

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, 24 June 1986

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

### SESSIONAL ORDERS

#### *Consideration of Standing Orders Committee Report*

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon. Clive Griffiths): Honourable members, if it is your wish we will adopt the procedure that we have in the past; that is, that we go into Committee and that the President take the Chair while the Chairman of Committees moves and explains the report of the Standing Orders Committee.

#### *In Committee*

The President (Hon. Clive Griffiths) in the Chair.

The **PRESIDENT**: I propose that we deal first with the item headed "Time Limit on Speeches", followed by the item "Sitting and Adjournment of Council", and then the item headed "Address-in-Reply".

#### *Point of Order*

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr President, would you please indicate which page you are looking at?

The **PRESIDENT**: Unfortunately we have one of those pages which does not have a number.

We are dealing with that part under the heading "Your committee recommends that the House adopt the following sessional order" under item 2.4.

#### *Committee Resumed*

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Before members should be a document headed "Report On Proposed Sessional Orders Relating To: Limited-Time Speeches, Sitting Times, and The Precedence of the Address In Reply Debate".

I move—

That the following sessional order be adopted—

1.1—A member may not speak in the House for more than 30 minutes, and in a committee of the whole for more than 10 minutes each time, on any motion, amendment, or amendment to such amendment:

Provided that on a motion to adjourn the Council, no member shall speak for more than 10 minutes and the whole debate shall not exceed 40 minutes.

1.2—Rule 1.1 shall not apply to:

(a) the Minister or member in charge of the business comprising the subject matter of the debate or to the Leader of the Opposition, or the Leader of the National Party of Australia, or to any member speaking on behalf of the said Leaders;

(b) any member when speaking in the address in reply debate or on any motion moved under SO 152(c),

and, for the purposes of paragraph (a), no time limit shall be imposed, and in the case of paragraph (b) each member may speak for not more than 60 minutes.

1.3—By leave, a member's time may be extended by 15 minutes, but no extension shall be sought or granted in a committee of the whole House.

The **PRESIDENT**: Before we go any further, I want to get this straightened out. In future when any document is printed I want its pages to be numbered so that we have page numbers to refer to. We cannot usefully refer to pages in this House of Parliament when those pages are not numbered. I want that firmly established in the mind of everyone who has such documents printed in future.

Secondly, it is important that everyone gets the same piece of paper; the matter is complicated enough as it is. Does any honourable member not have the appropriate document? No. Having established a few of the ground rules for now and the future, the question is, that the motion be agreed to.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Members will be aware that the Government proposed a change to Standing Orders, and that rather than that motion being adopted, it was referred to the Standing Orders Committee. The committee has now reported to members. Its recommendations are not in direct agreement with the items originally proposed by the Government. Nevertheless, the proposals before members, generally speaking, have the concurrence of all members of the Standing Orders Committee. The members of the committee represented the various parties and endeavoured to reach a compromise.

The committee felt it was their duty to put forward recommendations to limit the time that members could speak, and those times do not concur with those contained in the Government's motion. The committee felt the Government's time restrictions were too harsh. We felt it would suffice for most occasions to allow an unlimited time to a Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, or the Leader of the National Party—a recognised party—and to allow 30 minutes for other members with the addition that they could seek leave to receive an extra 10 minutes.

If these proposals are adopted it will mean a change in this place because members will be debating against the clock, which will add another dimension to debates. This will make it a little harder for some members who will not only have to put across their point of view but do so against the clock. Some members might object to this.

Exceptions are provided to the time limits I have outlined. Members of the committee felt there should not be this same time limit for speeches made to the Address-in-Reply, because of its importance.

An exception has also been made for money Bills, and there might need to be some cleaning up on this exception in regard to what is a money Bill.

In short, those are the proposals of the Standing Orders Committee.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Members should understand that the report of the Standing Orders Committee does not mean that the Chamber must necessarily agree to all recommendations. I agree with some of them but I disagree with others. We must recognise that these are proposed sessional orders which will come up for review probably early next year. Nevertheless I am bound to point out some of my objections to this report. In the main my objections concern the time limit on speeches.

Members should understand what occurs in other upper Houses of Parliament in Australia. Those in Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, and Tasmania—the only States on which I have information—have no time limits on members speaking on Bills or motions, or on speeches made in Committee. So, other Houses such as ours have not seen the need to limit the time for speeches.

I urge members to research past debates in this place. This would show that members here speak on average for no more than 20 minutes,

certainly no more than half an hour. There are times when members feel the need to take much longer, and they should be given the opportunity to speak for the time they feel necessary. I emphasise, though, that it is a rare occurrence. Some members here have spoken for a number of hours. Since I have been here Hon. Roy Cloughton spoke for five hours on one occasion, and a member from this side spoke for about four hours. There were tactical reasons for those long speeches, and we all know about them.

To limit the time for speeches is to undermine the whole function and reason for the Legislative Council. I urge members to think carefully about these recommendations. Traditionally this House has supplied checks and balances. When the Legislative Assembly sends matters here for our consideration, time needs to be taken to scrutinise those matters properly.

Often people say our parliamentary procedures are slow and laborious. Nevertheless they allow people from outside to have an input into matters that come before this Parliament. Indeed, this House allows for a second opinion to be given on those matters.

Many Bills which are tremendously important to certain sections of the community have been introduced into this place. The Labor Party knows that the Trades and Labor Council has been very interested in certain industrial legislation and it has had a great involvement in that legislation. Similarly, the Confederation of Western Australian Industry and the Chamber of Commerce have lobbied members and urged them to slow down in their considerations. Members will recall that when the financial institutions duty was debated in the Assembly there was an argument about whether charities would be affected. The result of careful consideration was that charities would not be affected by FID. Members will also recall the debate on the State Government Insurance Office Act. Again there was a very good reason for our taking our time in that debate.

I know that many members will say that matters are debated at length in Committee. That is not the case all the time. In fact, there is very good reason for members making lengthy speeches in the second reading debate and allowing the Committee stage to progress quickly. Hon. Joe Berinson will remind us that the workers' compensation legislation was debated for hours and that the most of

that debate took place in the Committee stage. Lengthy debate on that legislation also occurred during the second reading debate with members from both sides making a careful contribution to the debate.

If we attempt to rush matters through this House, we will not be doing our jobs, no matter how convenient it will be for certain people. I know that there are certain exceptions to this attempt to limit the time for members' speeches. However, this House is for the members to be able to express their views. They should be able to go to their electorates and to talk with people in industry and commerce and to the people in the street. They should then be able to come back to this Parliament and express those views. If it takes a member 45 or 50 minutes to express his or her view, so be it. Parliament is not for the convenience of the Government, whether it be a Labor Government or a Liberal Government. It is certainly not for the convenience of Ministers even though, as a Minister, I would take the same attitude as present Ministers that Government business should pass as quickly as possible.

This is a serious matter. I think that the Legislative Assembly has sought to avoid making hasty decisions. We should closely examine all legislation. It is rare for people in this House to speak at great length. I cannot recall many long speeches, but there have been times when one has been needed. It is for that reason that this House should not be dominated by the Government.

If members look at today's Notice Paper they will see that much legislation will come on for debate. That does not mean that we should rush that legislation. Matters to be debated include industrial relations, transport, rural matters, housing, and matters relating to traffic. I know that all members will not be interested in all of those matters. However, some of us will be very interested in some matters. There will be a need for us to look very closely at the legislation relating to rural matters.

Hon. Eric Charlton made a long and excellent speech in this House the other night. It had to be long to enable him to get his points across. On another occasion another member may need to take the same time to make other points. I think there is no reason to limit the length of speeches in this place. Many speeches could not be cut short. Why should members of Parliament not have the opportunity to say what they like? I believe that limiting members' speeches will undermine all this House stands for.

I ask for clarification of the rule as it relates to the time for speeches in debates and the 10 minutes allowed for speeches in Committee. I also understand that certain debates such as the Address-in-Reply and the debate on the Budget papers will not have limitations imposed on them. I wonder whether Supply Bills and Appropriation Bills are included in those exceptions. They certainly should be because they are matters that need lengthy consideration. We do not enjoy the rules that apply to those debates in the Assembly. It debates money Bills at length, clause by clause. We debate the whole document. It would be a grave mistake to limit members' speeches on those matters.

I urge members to consider this matter carefully. Members have had the experience, over the last two weeks, of listening to long and to short speeches. At least, in those speeches, members have been able to represent their electorates and attempt to get their views across. To limit those speeches would be an attempt to limit their representation of the people in their electorates.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: The Committee should take note of one or two things. First, this is a sessional order to be conducted as an experiment until the end of this session. That is very important for all members to understand. We are not now laying down the law for all time.

