures. It would be unthinkable to allow prosthetists to reduce tooth structure as the Minister has acknowledged earlier by amending his own legislation.

It finishes

I would appreciate it if this letter could be presented to the Parliament so that any Member supporting the legislation will be aware of dangers to the public inherent in the proposed Dental Prosthetists Bill of 1984.

I have never set myself up as an authority on this matter and I do not consider myself, without advice, to be able to decide who should be a doctor or a dentist. That is not my area of expertise. I take advice. On this matter, the people who would be advising the Government would be those people involved in a whole range of dental services and medical services, and those people have spoken very strongly about this part of the Bill. We must consider what they have said. If members opposite can provide information which shows these experts to be wrong, I would be interested to see it.

The other important area of the Bill deals with the qualifications these people will need to be registered and licensed. Further, an advisory board is to be established, and one of its major functions will be the setting of examinations and the determining of qualifications. We are presented with two problems here, one dealing with qualifications and the other with the board which is to set them.

The situation in Victoria is that dental prosthetists must first complete an apprenticeship course of four years. I hope Hon. Fred McKenzie is listening because he asked me about the situation in Victoria and the Eastern States generally. So a prosthetist wanting to be what is termed in Victoria an "advanced technician" must complete a four-year apprenticeship course. He must then complete two years of practical experience and then do two years of study at the Melbourne Dental Hospital and pass examinations which will qualify him to be an advanced technician.

Hon. Tom Stephens: What was the situation when the legislation was first introduced there?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I telephoned the head of the Melbourne Dental Hospital today and I was told that this is the case. When the legislation was first introduced there, I do not think they had provisions for advanced dental technicians or for these qualifications I have just mentioned.

Having done two years' practical experience, they must then complete 950 hours at the dental school, at the end of which time they are able to work on the public and do work on full dentures. I was told all this today by the head of the Melbourne Dental Hospital after I phoned him to confirm the information I had.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: In other words, the right to practise directly on the public is commensurate with a high level of training, something which Mr McKenzie seems to forget.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I was informed that in that two years of study they are trained in clinical and non-clinical areas which would not have been covered during their apprenticeship course of four years.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You have not told us what happened when the legislation was introduced.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: New South Wales and Victoria were the first States to license dental technicians: they were not allowed to work on the public, but they were registered. Incidentally, Victoria has a Labor Government and these are the requirements that Government imposes on people wanting to be dental technicians capable of operating on the public.

Tasmania has often been mentioned in this debate. I understand that it was in the 1950s that dental technicians there were given the right to work on the public, but I understand that at the time the State had a shortage of dentists. It is interesting to recall that this is similar to the "barefoot" services provided in third world, underdeveloped countries, where they have no doctors. It may well be that it was thought it would be better to have people on the outskirts of medicine dealing with dental problems rather than to have no-one dealing with them. I believe that in Tasmania and Victoria, dental technicians were licenced at a time when both States were experiencing a shortage of dentists.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: And for 30 years they have had no problems.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The member talks about problems, but I am talking about qualifications.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Surely history counts.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Is the member suggesting that we should start with the conditions in Tasmania 30 years ago?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: The Bill does not do that.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am outlining the standards required in these States today.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You are putting up scare tactics.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: This information is available in our own Parliamentary Library, but I had it all confirmed by the head of the Melbourne Dental Hospital, so if the member wants to call him a liar, he can go ahead.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I am not saying that.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. Robert Hetherington): I have been listening to the member closely to date and I would like him to continue.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I rang the head of the Melbourne Dental Hospital to ascertain whether my information was correct that their dental technicians had to do 950 hours' work at the dental hospital after the initial two years' study, and he confirmed that my information was correct; he confirmed that they had to do this work before they could be registered as advanced technicians.

Occasionally I find, on reading previous debates in this House, and from other States, and after reading the legislation involved, that some members are in the habit of taking some licence when quoting certain material, and I have found that on occasions a check will reveal that their comments are incorrect. I obtained a copy of the Tasmanian legislation because I wanted to know the facts; I wanted to know about qualifications in that State.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Mention the transitional arrangements at the same time.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Here is another member suggesting that we go back and start with what was available 30 years ago.

Section 49 of the Tasmanian Act provides that apart from their being of good character, they must have completed a course of training prescribed in the regulations. I have no argument with that. I gather that this has been the case here and that dental technicians have had to pass an apprenticeship course conducted at the Mt. Lawley Technical College.

That is one phase in respect of dental technicians. I understand that large numbers of dental technicians have been trained at Mt Lawley Technical College. They have been doing a good job, and they will continue to do a good job. I believe that educational institutions will continue to turn out dental technicians.

The next provision states that—and remember this is section 49 of the Tasmanian Act—the course of training with which that board is satisfied is equivalent to the course of training referred to in subclause paragraph 1. We recognise that some people may well have other qualifications which are paramount, and we will allow for them

by stating, "A course of training with which the board is satisfied". The Tasmanian Act then goes on to say, "And that he has passed the examination prescribed in the regulation". In other words, for a dental technician to operate in that State, he must pass the ordinary apprenticeship course he is required to undergo what is considered by the board as adequate training plus an examination.

I want to draw a parallel here with what happens in terms of professional people coming here from overseas. Occasionally members raise queries about people who have obtained their qualifications overseas. The committee for professional qualifications has been established to deal with such cases. If a dentist, an engineer, or a doctor comes from a country whose qualifications Australia does not recognise, then it is possible for such a person to obtain registration in this State without returning to university, and without all the practical training. Because one may come from an area whose qualifications are not recognised by Australia and his or her results may not be known, it is possible for one to come to this country, undertake a special examination, including a practical examination, and that qualification should be accepted. That is exactly in line with the Tasmanian legislation. It identifies the contribution that a person may well have made for, say, 10 or 20 years, in the particular area, but it provides a protection for the public by defining some type of examination. It seems to me that there is no reason that we should not consider some type of approach like that to ensure that those people are properly qualified.

I do not know that the numbers concerned are large. I have had all sorts of figures given to me, and I believe what Hon. Kay Hallahan says is perhaps the nearest to correct. It is impossible to give the exact figure. If that is so, it is even harder to try to estimate how many people would come under the provisions of the grandfather clause. People who have not gone through the Mt Lawley Technical College and who do not have certain qualifications may need to be catered for. They can be catered for in other ways and the public can still be protected by ensuring that they have the necessary skills.

We could even go the extent to which South Australia has gone—incidentally under a Labor Government. That State has set up a transition course. There are now 20 technicians doing that course under the grandfather provisions, although I understand the Bill has not been proclaimed because the Government wants its proclamation to coincide with the graduation of these people from the course. That seems to me to have solved the

problem in South Australia. There was no big fight in that State. The Government recognised that public health is important, and unqualified people should not deal with the public.

The technicians to whom I have spoken personally have indicated that they do not want unqualified people to be registered under the Bill. We should not just provide a *carte blanche* provision, although I do not suggest that the Minister would allow that to happen.

The advisory committee's major job is one of education. It will be the examining body. Under the Victorian legislation, a person lecturing to dental technician apprentices employed in the technical education division is on the board. It seems to me that the Government will nominate such a person to our board, but I wonder why such a provision is not included in the Bill to ensure that at least one member of the board knows something about dental apprenticeship work.

Furthermore, the composition of the committee would be enhanced if its membership included the dean of the faculty of dentistry. The board is to include three dental prosthetists—a representative of the dental technicians association, a representative of the dental laboratories association, and a representative of the union. This proposed committee probably includes the largest number of dental prosthetists of any such board in Australia. The Board would include two dentists, and two educators. In other words, the representative of TAFE could be a lecturer in dentistry, and an independent person from the dental faculty could provide the two technicians with some guidance in this great thrust into the area of dental technology.

The future is exciting for people operating in this area. We are providing the basis by which dental technicians will have the opportunity to rise in stature. They will be able to embrace the new technology. The committee will consider all these areas and it will set examinations of a type in which the public can have confidence. Just to be a dentist or a dental technician does not make one an educator. I agree that the members on the board will make input to its workings, but it will also control the area of education.