#### [Questions taken.]

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: The last time we amended sessional orders, we tried an experiment with questions in order to stop the time-consuming practice of having a member give notice of a question one day and ask it again the following day. Members were concerned that there was not enough time to debate matters properly. The Leader of the Opposition has correctly stated that he does not want a time constraint on speeches made by members in the Chamber.

The Standing Orders Committee was extremely mindful of this matter when it met. The matter was not dismissed lightly, nor were pronouncements made on it. Members should look not only at sessional order 1.1, but also at order 1.3 which would allow a member, by leave, to have his time extended by 15 minutes when talking during debate and not during Committee.

From time to time members have spoken on complex matters. For example, Hon. David Wordsworth spoke for some time on a complex

matter many years ago; Hon. Mick Gayfer has often told this Chamber at length about transportation costs or grain-related matters. Indeed, members of the Government when in Opposition spoke for a long time on industrial relations. I suggest that nobody in this Chamber would be churlish enough, when following the thread of a debate, not to grant an extension of time to a member whose 30 minutes was almost up but who had yet to develop his theme. Complex issues can be dealt with through the provision of an extension of time. In some cases, certain members have succeeded in boring the Chamber to the extent that both sides would have been only too delighted to refuse the extension of time.

With respect to certain Bills or motions, members are entitled to speak for a longer time. Such examples include debate on the Address-in-Reply and on matters mentioned in Standing Order No. 152(c); that is, annual Estimates of Expenditure for the Consolidated Revenue Fund which we are asked to take note of. The Leader of the Opposition has just pointed out that in another place the Budget is debated item by item and members are allowed to debate each item within the Budget papers. We may not do that. We must take note of the Budget papers and make our comments accordingly.

Therefore, the Standing Orders Committee felt that Standing Order No. 152(c) should be included in the sessional order which would allow extra time. However, we omitted to mention Supply. I suggest that members consider an amendment to cover all matters to do with Treasury and Supply. It would be all-embracing. It would cover those matters which we may not amend. However, our voice must be heard.

I move an amendment—

Rule 1.2—To add after paragraph (b) the following paragraph—

(c) or on any Bill which the Council may not amend.

#### *Point of Order*

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: With all due respect, the Leader of the Liberal Party spoke on the general overall effect of this move. I tried to get to my feet as the Leader of the National Party to say a few words. I would have moved an amendment a lot earlier than the honourable gentleman's amendment.

The PRESIDENT: Are you raising a point of order?

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am. I have an amendment which precedes the amendment moved by the Leader of the Liberal Party.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no conflict. If any honourable member wants to move any subsequent amendment to any parts of this section we are dealing with, he is perfectly free to do so. In other words I am not going to rule, for example, that if the Chamber agrees to the amendment proposed by Hon. John Williams, the member would not be allowed to move an amendment to an earlier part of the recommendations.

We are now dealing with the section on the time limit on speeches. Hon. John Williams has proposed to insert after paragraph (b) the paragraph—

(c) or on any Bill which the Council may not amend.

#### *Committee Resumed*

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: May I suggest that amendment be circulated so that members may have a look at it in order to make a decision? I think Mr Gayfer is right. I suggest any other amendments be circulated and we discuss the overall matter. Then we can have a look at all the amendments.

The PRESIDENT: With respect to the honourable member, we are not going to deal with all the amendments together, we will deal with them one at a time. We are not going to deal with Hon. H. W. Gayfer's amendment or with anybody else's amendment until after we have dealt with Hon. John Williams' amendment.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: With due deference, Sir, if we decide to chuck the whole lot out, what is the use of dealing with Mr Williams' amendment?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have just explained the procedure will be that the final question I put to the Committee will be that the proposal, in its present state or as amended, as the case may be, be adopted. If members then do not like it, all they have to do is to say "No" and that will be the end of it.

I am still at a loss because we do not have numbers on the pages, but we have the amendments. I must commend the staff for being able to photocopy these in the short time available. They are working under extreme pressure. Hon. A. A. Lewis' question provided the necessary time.

Hon. N. F. Moore: He is of some use.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The proposal is that we accept the recommendations 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 as proposed by the Standing Orders Committee to which Hon. John Williams has moved an amendment.

**Amendment put and passed.**

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I then presume that after paragraph (c) we would delete the top of the next unnumbered page. That is, for the purpose of paragraph (a), no time limit, and paragraph (b), each member shall speak for not more than 60 minutes. In other words, we would leave the Address-in-Reply and financial questions with unlimited time. I am asking a question and I hope to get an answer.

The PRESIDENT: There will be a consequential amendment which would read, "and in the case of paragraphs (b) and (c)".

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I have to admit that I totally agree with much of what the Leader of the Opposition has said. The word "Parliament" is derived from the French word "parler", which means "to speak". That is what we should be doing. However, my party believes it is the abuse of that privilege which has brought about the need for change, in just the same way that the need for change in another place was brought about. I can well remember Hon. H. E. Graham speaking for 5½ hours, creating a record by some 10 minutes, I think it was. Then I came to this House to find Hon. Roy Cloughton speaking for 4½ hours.

Hon. D. K. Dans: He could not make it; he tried hard.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: He did not repeat himself, but he became weaker and weaker. He bent around the knees.

The point is that members of my party believe it has gone far enough. They sympathise with Hon. A. A. Lewis, who spoke for only three hours on the Mining Bill and felt he could go on for six.

A member: He did too!

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Perhaps. The National Party believes, and members have convinced me of this, that it is time for a change. We likewise agree with Hon. John Williams, who has pointed out—and I am very conscious of this and appreciate it—that these are sessional orders.

Having been in this place for a considerable time I am quite prepared to accept some rationale in the exercise, well knowing that what we decide now might be well and truly thrown out in 12 months' time. At least it will

give some of the newcomers a chance to see how it goes. Personally I think some of them will be caught by the restrictions. Accordingly, I am prepared to go along with most of it.

I move an amendment—

Rule 1.1, line 2—To delete the figure "30" and substitute the figure "45".

The period of 30 minutes is too short and a 45-minute period is more satisfactory. It would enable members to become accustomed to the new sessional order which seeks to place a time limit on speeches.

It should be remembered that this is a House of Review and, as Hon. Gordon Masters said, it is necessary on occasions for debate to be lengthy on certain subjects. In those cases, a 30-minute time limit on speeches would be too short.

I do not object to anything else in this order and I will not speak on any other item.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The proposed amendment is fair. I do not believe that the time during which we may debate issues in this place should be shorter than that in the other place. The number of people who will speak for their full 45 minutes will not be great. The amendment will soften the blow a little on those of us who, on occasions, have spoken for three hours.

**Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—**

**Ayes 16**

Hon. C. J. Bell	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. J. N. Caldwell	Hon. N. F. Moore
Hon. E. J. Charlton	Hon. Neil Oliver
Hon. G. M. Evans	Hon. P. G. Pandal
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. W. N. Stretch
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. John Williams
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. P. H. Lockyer	Hon. Margaret McAleer

(Teller)

**Noes 15**

Hon. J. M. Berinson	Hon. T. R. Helm
Hon. J. M. Brown	Hon. Garry Kelly
Hon. T. G. Butler	Hon. Mark Nevill
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. S. M. Piantadosi
Hon. Graham Edwards	Hon. Tom Stephens
Hon. S. J. Halden	Hon. D. W. Wenn
Hon. Kay Hallahan	Hon. Fred McKenzie

(Teller)

**Pair**

<b>Aye</b>	<b>No</b>
Hon. Tom McNeil	Hon. B. L. Jones

**Amendment thus passed.**

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It fascinates me that the Standing Orders Committee should come back to this Chamber and introduce new verbiage into the Standing Orders. Standing Orders Nos.

42 to 46 indicate that the only seats reserved in this place are those of Ministers. There is no mention of the Leader of the National Party, leaders of political parties, or the Leader of the Opposition. However, in its wisdom, the Standing Orders Committee has created section 1.2 (a) and has named in a House of Review—I still believe it is a House of Review—two people who will be allowed to speak at great length whenever they like.

Rule 1.2 (a) is a bad one and it is drafted badly. I do not begrudge the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the National Party the right to speak for longer than 45 minutes, if they can make a speech of such a length. However, bearing in mind the extensions of time from 30 minutes to 45 minutes and from 10 minutes to 15 minutes which have been made already, I wonder whether Ministers and members in charge of the business being debated and leaders of the various parties should be restricted to speaking for one hour.

We may be making rods for our own backs. When I first looked at this motion on Thursday, I intended to say that the Independent member of this place should be included with the Leader of the National Party and the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I thought you wanted to be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I only lead; I do not follow, Mr McKenzie, as Mr President well knows. I do not want to comment other than to say that the Standing Orders Committee has created a bad precedent for this place. In a House of Review I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the National Party has a place in these matters. In reality in this place there is only one position. Although recognised by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal, the Leader of the House in a House of Review is the only person who should be mentioned in the Standing Orders.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I can assure you that the Leader of the National Party is not recognised by the tribunal.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I know he is not recognised and, quite frankly, he does not deserve to be recognised.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Nor does the Leader of the National Party in the other place; but that is a totally different matter.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What about the independent member?