It has been suggested that this legislation will meet a need which has been met in other States. I have already mentioned the type of boards which are operating in the Eastern States, and incidentally, Hon. Fred McKenzie spoke about Tasmania. There are some differences in regard to the board in that State. Firstly, it is part of the dentists' board. Secondly, the director of dental health services is the chairman of the Tasmanian

board. Incidentally, I believe we could have followed this example, but had I suggested that, I would have been accused of supporting the dentists. As well as the director, the Tasmanian board includes two dentists and two dental mechanics or technicians.

We have heard people scream about the Tasmanian legislation, but we could set up a committee like that and I would not argue with it. I still believe that my proposed board would recognise the education area—a very important area.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: How many do you reckon you need?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: The Bill proposed a committee composed of seven members, but I am suggesting eight members. I am not saying that the dentists and the technicians do not have the necessary expertise, but I am saying that we need the assistance of people involved in education. The Victorian board is composed of eight people, and the NSW board is composed of nine. I gave some thought to the proposition that the chairman should be a barrister or a solicitor. When in Opposition in NSW the Labor Party suggested the inclusion of a barrister, and the policy was implemented when it became the Government.

If the chairman, who, incidentally, will be the consumer representative, were a solicitor, then he would be able to give the board a fair amount of advice. If we had suggested that then perhaps they would not have found someone else to fill that position. It has been suggested elsewhere. It is the situation in South Australia, I believe, but in South Australia, a solicitor is the chairman. I am suggesting that the chairman should be a solicitor, but I do not want to see an overburdened board.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you not think that this sort of detailed discussion could better take place in the Committee stage?

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I thank the member very much. That was to be my next point. I have a couple of areas with which I will not deal at length. However, I will ask the Minister to give consideration to them. In looking at other legislation on this matter, we see that, even though the legislation allows dental technicians to work on peoples' mouths, it has made it clear that dental technicians should not operate in mouths that are not healthy. There is no requirement in this legislation about that. I would be interested to hear the Minister's comments about what is intended in that regard.

I have noted some of the other States' legislation went to the trouble of ensuring that dental technicians who operated in peoples' mouths must carry insurance. We often find out after the event

that the public is not sufficiently protected. Perhaps the Minister might indicate whether dental prosthetists will be expected to carry adequate insurance to protect the public.

I have not been able to check on matters relating to workers' compensation. However, I think the Victorian legislation included provisions relating to this matter. Will the situation in Western Australia be that a person is covered by the Workers' Compensation Act, under this measure, or is there a requirement for some other form of protection?

I think Hon. Graham MacKinnon indicated that this Bill would best be debated in the Committee stage. However, one matter to which I wish to draw attention is a survey which was carried out into the public's attitude to dental technicians. It was not carried out in this State. The survey showed that 92 per cent of the people interviewed felt that it was very important that someone who examined people's mouths and who provided dentures should be well-trained in dental disease and hygiene. I think that reinforces the public expectation that, if we allow dental technicians to operate in people's mouths, we have an important responsibility to ensure that those dental technicians are properly qualified.

I also remind members, when they are considering this Bill, of the working premise that was suggested by people in Kentucky. I mention this again because I feel that this is an ideal we should seek to attain. As I said at the beginning, those people said that, as a working premise, it was decided that any suggested legislation on the licensing of dental practitioners should only contain provisions which bear a direct and substantial relationship to the protection of public health and safety. I feel that is of paramount importance.

The people in my electorate have informed me, very clearly, of their concern in this area. I have written to a large number of people in my electorate about this Bill. I have taken the trouble to look at dental technicians' laboratories. I have spoken, not only to technicians and dentists, but also to educators in most States of Australia. A number of States have no legislation of this type at all. I believe that based upon the expressions of concern by those people, the Government should be very concerned about the health aspects and should listen to the advice given to it by specialists in this area. I think it is possible, provided that we carefully examine this legislation, that we will have a Bill which will allow dental technicians to carry out their requirements under this legislation. I hope that, some day, consideration will be given to seeing that certain standards are set for dental technicians, standards which will prevent just any-

one from entering that profession as is the case now.