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Certainly not.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Independent member will look after himself.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to concentrate on this quite complicated matter.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I know it is not difficult for you, sir, but—

The PRESIDENT: It is for me.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS:—for Mr Charlton, who has never had a clue, it probably is extremely difficult. He probably has not read the Standing Orders. I hope Mr Charlton gets up and comments on this matter. I have plenty of time.

Following Mr William's amendment, I ask: Why are we drawing a distinction—I hope a member of the Standing Orders Committee will tell me—between the Address-in-Reply and the Budget debate?

Hon. Garry Kelly: We have 60 minutes.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hang on. Mr President, I take your ruling in regard to 1.2 (c) which was inserted by Mr Williams and which mentions Bills that we cannot amend, but it then goes on to say—and Mr Williams said there would be a consequential amendment—"For the purposes of paragraph (a) no time limit shall be imposed, and in the case of paragraphs (b) and (c) each member may speak for not more than 60 minutes." Is that right? I want to know two things: Firstly, why do we differentiate between the Address-in-Reply and the Budget debate because in these times, with due respect to His Excellency the Governor, the Budget debate is vitally important.

Nobody seems to realise what is going on in this country. Today we heard the Premier introduce one of his many taxation jaunts which will put small business right out of business; wait and see. Hawke and Burke will kill small business.

Hon. Garry Kelly: What has that got to do with the Standing Orders?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is related, funnily enough. Dear, oh dear, I did not want to let the monkey talk.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members, I said at the outset that the amending of Standing Orders is probably one of the most complicated functions that this place can deal with. It is complicated enough if we all carefully follow what everybody is saying, if indeed we are able to carefully follow it, but it becomes more complicated if we cannot hear what a member is saying, or when the member who is

saying it starts having a different conversation with a member along the way.

For the benefit of members who have not been here when we have previously handled this matter, in a Committee of this type, when we are dealing with Standing Orders the Chairman is frequently called upon to make explanations. Hon. Sandy Lewis has indicated that he wishes to ask two questions and I am trying to concentrate on his first question in order that I have a fighting chance of answering it prior to his getting around to putting his second question, but I ask the member to do it slowly; I went to Fremantle Boys College!

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If you cannot hear me, Mr President, I will remedy the problem.

The PRESIDENT: I can hear you.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: With due deference, Sir, you just said you could not hear me, but you now say you did not say that at all.

I want to know why we have the differentiation between the Address-in-Reply and the Budget debate. That is my first question. My second question is: With paragraphs (b) and (c) it appears we are changing the rules in such a way that when we get to the Budget debate we could put the Government in a position as set out here, if we wish to be nasty, and I do not suggest to anybody that we would do so. We could put the Government through an Estimates debate as is done in the other place. I understood we always could do so; that if the House so decides, or if a member decides to do so, we could query the Estimates section by section. My questions are fairly simple, Mr President.

You may elucidate on my third question: Why has the Standing Orders Committee introduced "the Leader of the Opposition" and "the Leader of the National Party"? As far as I can see, they are mentioned nowhere else in the Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Frankly, I cannot understand what Hon. Sandy Lewis is saying when he suggests that we have differentiated between the Address-in-Reply and the Budget debate. I cannot follow that.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Because in regard to the Address-in-Reply, paragraph (a) states that no time limit shall be imposed.

The PRESIDENT: All right. The explanation is that paragraph (a) provides no time limits for the person introducing the legislation, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the National Party, or a person representing them

during the debate. There is no differentiation because the Address-in-Reply and the Budget debate are dealt with by recommendation (b) of the proposal put forward.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I apologise to the Chamber. I thought the Address-in-Reply would have no time limit but I now see that the Address-in-Reply has a time limit as does the Budget debate and I am more horrified than ever; but I go along with Hon. John Williams and Hon. Mick Gayfer's suggestion that it is only for a year, and I could probably endure that.

The PRESIDENT: To answer the member's second question, his assumption that when we debate the Budget papers under Standing Order No. 152(c) we deal with each part of the Budget papers section by section, is incorrect.

Members can under Standing Order No. 152(c) debate all or any part of the Budget papers but the Appropriation Bill is the time the honourable member is speaking about where each departmental paper is debated paper by paper. It would not be under Standing Order No. 152(c). That would be my answer, if I understood the member's question correctly.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I return to the debate about sessional orders 1.1 and 1.2, which relate to the question of limiting the time of speeches in this Chamber.

It is my view that the principle of limiting time is wrong. It would not matter much if we were to have 30 or 40-minute speeches or three-hour speeches, or whatever; I do not accept the principle that a time limit ought to apply on speeches made in the House.

What worries me most of all is that the Government is seeking to make this Chamber into a pale imitation of the Legislative Assembly so that it operates in a similar way and is there for the benefit of Ministers. When the Legislative Council becomes that pale imitation of the Legislative Assembly, it will be a very good excuse for the Government to get rid of it. It is the situation of long live the difference between the two Houses. One of the greatest differences between the two Houses, as Hon. Gordon Masters pointed out, is the difference between most upper and lower Houses in Australia, and that is that in the upper Houses there is no time limit.

Hon. D. K. Dans: With the exception of the Senate.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: There are something like 72 members in the Senate.

Hon. D. K. Dans: What difference does that make? .

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It makes a lot of difference.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You want to make the rules as you go along.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: That is what the Leader of the House is doing. He is seeking to change a long-standing tradition of this House.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You are taking selective examples. You are not debating.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: You are not debating!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members can speak only one at a time.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: It is a classic case of caucusing. When people decide to make a change to something that already exists, they usually have a very good reason for it. However, trying to find a good reason for this change is very difficult. If one looks at what is happening in this Chamber now, I submit that there are very few occasions on which members make a welter of the fact that there is no time limit.

I did some research the other day. I looked at the debates from two days of sitting and I wrote down for how many minutes each member spoke. I chose the days at random. The first was 16 April 1985, which happened to be the day on which the Aboriginal land rights Bill was discussed. The longest speech on that day went for 90 minutes and it was one which I made in response to the Bill. The next longest speech was 45 minutes followed by 38 minutes, 41 minutes and 30 minutes. Under the Standing Orders, as amended, there would have been no person who on that occasion exceeded 45 minutes. Everybody was within the new Standing Orders. There were 23 speakers that day and the average speaking time was 17.7 minutes.

The next day which I studied was 12 November and there were 24 speakers who spoke for an average of 10.5 minutes. On that occasion only one person exceeded 30 minutes. Someone might argue that because of what has happened in the past there should not be any problem with the new times. The point I would make is that people are not taking advantage of unlimited time now but there are the occasions when somebody needs to do so. Hon. Roy Cloughton spoke here all night once and he did so for a very good reason. I thought it was tremendous politics to keep the Chamber going

while some activity was going on outside. It was a classic filibuster.

To me that was very good politics, and there are other occasions when people, perhaps once every six years, want to make a speech about their electorate. Hon. Tom Knight would take the Chamber around his electorate, but that is something which did not happen every day. It is in fact something which happens only when a member wants to speak for considerably longer than 45 minutes because he has something of great importance to say. It happens only infrequently and this amendment seems to me to be totally unnecessary. The Government has not put up an argument to support it. No-one on that side of the Chamber has given anything other than a vague reason for bringing in this time limit. Some people have claimed that it will do away with boring speeches, but that is not sufficient reason to take away one very important aspect of this Chamber, and that is that members should be able to talk for as long as they wish.

What really worries me, apart from the danger that this will make the Legislative Council a pale imitation of the Legislative Assembly, is that now when people get up to speak they will talk for as long as they are permitted. If one looks at the Legislative Assembly one finds everyone there talks whether they need to or not for as long as they are allowed. In this Chamber, people talk for as long as it takes them to make their point. That is a major argument against bringing in a time limit because people have the tendency to use every second that they have. In this Chamber, however, people stop talking once they have made their point. What will happen here if members agree to change Standing Orders is that people will speak for their 45 minutes and that will mean that this Chamber will sit for longer than it does now. I refer again to the average length of speeches made on two occasions last year—17.7 minutes and 10.5 minutes. If this Standing Order is changed, members will be able to speak for 45 minutes each.

If one looks at the limit of time for speeches in Committee, one finds members will not be able to speak for more than 10 minutes in Committee. If I wanted to make a five-hour speech in Committee, all I would need to do under this arrangement would be to stand up for 10 minutes and talk, then get my colleague sitting next to me to stand up and talk for another 10 minutes, and so on. If I were to do what Mr Cloughton did, with very good reason, I could keep the Chamber here all day and all

night. It is quite ludicrous to suggest that there should be a limit on that as well.

The principle of limiting speeches is wrong. We should maintain the difference between this and the other Chamber. People do not make a welter of the fact that we have unlimited time. Members on the other side have given me no reason for changing the Standing Orders. All they have done—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will honourable members stop their interjecting. We are in Committee where any member may speak as many times as he likes. There is no need for people to interject.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I will proceed to finish before I make a mess of my own argument. Ninety-nine speeches out of 100 made in this Chamber are made for the amount of time required to make the point. The odd one per cent of speeches where people talk for longer than they should is not usual, and that is not a good enough reason to get rid of the principle of unlimited time. I am particularly worried because this is part of a concerted effort by the Government to destroy this Chamber. Once the Legislative Council is a pale imitation of the other place, the Government will say that it is unnecessary and will get rid of it.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: One of the points raised by Hon. Norman Moore worries me a little. He said that no other upper House in the country had a time limit. The Leader of the House said, "What about the Senate?"—apparently that is the exception that proves the rule.

Hon. N. F. Moore: I said, "Most upper Houses".

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Does it matter? We seem to be locked into a syndrome in which we do not do anything because we might be breaking new ground. Just because other upper Houses in the country do not have time limits on speeches, is that any reason for this place not to bring down time limits on a trial basis?

A point that has been made by Hon. John Williams and Hon. Mick Gayfer is that this sessional order will be in place for only one year. If we do not like the system that is being instituted, we can throw it out. Every time a proposal for change is put up in this place, it is like pulling teeth—we seem to be frightened of moving onto new ground.

Another point that Hon. Norman Moore made was that if we extended speeches to 45 minutes everyone who speaks in a second read-

ing debate will speak for 45 minutes. I think that is hogwash. If a time limit is put on speeches it will make members prepare better and get their point over in a more efficient manner. At present, there is no discipline and members can ramble on for as long as they like. Hon. Norman Moore might find it interesting to listen to a member doing a Cook's tour of his or her electorate every six years.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: That is freedom of speech.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: We talk about efficiency in Government and private enterprise but when it comes to this place we can stay here all day talking like a mob of hyenas for as long as it takes. If someone wishes to talk his head off for two or three days it does not matter. We are paid, but efficiency does not count. I think it is reasonable that we have time limits for second reading debates and the Address-in-Reply.

Hon. G. E. Masters said that this was a House of Review. I had to contain myself. The leader of the Democrats also said it.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: I will take a point of order on that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Hon. G. E. Masters said that people must have time to speak. The proposed sessional orders do not operate as a guillotine. We are limiting the length of the second reading debate if everyone speaks for 45 minutes multiplied by 33, as a maximum. The Committee stage is unlimited. I maintain if one is talking about a Bill, no matter how complex, it is not the whole Bill that one is worried about. It is usually certain clauses. Members can speak as much as they like in the Committee stage. If a member cannot cover his or her points in 10 minutes before the Committee of the whole House there is something wrong. If the Minister answers, a member has another 10 minutes to speak. I do not see that there is any reduction in the review procedure available to this Chamber.

I call on members to give the proposed sessional orders a go. If we do not like them we can throw them out in 12 months. There was much gloom and doom about the previous sessional orders relating to questions and petitions and how the rights of the private member would be infringed. When it came to final approval the motion went through without any trouble at all. I think we should try this proposal and review it at the end of this session. I urge members to support the sessional order.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: One of the proposals contained in this motion before the Chair is that the time limit on speeches be restricted to 45 minutes. I am reminded of what happened in the Wild West with the noted outlaw, Jesse James. The question was always asked, "What killed Jesse James?" The answer was, "A .45." That is what this Government is proposing to do.

#### *Point of Order*

Hon. D. K. DANS: On a point of order I would like the honourable member on his feet not to say what this Government is proposing. The proposition before this Committee is the report by the Standing Orders Committee. I would suggest that you, Sir, should look at the composition of that Committee.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the House knows that he cannot argue a point with the Chair.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am picking up bad habits from the leader of the Independents.

#### *Committee resumed*

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It seems that I hit a bullseye with one shot. I am not in favour of time limits on speeches at all. I think the old order should prevail. It is not an ancient order but it is a practice of this Chamber—and has been for a long time—that has worked. We have had an illustration tonight from Hon. Norman Moore pointing out the length of speeches at random. I cannot see any justification for having a time limit of 10 minutes while in Committee when one can speak as many times as one likes. It is one of those superfluous things.

In response to the question of whether it is a House of Review, one of the things that has disappointed me is that members of the Labor Party seldom contribute to the debate when in Government. How can they consider themselves members of a House of Review? That is a disappointment. If they contributed more this would be a true House of Review rather than being one-sided. It is a great shame.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! When an honourable member is speaking all other members will refrain from interjecting. If one talks about democracy one will find that in a democracy every member can have his or her say. Every

member has an opportunity to speak in this place and that is why we have rules. There is no compulsion on members to agree with what is being said but it is reasonable to let the member have his say.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is a fact of life that members of the Labor Party pride themselves on the theory of practising democratic practices. What is more democratic than having unlimited time in this place to state one's case on behalf of the people one represents? The Labor Party is cutting across its own ideology in this regard. That disappoints me.

I wish to reinforce what Hon. G. E. Masters said in respect of other State upper Houses. I have done a little research and I cannot find any mention of a time limit on contributions in those Houses. Therefore, it is not unusual that we should conform with that in this Chamber, as we have done from way back. It is also very relevant that we do have 34 members in this place, whereas there are 57 in the other place. It may be that a House which contains a greater number of members will need that time constraint. Quite frankly the system we have used works very well indeed with the number of members we have in this place. It has not been abused except on rare occasions. That is a small price to pay for unlimited licence to contribute as one needs to.

This Chamber does not enjoy a private members' day as some other Houses do. There is no facility for members to raise issues on a regular basis by having a private members' day once a week or once a fortnight. Therefore, we need this extra licence so we can represent the people in this State. I do not intend to contribute much more except to say I do not support the amendment at all. I will oppose it as I do not believe in time limits.

#### *Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. D. K. DANS: I will try to point out to the Chamber what this motion is all about. A couple of members have engaged in flights of fancy as to what they think it is all about.

It is simply a motion that I put to this Chamber in order, hopefully, to make us a little more efficient. Someone came pretty close to the mark when he said we would have our eyes on the clock. That is what it is all about—not so much the length of the debate, but knowing for how long one can speak.

It has been said in some circles by various skilled speakers that if one cannot thoroughly cover any subject in 45 minutes, particularly in

a parliamentary situation, then one is not even trying.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You do admit you were wrong about 30 minutes?

Hon. D. K. DANS: No, I am not admitting anything. I will come back to that point in a moment. This brings it down to the utterances of the conservatives as opposed to the progressives. That is the vital difference!

Hon. P. G. Pental: Is that what you have become since you stopped being socialists?

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Pental should pipe down—he might say something intelligent and that will throw me.

Hon. P. G. Pental: We will see about that later. You are all puff and blabber.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. D. K. DANS: How much later?

Hon. P. G. Pental: You will see. We will refer to some of your promises. Don't get excited.

Hon. D. K. DANS: All members need to do, of course, is to prepare their speeches as members in the other place do. I do not think there is anyone in this Chamber who would dispute that the level of debate in the other place is of a much higher standard generally than debate in this place.

When I brought the motion into the House I spoke for a very short time and had no objection to the motion going to the Standing Orders Committee. That committee brought down a report to this Chamber today which I understand was unanimous. It should have been. One of the things that astounds me is that some people vote one way on those committees and then vote the other way when they come into this Chamber.

Tonight we are debating the report of the Standing Orders Committee which, incidentally, does not fulfil all the points that I put to the House. I am quite prepared to support that, because it is one of those committees that tries to do the right thing for all the members in this Chamber. On this occasion I think it has done that.

Mr Moore says the cutting down of the speeches in this place will somehow or other make this Chamber a pale image of the other place.

Hon. N. F. Moore: It is part of the strategy.

Hon. D. K. DANS: There is no strategy whatsoever involved. This motion went to the Standing Orders Committee, and that com-

mittee has brought back to this Chamber a recommendation. One of the things it is designed to do is to stop this place becoming a pale image of the other place; because its standing in the community and the Press is at a very low level. If anyone wishes to challenge that, let him look at the kind of publicity we get in the daily newspapers. Going further, when giving longwinded, badly-prepared speeches, members should look up at the Press Gallery. On many occasions there is no-one there. We have done it ourselves when in Opposition—do not worry about that.

This issue will be decided in this Chamber; not by me, nor by the Labor Party, but by all the members in this Chamber. They will decide what system they want as a result of the report brought here by the Standing Orders Committee. Surely anyone who comes here with a view to properly representing his constituents' points of view would not argue with that.