I support the second reading of this Bill to enable us to go into the Committee stage to seriously consider some of the matters which I have raised.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. Fred McKenzie.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.17 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Earlier tonight, during questions without notice, the Leader of the Opposition said that he would give me a letter formally and you, Mr President, said that he could not do that. He sent it over to me. I want to be consistent and say that I have not received the letter. If he wants to go to Mr Minniti and ask him to make a formal complaint first thing in the morning, I can assure him that Mr Minniti's complaint will be thoroughly investigated. I will not countenance this dealing through a third person and I think I am entitled to take that attitude.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [10.18 p.m.]: Members of Parliament have a duty to the public they serve and to those people who elect them to Parliament. I am surprised that the Leader of the House has not seen fit to accept statements from any member of Parliament who considers that what they are doing is their duty. It has always been my experience in this Parliament that members put forward complaints on behalf of the people they represent and those complaints are always well-received. The reason I wanted to give that letter to the Minister was that I understood he had no knowledge of the dispute. I thought that, in the interests of those people involved, he should be advised of the matter and asked to take some action, bearing in mind the very serious nature of the dispute.

I intend to debate this matter at some length tomorrow. I will not pre-empt that debate. However, I am extremely sorry, as I think all members of this House are.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: We have a ruling from the President. We are not sorry.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I, and the members of the Opposition, are very sorry that the Leader of the House, or any Minister, has refused to accept a letter which contains information which we think he or she should receive. If we are not able to make complaints and put those sorts of propositions to the Government and to the Minis-

ter, then heaven help the public and their representatives in this Parliament because it simply means that the Government is shutting its eyes and its ears to genuine complaints. If members of Parliament do not reflect those concerns, then we

should not be here. More particularly, the Leader of the House should not be in the position he is serving in today.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES: ENTERTAINMENT

King Sound Hotel

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

(1) Did the Government meet all or part of the cost of a function held at the King Sound Hotel, Derby, on Tuesday, 2 October 1984?

(2) If so, what was the total cost to the Government of the function?

(3) How was the invitation list determined?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Accounts received indicate a total cost of \$3 973.

(3) Suggestions for the invitation list were received from the local shire, the Kimberley regional manager, and local members of Parliament.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: ABORIGINAL LAND INQUIRY

Expenditure

337. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

(1) Further to his answer to my question 313 of Thursday, 18 October 1984, will the Minister provide an itemised summary of expenditure incurred by the Aboriginal land inquiry?

(2) What amount was paid to Mr Seaman to conduct the inquiry?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

(1) The attached schedules 1 and 2 were provided by the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority and give expenditure by the Aboriginal land inquiry for the 1983-84 financial year and to 30 September 1984 this financial year. Further expenditure of final accounts are expected over the next two months.

(2) According to information provided to me by the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority and the Crown Law Department, Mr Seaman has received \$70 572.60 in salary payments for the period 1 September 1983 to the present date for the conduct of the inquiry.

Salaries	69 820.87
Travel allowances	97 803.58
Travel fares	26 184.52
Telephones	10 397.85
Postage	4 604.54
Motor vehicle hire	8 073.45
Aircraft charter	35 408.45
Legal costs	1 050.00

Consultants fees	52 814.59
Advertising	2 691.14
Printing	19 063.78
Stationery	8 069.73
Miscellaneous expenditure	3 829.72
Entertainment	815.69
Petrol and oil	1 611.60
Petty Cash	624.97
Equipment purchase	27 192.94

TOTAL **\$370 057.42**

Salaries	20 672.31
Travel allowances	12 697.09
Travel fares	13 015.90
Telephones	1 277.12
Postage	2 354.04
Vehicle hire	6 118.21
Aircraft charter	11 631.00
Consultants fees	83 799.16
Advertising	1 387.71
Printing	1 224.24
Stationery	941.66
Miscellaneous expenses	462.70
Petrol and oil	904.48
Petty cash	163.96
Equipment purchases	654.36
Anthropological support	50 646.00

TOTAL **\$213 840.94**

+ Expenses for 1983-84 **370 057.42**

Total Expenditure to
30-9-84 **\$583 898.36**

PASTORAL INDUSTRY: LEASES

Termination

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

I refer the Minister to an article which appeared on page 1 of the "News of the North" supplement to *The West Australian* of Thursday, 18 October 1984, under the title "Government ends leases on 4 stations".

Will the Minister please advise—

(1) What are the names of the four stations referred to as in the process of being forfeited to the Government?