It has been said that there are no time restrictions in the other upper Houses in Australia. Maybe there are not—I know that there are in the Senate. But that is a pretty weak kind of argument, because I have used it on a number of other occasions for a number of other things. I can recall members on this side of the House, when in Opposition, saying that it does not really matter because we are debating what happens in the upper House of Western Australia. I must concede that—that is what we are doing.

But I want to get out of people's minds the thought that this motion is part of some long-range plan to discredit this place. If members are going to proceed in the manner in which they have been, then they will do more to discredit this place than any other single experience that I can think of. The length of time that it has taken tonight to debate an issue that has been to an all-party committee should underline the very reasons for which I brought this matter before the Chamber.

How anyone can read into that that this is some part of a long-range plan, bearing in mind that we go to elections from time to time and that numbers go up and down, and members go in and out of this place, is beyond me. I was counting up this morning, and I found that in the short time I have been in this place there have been 30 new members. In other members' cases there might have been many more. It is frightening when one thinks how insignificant one is, as an individual.

I see Mr Gayfer laughing away. He and I are what might be called some kind of survivors, although we do have to go to elections. That is part of the democratic process. Mr Ferry tries to make out that somehow or other we are very democratic if we speak for as long as we like. If one stands up and numbers up from one to 10, that is democratic. Come on!

If anyone was in the public galleries tonight looking down on us, he would say, "My God, why in the name of goodness didn't they move a motion such as this some time ago?"

Mr Gayfer has moved an amendment to incorporate a speech length of 45 minutes and time extension. What more do we want? It is not as though we are going to stifle debate or stop people from debating issues.

On another point, in my opinion most Bills are Committee Bills, and when one can speak for 10 minutes as many times as one likes, that does not suggest to me that we are muzzling people. Surely not!

Hon. N. F. Moore: Why bring it in?

Hon. D. K. D'ANIS: It has been brought in to introduce a little bit of order into this place. If members opposite think they are not slipping down the track, they do not read the editorials or do as I do and listen to the people who come into the public gallery from time to time. It will not advantage the Opposition, or us, one bit.

The Standing Orders Committee is a good committee which brought in first-class recommendations. They should be adopted.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I rise to reply to some of the things said by members opposite. Firstly I make it clear that this is not a Caucus matter; it has not been caucused.

The Standing Orders Committee came to an agreement. It was not what I wanted, because I went in believing we should be able to speak for 45 minutes. The agreement was for 30 minutes, and I stuck by that agreement. I made it known to my leader that I would vote for what the committee recommended. I did not do that on one issue, when Hon. John Williams came across and we renegotiated something, which is how we should properly behave.

Members opposite speak nonsense when they say we are trying to emasculate the House. I have been one of the people who for years, within my own party and this Chamber, has been trying to reform this House to make it a decent House of Review, and that is more than it has been in the nine years I have been here. The remarks about our trying to get rid of the

House are nonsense. I do not want to get rid of the House. If members opposite go on behaving the way they have behaved, they may get rid of the House themselves, because people might get sick of them.

I want this to be a decent, reformed, and democratic House. I will not begin a lecture on what democracy means, because it might take me too long. Parliament takes its name from the French word "parler", to speak; it was a parley-ament. It arose from King Edward I calling two knights from each shire and two burghers from each borough to consider his need for taxes. It arose from their need to appoint a Speaker to return to the King and tell him what they had decided. Gradually it became a House of legislation.

The Leader of the Opposition told us that we were here for members of Parliament. I thought we were here for the people.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I said the members were here to represent the people.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: I heard what the Leader of the Opposition said. I thought I would have a look at our Constitution Act. I refer to section 2(1) which reads as follows—

There shall be, in place of the Legislative Council now subsisting, a Legislative Council and a Legislative Assembly: and it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the said Council and Assembly, to make laws for the peace, order, and good Government of the Colony of Western Australia . . .

Our prime purpose is to grant the Crown money and to make laws. Our purpose is also to review legislation and to scrutinise the Government. That is the role of Parliament. Listening to the Leader of the Opposition, I would have thought that the other place should have two sets of Standing Orders, because from what he said, if something originates in the other House, it comes here and we have to discuss it carefully and at length. I presume he believes that if legislation originates here, it should be discussed at length in the other place, which then becomes the House of Review.

All this talk about a House of Review is a lot of nonsense. We are not organised as a House of Review; we do not operate as a House of Review. The sooner we realise it and the sooner we do act as a reformed and democratic House, the better—and democracy does not mean being able to talk for a long time.

The reason we are introducing the sessional orders—if we do—is to bring some order into this place. I was part of the committee that recommended that we accept the sessional orders as an experiment, because we need some sort of predictability and orderly debate in this place.

I would like 45 minutes for speeches—and maybe I would have got it—but I accepted 30 minutes. I wanted 45 minutes because that is the time of a lecture. My colleague, Hon. Garry Kelly, wanted 40 minutes, the length of a class.

It would be a good thing if we had ordered debate here. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition, as he pointed out to us, that if a member wants to filibuster, he can do so in the Committee stage. But if to be able to talk indefinitely is a sign of democracy, perhaps the American Senate is the pattern we should follow, where good laws have been destroyed by conservatives filibustering. That is not the kind of model I want to use for this place.

I want to see this place reformed. In due course I hope members will accept legislation to reform the House and to make it a democratic House. I want its business run in an orderly way so that we can get on with our prime purpose of legislating and also carry out our prime purpose of granting Supply to the Executive—I am referring now to the Executive in the broadest sense—and also carry out a scrutiny and examination of Government behaviour. If we are to do that, we need a balanced and a democratic House, and we need other reforms written into our Standing Orders, something which might come in due course if we become a democratic House. To do that I recommend we carry out the unanimous recommendation of the committee.

Reservations have been mentioned. I did not write in any of my reservations because I believe when people reach a compromise, as they must in a democratic system—which is what we are trying to make of this House—they accept that they vote in favour of the compromise, which is my intention tonight. I will vote for the recommendations because they are better than what we have and will give some better order to the House and allow members a chance to speak on the principles of a Bill. The recommendations will allow members who introduce measures to speak for longer than 30 minutes if necessary.

I have a reservation, too, about that point. I am a little concerned that we give Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition unlimited

time, because this is just another example of the encroachment on the House by the frontbenchers on both sides of the House, who want to keep their members tame. Nevertheless, the way things have developed we sometimes need longer explanations of Bills, although normally we do not get that. We need to give the principal speaker from either side time to reply in detail if necessary. We then need to give people an adequate time to speak on aspects of the principles of legislation before those measures go into Committee and are dealt with in detail. In Committee, a 10 minute speech is not too bad; members can deal with a great deal in 10 minutes. It might be a good idea if, when we went into Committee, we got out of the notion that some members seem to have, that getting up and repeating what was said last time is somehow developing the argument. That is something for members to decide.

For the Leader of the Opposition to talk about whether we have sufficient time to debate Supply Bills is hypocritical. He was a member of a Government that regularly brought Appropriation Bills into this House on the last night of sittings. I remember one night that the Appropriation Bill was brought on so late that, at my suggestion—I was being generous because I knew we were not going to spend sufficient time on the Bill—the Leader of the House had his speech incorporated in *Hansard*. This occurred very late at night and very late in the session. The Leader of the Opposition was a member of that Government.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: At least he did not pro-  
rogue Parliament.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: If I remember correctly, he refused to debate some of my legislation and brought it on on Christmas Eve.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It was not Christmas Eve; it was Christmas Day.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: It was Christmas Eve.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to finish this before Christmas Day.

Hon. ROBERT HETHERINGTON: This proposal gives members a great ability to do their jobs.

I point out to Hon. V. J. Ferry that there are various devices in this Parliament as far as airing grievances are concerned that make us far more flexible than the other place. I think we should stick to what is before us because it is

reasonable, rational and sensible. We should give it a go. If then we do not want to continue with it we can debate matters as we debate them now.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I was not going to rise on this matter again. I thought the debate prior to the suspension of the Chamber for tea was going nicely although it had been lengthy. People were being sincere in what they were saying. However, after the tea suspension, for one reason or another, the debate changed to that which we have now come to expect from the Leader of the House. All of a sudden he began to shout and to use his bully-boy tactics. He huffed and puffed telling members they will do as they are told or else. We are used to that attitude.

We have also heard hypocrisy from Hon. Robert Hetherington. He said that he would like to turn the House into a decent House of Review. The day when one of the Government members crosses the floor on a point of principle will be the day that we believe this has become a meaningful House of Review.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members to moderate their language and to talk to the Chair. I also ask them to talk about proposal No. 1 in the recommendations.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Thank you Mr President. I have been here for 12 years. The first time I see any one of the members opposite cross the floor of this Chamber I will know that the penny has dropped. I ask members not to listen to the rubbish spoken by Mr Dans. We know that Government members are acting under instruction and have to do everything they are told.

This debate has been damaged greatly by the Leader of the House and, to a lesser extent, by Hon. Robert Hetherington. I have a great deal of time for him most of the time. It is sad that he debased the debate as he did.

Hon. D. K. Dans: When are you going to say something valuable?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: At least I am not shouting and raving and huffing and puffing.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is that gutless flea on the other end of your front bench. Shut up you mug.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the House knows that he cannot refer to a member in that fashion.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT: He knows it is unparliamentary. I am pleased that he withdrew it before I asked him to. I suggest to members that they do not have to agree with what other members say. Surely each member understands that he is entitled to have his say. The ultimate decision is made by all members when the vote is taken. It seems to me that we can reach that stage of the proceedings sooner or we can reach it later. All that seems to happen is that we prolong the debate with no-one really saying anything. I recommend to members that we lower the tempo of our language and that we speak with moderation. We should stick to the question before the Chair. If we do I feel that we might get through this matter tonight.

#### *Committee Resumed*

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I supported the 45-minute time limit because I feel it is better than the 30-minute limit and, being able to add up as I can, that was the fall-back situation. I appeal to members to reconsider their positions and to vote against the proposal before the Chamber. I do this for good reason. I do not think an argument has been put forward which would suggest that the proposal before the Chamber will improve the situation at all. The debate will go on and if a matter is debated at length in Committee, so be it. John Williams said that any member who asks for an extension of time will be granted one. If that is the case, there is no purpose to having a time limit.

I am a little disappointed in Hon. Mick Gayfer. I thought he would stick firmly to the traditions of the Legislative Council and anything at all that would reduce its powers or the strength of its members would be opposed by him. It may be that the members of his party have given him some direction about which I am not aware.

It is unfortunate that voices were raised and the debate lost direction. I urge all members to vote against the recommendation.

The PRESIDENT: I was asked during the tea suspension whether leave to extend a member's speech by 15 minutes could be extended more than once. I indicated that I thought it could. It is incumbent upon me to advise the Chamber that that is not so. Only one extension will be granted.

Sessional orders 1.1 to 1.3, as amended, put and passed.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The next recommendation refers to the hours at which Parliament shall sit.

Rather than read through the proposed sessional orders at the moment, I would like to speak on them first. It is suggested that the hour for commencement on Tuesday be 3.30 p.m. That, I must admit, was a compromise motion between the present time of sitting—4.30 p.m.—and the proposal that the Chamber sit at 2.30 p.m. The idea is that we should have afternoon tea before that time and no interruption will subsequently be caused to the Chamber.

It is proposed that the Chamber begin sitting at 2.30 p.m. on Wednesday and that will allow the various parties to get their business over with in the morning. The time of 2.30 p.m. was recommended, very sensibly, so that those members who had luncheon engagements, representing the Government away from Parliament House, could get back in time.

The Thursday starting time of 11.00 a.m. was chosen in order to give the Standing Committees of the House a chance to meet. Perhaps they have been left a little short and we will probably hear from them on that. That time gives them only two hours to meet, if they wish to meet during the day that the Parliament is sitting.

If this Chamber adopts the recommendations of the Select Committee on Legislative Council committees, perhaps we will have to change those hours. However, this is probably designed for the present manner in which we do our work.

The major recommendation in the report is the one which provides for 11.00 p.m. closing. It is noted that it could be 11.00 p.m. or it could be 11.40 p.m. As members will appreciate from the debate on the previous section just passed, there could be a forty-minute debate on the adjournment. In other words, it could be 11.40 p.m.—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Or it could be a Bill which the Leader of the Opposition is talking on which has been introduced at 10.55 p.m.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Yes. Not necessarily the Leader of the Opposition, but the Government could go on introducing a Bill and that this could take the final adjournment well past 11.00 p.m. One could be discussing the adjournment until well after midnight. I think that adjourning a debate at 11.00 p.m. might well prove frustrating for both the Government and the Opposition.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Unless the House is otherwise ordered.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Unless leave is granted. It will take only one dissenting voice; and that might be a little difficult.

The 5.30 p.m. closing time on Thursday is to enable country people, such as Hon. Mick Gayfer, who spoke strongly on this section, to return to their electorates. It looks as though the balance of power is paying off in that respect.

One of the difficulties that I perceive is that until now members in this place have never, or seldom, stopped speaking in the middle of a speech and gone on with it the following day. That is a tradition of this place. Having risen to one's feet, one has to go on and the Chamber has to listen to one. In the other place members do stop their speeches, and continue them the following day. Hon. Mick Gayfer was the only person that I recall ever having his speech interrupted and, indeed, he never finished it.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Excuse me, there is no reason why it cannot be finished yet. I will tell you later.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: This will be a change and we could end up with quite a lot of half-finished speeches; and that would create difficulties. There is nothing in the Standing Orders which says that we have to return next day to a Bill that has been adjourned the night before. We could end up with two or three Bills on the Notice Paper which contain half-finished speeches; and this would put a greater obligation on people to be in the Chamber and ready with their speeches. I believe that is an obligation because we do chop and change on the Notice Paper often in this Chamber.

In fact I left my notes for this Committee in my room because I thought I could collect them when Hon. Vic Ferry was giving his Address-in-Reply speech. However, that was not to be for the Leader of the House changed the order of the Notice Paper. Many members could be sitting tightly waiting to see whether, by chance, the Leader of the House would give them the nod to continue their speeches.

The clause in section 2.3 which allows the Chamber, when in Committee, to knock off five minutes before the 5.30 p.m. finishing time, will give the President time to return to the Chair. That really is not arguable. It might appear a very good idea to have this Chamber sitting more normal hours, but I think it will be a lot harder on the staff. They have to get everything ready and I do not think that mem-

bers generally realise how much paperwork there is to do in that respect. I think it will be more difficult for members to sit in the Chamber and I just wonder whether this Chamber, with its 34 members, can have too many of its members outside the Chamber. That happens in the larger Chamber and one still gets a reasonable attendance, but this Chamber already suffers from having, if I may say so, too few Ministers in it. In fact we very often have only one Minister in the Chamber or worse still the Government Whip sitting on the front bench. I am not sure why he sits there, because, as he is out of his seat, he cannot make a contribution. He would be far better off in his own seat, where he can act.

I move—

That the following sessional orders be adopted—

2.1—The Council, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business at 3.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 2.30 p.m. on Wednesday and 11.00 a.m. on Thursday in each week. Unless previously adjourned, the House shall continue to sit until 11 p.m. on Tuesday and Wednesday and 5.30 p.m. on Thursday.

2.2—Where the House is sitting at 11 p.m. or 5.30 p.m., as the case may be, the President, unless the House has otherwise ordered, shall interrupt the business then proceeding and any debate then in progress shall be deemed to be adjourned. The business interrupted, and any debate so adjourned, shall be set down for resumption on the next day of sitting.

2.3—If the House be in committee at 10.55 p.m. or 5.25 p.m. the chairman, unless the House has otherwise ordered, shall interrupt the business then proceeding and, without putting any question to the committee, report progress on any matter referred to that committee, and no progress on any matter referred to that committee, but not reached at the time of such interruption, and move for leave to sit again.

2.4—Upon the interruption of business as so provided, no further business shall be transacted except:

(a) the receipt of messages and, in the case of a Bill received from the Assembly, the moving of its second reading by the Minister or member in charge;

(b) a motion to adjourn the Council to a date or time or both that is different from that already ordered, and upon the conclusion thereof, or if there is no such business, a Minister shall move the adjournment of the House.

(see proviso to rule 1.1 for time restriction on adjourned debate.)

The PRESIDENT: I would say, for the benefit of members, that the term "until otherwise ordered" means that notice of motion has to be given and the motion moved and agreed to that the House meet at some other time.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is as it is now.

The PRESIDENT: That is exactly as it is now. It is open to the House to move a recommendation to change at any time for some particular reason or other.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I do not oppose any of the proposals put forward in the recommendation. Members of the Standing Orders Committee were in agreement about the commencement time of 3.30 p.m. for Tuesday. That commencement time certainly accommodates the Opposition as far as its meetings before the Tuesday session are concerned. The proposed sitting time on Wednesday from 2.30 p.m. to 11.00 p.m. is not a proposal with which we would argue. I am, however, anxious to see how it will work out.

I have some reservations about the proposed sitting time for Thursday—11.00 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. I am not suggesting that I will oppose the introduction of those times, but I do think as time goes on that the committees that must necessarily meet while the House is not in session may not have sufficient time to do so. It could well be that Thursday morning is one of the few times at which my members would be able to meet their commitments to any committees. Certainly, at present, there is only one Standing Committee, but we hope there will be more in the future.