(2) Why are the leases being forfeited?

(3) What are the names of the six station leases currently being investigated by the Department of Lands and Surveys to determine whether they too will be forfeited?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Kimberley Downs, Napier Downs, Bohemia Downs, and Louisa Downs.
- (2) Non-compliance with pastoral lease conditions as prescribed in part VI of the Land Act.
- (3) As these leases are still subject to investigation, and in fact the deficiencies may be rectified, it is not appropriate to name the pastoral leases concerned at this stage. It is a matter between the department (Pastoral Board) and the lessees of the stations.

EDUCATION

Participation and Equity Programme

340. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Education:

What are the criteria used to select "target schools" for the participation and equity programme?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Following consultation with the Commonwealth Schools Commission, the criteria used to select Education Department target schools were—

A modified form of school retention rates from year 10 to year 11;
school absentee rates;
the proportions of Aboriginal enrolments within the schools; and
a form of socio-economic index for each school.

PLANNING: WITTENOOM

Future

341. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Regional Development and the North West:
- (1) Has the Government made a decision on the future of Wittenoom?
 - (2) If so, what is this decision?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) No final decision has been made.
- (2) Answered by (1).

PORTS AND HARBOURS: CARNARVON

Small Boat Harbour: Dredging

343. Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works:
- (1) Is the Minister aware that a dredge is currently working on the small boat harbour in Carnarvon?
 - (2) What is the current work programme of that dredge?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The dredge has been working under contract to the Minister for Works in carrying out maintenance dredging of the fishing boat harbour.

HEALTH

Mt. Magnet Shire

344. Hon P. H. LOCKYER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the town of Mt. Magnet is without a doctor?
- (2) What steps are the Government taking to have a doctor stationed in Mt. Magnet?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes—this problem is not confined to Mt. Magnet.
- (2) Discussion has been held with the shire to explore the possibility that they provide accommodation for a resident doctor. Consulting room facilities can be made available at the nursing post. The mining company will also be approached to ascertain whether they can provide accommodation.

GAMBLING: GAMING STUDY GROUP

Report

345. Hon P H LOCKYER, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

With reference to the present inquiry into gambling laws in Western Australia, when does the Minister expect to make an announcement on the findings of the committee?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The Government expects to receive a report and recommendation from the chairman of the gaming inquiry early in December for its consideration.

MINERALS: AGNEW MINING

Assistance

346. Hon P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What steps are being taken to assist Agnew Mining with mining operation at Leinster?
- (2) Is the Government going to give financial assistance to the project?
- (3) What form will this assistance take?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) My colleague, the Minister for Minerals and Energy, has had discussions with senior management of the companies and unions involved in the Agnew joint venture. The Government is aware of the current problems and is examining means and extent of possible State assistance.
- (2) and (3) The form and extent of any assistance has yet to be determined.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTES

BWIU: Minniti and Son

97. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

Has Mr Dans become aware of a dispute involving Minniti and Son and the Building Workers Industrial Union?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Because a member from another place asked me tonight to supply some information to the Premier, I had this matter checked out. No reports have been received in my office or in the Office of Industrial Relations. The communication is in my office, and I can get it if the member would like me to.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTES

BWIU: Minniti and Son

98. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

Is the Minister aware Mr Minniti has telephoned, Mr Tom Butler, the industrial relations officer in the Premier's office, and that there was absolutely no result from the discussion that ensued?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I have answered the question. No, I am not aware of any of those matters. I deal with matters which come before me from the Office of Industrial Relations or directly to my office. I had no reports of any problems whatsoever as late as 4.45 p.m. today.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTES

BWIU: Minniti and Son

99. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

I note the Leader of the House had no reports made to his office. Could I ask this question—

In view of the very serious nature of the dispute and the strong likelihood

of violence on the site, will the Minister send out his industrial inspectors as a matter of urgency?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The answer is "No". First and foremost, I run the Department of Industrial Affairs. At this stage I know of no dispute in the area referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. If these people want to communicate their problems to the Opposition, as a matter of courtesy, I would think they should communicate them to me, or to the Office of Industrial Relations. If the Leader of the Opposition is so concerned, let him give Mr Minniti some instruction on what to do, and I will give him the answer if he goes through the correct channels.