Hon. Tom Stephens: The other Standing Order could be changed.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Quite right, but I think we will have some difficulties with respect to those proposed times. However, we will see how it works out. I put it to you, Mr President, and to the Leader of the House, that there could be some difficulties with a finishing time of 11.00 p.m. I am anxious to see how that works, but I have a strong feeling that when a large amount of legislation piles up, the 11.00

p.m. finish will be difficult to achieve and an extension of time will be sought. I hope I am wrong, but I think that is quite likely.

As I understand it, if the debate taking place in this House is not concluded at 11 o'clock in the evening the House will adjourn and the next day the debate will be resumed from the stage it finished the night before. The Address-in-Reply debate, if one of the Orders of the Day, would continue from the completion of that item. I hope that is right; it is as I understand it.

The PRESIDENT: I will explain the matter when you finish your remarks.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Thank you, Mr President.

I also understand from a reading of the recommendations that at the 11 o'clock adjournment, within the limits of the time we have now agreed on, members will be able to talk on the adjournment if that is what they wish. With those few comments, I support that proposal.

The PRESIDENT: Before I put the question, I will answer the question that the Leader of the Opposition has asked in regard to the situation that will occur if an honourable member is speaking to a debate at the time the House is to adjourn. That debate will be interrupted and the item will appear on the next day's Notice Paper with the name of the member who was speaking when the House adjourned as the member to be given the call. However, it will not mean that that debate would necessarily come on the next day. It would simply mean that it would be placed on the Notice Paper. It will not necessarily go on the Notice Paper as Order of the Day No. 1. It may well be Order of the Day No. 25 and it may not be brought up for debate for a long time. That is the explanation.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: Although I am not unhappy about changing the hours the House sits, I do have reservations about beginning at 11 o'clock on Thursday mornings. Having been a member of the Standing Committee on Government Agencies for four years or so, I have observed that on a very regular basis we needed every minute of Thursday morning in which to complete the work of that committee.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Two hours is plenty.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: The time is particularly necessary when witnesses come to give evidence before the committee. It would be unfair to ask them to come in at 7.30 in the morning if our meetings must begin at that time in order

for the committee to complete its activities. If the House decides to have more committees, we will have to reconsider either when we sit on Thursday mornings or whether we can change the Standing Order that says that committees cannot meet while the House is sitting. That may be a better way of achieving what people hope to achieve.

I hope that the Standing Committee on Government Agencies will provide an example of how this will work. I hope that the members on the committee will view the proposal as a trial horse to see whether the Standing Order will be effective.

I also suggest that the new Standing Order with respect to finishing at 11 o'clock will be the very first Standing Order for which the Government moves for a suspension. The reason why the House goes past 11 o'clock, as we all know, is not that people want to stay here until the early hours of the morning but that Governments, both Liberal and Labor, want to get their legislation passed. We sit here until three or four o'clock in the morning sometimes, simply because Governments have a legislative programme.

The mere fact of our saying that we want to stop at 11 o'clock will not stop the Government putting through legislation. The Standing Order would be suspended when that legislation could not be put through. If members think this will improve the workings of the House, I suggest that they are wrong. It will not have that effect. The usual log jam of legislation will continue and may even be worse because we would have sat only until 11 o'clock on some nights on which we could have gone on with the legislation. With that reservation, I support the proposition.

**Sessional orders 2.1 to 2.4 put and passed.**

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I move—

That the following sessional order be adopted—

15. Except as provided in SO's 170, 170A, 170B, any order of the day for the resumption of the adjourned debate on the motion to adopt an address in reply to the Governor's speech shall take precedence on each sitting day over all other business, and no motion shall be entertained that, if passed, would have the effect of nullifying that precedence.
16. On any sitting day before the adoption of the address in reply, but subject to SO's 181 and 212, motions and

other business may be dealt with, and in the event that the address in reply debate is adjourned prior to the time at which the House itself is adjourned, the House may proceed to orders of the day (if any) as they appear on the Notice Paper.

This amendment will enable motions to be debated in the first hour of sitting. At present, motions from the Opposition—ones that are not substantive—having been introduced, cannot be debated until the Address-in-Reply debate is completed. This change will allow those motions to be debated during the first hour. As members know, after one hour motions can only continue with the agreement of the House for if there is one dissenting voice one cannot go on with the motions.

These changes will allow consideration of Government business after adjournment of the Address-in-Reply debate. As compensation the Opposition would be able to do more in the first hour than it can at present because the present orders prevent further debate on motions. I think one is balanced against the other.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: This recommendation came about as a result of Hon. Norman Moore putting forward an idea. I had supported it, but over the weekend I developed some reservations. Since then the Standing Orders Committee has taken account of some of the matters I raised, and so I think it has gone along the lines I would like to see adopted.

I am still not absolutely sure of one or two points, and I intend to raise those. The importance of the position on the Notice Paper of the Address-in-Reply is preserved, and that is very important. With the time limits, it makes allowance for a longer speech on the Address-in-Reply.

As I understand from the explanation by the Chairman of Committees, if the Opposition wishes to bring forward any motions they will at least be dealt with in the first hour of any sitting.

While the Address-in-Reply progresses, if an Opposition member were to introduce an amendment, I assume that the Government would then have the option of proceeding to debate that amendment, or adjourning it to the next day. The amendment is debated first up on the Notice Paper for the next day as part of the Address-in-Reply.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That would be my thinking.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the Opposition were to move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, and the Government were to proceed with the amendment, that is fine. If the Government decided to adjourn the amendment, it can only be adjourned to the next day, when it must come on as No. 1 on the Notice Paper.

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: If the Address-in-Reply progresses during an evening to the stage where there are simply no more speakers, as has happened in the past, the debate is adjourned by a member and the Government is able to proceed with Government legislation until 11.00 p.m. On the next day, the Address-in-Reply again takes precedence. That is as I understand the position.

The proposed sessional order says this—

On any sitting day before the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, but subject to SO's 181 and 212, motions and other business may be dealt with.

One cannot very well use the word "shall", so "may" means it will be the case, does it?

The PRESIDENT: It is a permissible situation. There might not be any motions. It means motions may be debated if there are any.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: So it does not mean "may or may not"?

The PRESIDENT: It does not suggest you must go on with a motion if you do not have one.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That was my understanding. So with the questions on the Standing Orders dealing with the matter I and some of my colleagues raised during this debate some weeks ago, I am now prepared to support the recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee.

Although there has been great criticism of the length of debate on these matters, they are very important indeed, and the earlier debate a week ago brought this idea forward. If it is effective, this is worthwhile. We are looking at many areas. The existing Standing Orders have been there for 20, 30, or 50 years, so we must be very cautious in altering them.

I support the recommendation.

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I congratulate the Standing Orders Committee on accepting such a good idea. It was actually a compromise between having no change and the change proposed by the Leader of the House.

If a person wishes to speak on the Address-in-Reply on a particular day, he should have the opportunity to do so. However, if one person has spoken, somebody may move that the debate be adjourned.

Hon. D. K. Dans: They can do that now, can they not?

Hon. N. F. MOORE: I realise that. While I am not suggesting Standing Orders should prevent that from happening, members on both sides of the House should accept the spirit of this thing. If more than one person wishes to speak on the Address-in-Reply on a particular day, they should be able to do so. Adjourning the debate after one speaker would defeat the spirit in which this is put forward.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr President, if we now pass this, when may we be expected to introduce this system? My reason for asking this is that most of us have completed our speeches on the Address-in-Reply, but some have not. Some members will have had an advantage. I wonder if it is possible to wait until such time as the Address-in-Reply in this session is finished so that we are acting as a truly democratic House, as Hon. Robert Hetherington suggested we should be.

The other question is a more practical one. Is it the intention to put clocks above the door so as to count down the time?

Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: As President I am in a very peculiar situation, not knowing—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I apologise.

The PRESIDENT: Do not apologise. I thought you might be going to stop me from saying what I am about to say, which would have been a tragedy.

What I was pointing out to the honourable member is that in my position I am not allowed to know anything about what is going on. My task is simply to ensure that debates are carried out in an honest, orderly manner.

However, I would not be the least bit surprised if, as soon as the motion determining that these new proposals will come into effect is passed, a motion were moved so that they may take effect immediately.

I assume there will be absolutely no argument from the Government when we ask it for the funds to install the timing equipment which will be necessary to effect the time limits on speeches, because there is no other way to do it. I would expect no argument from the Minister

for Budget Management when we seek approval to get the BMA to install those timing devices in this Chamber immediately.

**Sessional orders 15 and 16 put and passed.**

## SESSIONAL ORDERS

### *Effect: Motion.*

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.32 p.m.]: I move—

That the sessional orders take effect from midnight on Tuesday, 24 June 1986.