I am not in the business of conducting industrial relations through the electronic media, through the print media, through hearsay, or through instructions from the Opposition.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTES

BWIU: Minniti and Son

100. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

The Leader of the Government has already stated—

The PRESIDENT: Order! When I ask if there are any further questions without notice, the Leader of the Opposition is supposed to start off by saying "I want to ask a question".

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I want to ask a question of the Leader of the House along the following lines—

- (1) Will the Minister respond to a written complaint on this matter by sending to the site an industrial inspector, in view of the fact that the person concerned has already contacted the Premier and his brother, Mr Terry Burke, and the industrial adviser to the Premier?
- (2) Will the Minister respond to a written complaint to his department by sending an industrial inspector?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) and (2) For the last time, I am the Minister for Industrial Affairs. When I receive a complaint personally, through the people in my office, or through the Director of the Office of Industrial Relations, I will respond to it. That is plain. I do not intend to answer any more questions in relation to the hearsay which Mr Masters is sprouting in this place. If the

person concerned wants to direct any complaint to me on the matter, it will be acted upon.

Point of Order

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I seek direction from you, Sir. If the Leader will not answer any more questions, is it proper for me to pass across the Chamber by messenger a formal complaint to the Minister so that tomorrow he may take action?

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order.

Questions without Notice Resumed

GAMBLING: CASINO

Jarman Committee

101. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

- (1) Has he received a report from the Jarman committee dealing with the final recommendation for the casino?
- (2) If so, what action has the Government taken on it?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The short answer is "No".

GAMBLING: CASINO

Jarman Committee

102. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

- (1) Was it accurately reported in *The Sunday Independent* of a fortnight ago that the report was about to come from Mr Jarman's office to Mr Dans's office within 10 days?
- (2) In the light of the Minister's statement that he has not received a report, has Mr Jarman himself indicated when the report might be delivered?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I am again, in this portfolio, not influenced by the print media, whatever they may say. When the report is released to me by the chairman of the casino control committee (Mr Jarman) a public announcement will be made.

GAMBLING: CASINO

Jarman Committee

103. Hon. P. G. PENDAL to the Minister for Administrative Services:

I ask not whether the Minister is influenced by the print media, but

whether Mr Jarman himself has indicated to the Minister when the report will be delivered.

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Opposition members seem not to be able to hear. Let me repeat. When I receive the report of the chairman of the casino control committee, I will let the member know.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: I have told you—

Withdrawal of Remark

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr President, I want that retracted. Mr Jarman has told me nothing.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Wait a minute. What does the Minister want retracted?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I understood Mr Pendal to say that Mr Jarman has told me—

Hon. P. G. Pendal: I did not say that at all.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Jarman has told me nothing.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Thank you.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Unlike the previous Administration, we do not lean all over committees. This is a completely independent committee, and, when dealing with an issue as fragile as the establishment of a casino in Western Australia, I have told the committee it has all the time in the world to reach a decision. It has no time constraints.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: That is all I wanted to know.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I just say through you, Sir, that, when the report of the committee is received, a public announcement will be made.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You are very touchy, Mr Dans.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not touchy. You are just talking drivel.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: It is time you retired.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I will be here when you are six foot under, Buster!

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the House does not come to order, several of you will not be here.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I shall answer all future sensible questions.

The PRESIDENT: If the Leader of the House will come to order, I shall endeavour to have some regard for the question he asked me which was that the honourable member withdraw a statement. I asked what the statement was and, in addition to going on with a lot of other points, the Leader of the House indicated the comment he wanted withdrawn.

As I understand it, the comment was not unparliamentary, and there is certainly no requirement that it be withdrawn.

Questions Without Notice Resumed

Are there any other questions without notice?

Hon. Graham Edwards: Try asking a sensible one for a change.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Several members interjected.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Well, ask a sensible question.

The PRESIDENT: If Hon. Mr Edwards does not wish to comply with the rules of this House, I suggest he is heading for an early exit. I am asking him to comply with the request that he come to order. I am the one who must maintain order in this place and I guarantee that I shall do so, whether I do it with co-operation or by some other means.