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [8.33 p.m.]: If the motion is passed, and Hon. Vic Ferry makes his speech on the Address-in-Reply, it will be possible for him to talk from now until 11.00 p.m. However, it will not give my new member here a chance to talk for three hours tomorrow should he desire to do so. In all fairness, I would have thought the sessional order could take effect the moment the Address-in-Reply was finished. It would then be fair to everybody.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I think it is still fair now. I do not think anyone will be disadvantaged.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I suppose not. We will just keep extending their time.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Before I put the question, I point out I made an explanation in regard to the extension of time. I indicated to the House that the 15 minutes' extension would occur only once; so I just remind Hon. H. W. Gayfer that I am on record as having made that point.

### *Point of Order*

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Would you allow me, Sir, to repeat my plea to the Leader of the House that this not be implemented until such time as the debate on the Address-in-Reply has been finished?

The PRESIDENT: No, I will not allow you to do that.

### *Debate Resumed*

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.35 p.m.]: I do not want to disadvantage anyone and I do not believe that will be the case bearing in mind the 15 minute extension. That is my personal opinion. However, let us see how the sessional order operates and then, if necessary, we can make some extraordinary rules to deal with an extraordinary situation. That is one of the disadvantages of moving the sessional order halfway through a session, but I would not envisage

many people speaking for longer than 75 minutes.

Question put and passed.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### *Precedence*

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.36 p.m.]: I move—

That Order of the Day No. 11 be taken before Order of the Day No. 1.

### *Point of Order*

**Hon. G. E. MASTERS**: I understood it was necessary to move to suspend Standing Orders in this case. I am not opposed to dealing with this Bill, but I understood that the Address-in-Reply took precedence on the Notice Paper in this Chamber, unless the House agreed otherwise. That means that the suspension of the relevant Standing Order ought to be required.

### *Motion Resumed*

Question put and passed.

Motion passed.

## TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION AMENDMENT BILL

### *All Stages: Leave to Proceed*

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.37 p.m.]: I seek leave to permit the passage of all stages of the Bill during this sitting.

**HON. H. W. GAYFER** (Central) [8.38 p.m.]: Earlier this evening we were advised of the Government's wish to do this. It has not been suddenly thrust upon us and another two Bills will be treated similarly. We consent to breaking away from the norm in this respect and, being fellows of goodwill, we thought we would demonstrate that to the Government by allowing it, just this once, to do this.

Leave granted.

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 19 June.

**HON. C. J. BELL** (Lower West) [8.39 p.m.]: The Opposition agrees with the Bill, and it understands the reason the Government has decided to proceed in this way.

Since the Act was proclaimed, substantial changes have occurred in the industry. Some anomalies have become apparent, particularly in the last couple of years, which have necessitated these amendments.

The Opposition appreciated that the Leader of the House made available to us last week Mr Ray Ellis, the Deputy Director General of the Transport Commission, to explain the reasons and mechanics involved in the legislation.

The Bill seeks to change the method of assessing the liability for the State fuel tax and seeks to change the basis from a calendar year to a calendar month. Had the electoral result been different, the Opposition would have been seeking to move to abolish this tax, although we now know it has been increased.

Nevertheless, we do understand why it is needed. The current rationalisation in the fuel industry has caused problems for the Government, and in turn the taxpayers, in terms of collection of the moneys. It has also caused problems for the companies involved. I recall a situation where a company which had ceased trading was still liable for the tax because the tax is based on an historical year; companies have been liable for tax when they are no longer trading. Unfortunately, under the current legislation a new company could enter the industry and not be liable for tax for another year; also, when a company drops out other companies of course pick up the sales but they have no liability for the tax for another year, which causes some disruption in the marketplace.

One of the problems caused by the legislation before us is that in July 1986, on the assumption that this legislation is passed, the companies will have to meet two payments. I understand this has caused some concern within the companies involved. They will have to make a payment on 1 July based on May 1986 sales and of course a payment on 15 July based on sales for the calendar year, in other words, the previous 12 months.

It was decided that the best way around that problem was to create a system of instalments whereby one-twelfth of the first liability for payment was spread over the whole year so as to stop that lump in their cash flow.

We see no problems with the proposed Bill. It does what the Government seeks to do—to be fair and equitable in imposing the new arrangement. We would have preferred to see the abolition of that tax, but that of course is a philosophical and not an administrative argument and the Bill is about administration.

With those few comments, I indicate the Opposition's support of this Bill.

**HON. E. J. CHARLTON** (Central) [8.43 p.m.]: My comments will also be brief. A couple of points obviously need to be made about the change. They have already been touched upon by Hon. C. J. Bell. This move is obviously the only one that can be made to bring the companies into line in regard to these changes. This opportunity should not pass without my making the comment—particularly in view of the Premier's announcement today that the levy will almost be doubled—as I mentioned the other night during the Address-in-Reply, that this levy will adversely affect the same section of the community that is responsible for paying this tax, regardless of which company pays it, when it is paid, and so forth. I want to highlight that point.

The National Party supports this move and believes that obviously it is the only logical thing to do. We thank the Government for informing us of its reasons for instituting the proposed changes. It is a coincidence that this Bill is before this House on the same day that the Premier has announced increases which will almost double the levy for fuel used on roads. We all know that the most fuel per head of population is used by those people who are forced into this situation because of the work they do or where they happen to live.

With those few comments I indicate the National Party supports the Bill.

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [8.45 p.m.]: I thank members opposite for their support of this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Hon. John Williams) in the Chair; Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House) in charge of the Bill.

#### **Clause 1: Short title—**

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Hon. E. J. Charlton said this tax is being doubled. The way he put it sounded almost as if he felt there was a way of avoiding this tax. Unfortunately it is a tax which is collected by the State regardless. It is not possible to avoid it. As a primary producer a person can avoid the Federal Government tax but this tax more or less catches everyone, whatever use is made of the fuel.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I think Hon. David Wordsworth also has it wrong. It is possible for the farming fraternity to avoid this tax being passed on, but a company paying the tax will

still have to do so. There is no way they will be able to get out of anything. I cannot quite see where the argument lies because this is not a tax for the individual; it is a tax for a company.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It is passed on.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is passed on, but it is not passed on in any specific way. The point Mr Charlton raised was that the income from it has been used for road maintenance. The money goes into a fund for overall road maintenance. Mr Charlton also made the point that in his speech tonight the Premier said that legislation will shortly be introduced to establish a transport trust fund into which all revenue from the fuel franchise levy will be paid to ensure it is used principally for transport-related purposes and not solely for roads. Mr Charlton infers that for the first time we will see that it will not go solely into roads. It will go into the MTT and areas which are transport-related such as the railways. Other points were adequately explained by Mr Bell.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am sorry to speak again, but there is quite a lot of confusion over rebates and diesel use off-road.

Hon. D. K. DANS: That is not in this Bill.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I know it is not in this Bill, but at the same time I felt I should bring it up because it seemed Mr Charlton thought it could be avoided. The tax cannot be avoided. Unfortunately there is a lot of confusion, so much so that it has cost me personally \$2 000.

The Federal Government is giving a rebate to farmers, but it passed a regulation which stated that rebate applications had to be submitted within a certain time. No-one knew about that regulation and no-one received a satisfactory reply to his appeal.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 2 to 14 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), and passed.

#### **ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SEVENTH DAY**

#### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 19 June.

**HON. V. J. FERRY** (South-West) [8.52 p.m.]: I have pleasure in supporting the motion. This debate gives a member a wide-ranging opportunity to mention a number of issues he or she feels disposed to mention.

First, I offer my congratulations to the newly-elected members of this House, and I wish them everything they would wish for themselves in their new role in public life. I extend my special congratulations to Hon. Doug Wenn, the member for South-West Province. Mr Wenn has a hard act to follow, taking his place as he does after the former member, Hon. Graham MacKinnon CMG, who represented the south-west with distinction for 30 years.

I wish to welcome my own colleague, Hon. Max Evans. I am sure he will contribute in a fine way to the work of this House and to Parliament.

I find it rather startling when I realise that at a very young age I am now the father of the House and it is amazing how time flies when one is having fun. The President. (Hon. Clive Griffiths) and I were elected at the general election on 20 February 1965 and we took our place rightfully under the Constitution on 22 May that year.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Would you be the father of the Legislative Council?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I realise that Hon. Mick Gayfer has been in this Parliament longer than I, but he had the misfortune of a certain redistribution and found himself in this House in 1974, for which we are grateful.

I wish to raise a number of issues tonight. Over the years we have heard so much about the democratic process and all sorts of reforms; even today and tonight we have had discussions, at length, about some changes to our method of work in this place. I mentioned earlier that I felt it would impinge somewhat on our democratic rights to have a limit on speeches. I suggest it is poetic justice that I am the first speaker on the Address-in-Reply debate to have the new time limit imposed on him. I understand I am all right until midnight—if I continue for that length of time I certainly will have the time limit imposed upon me.

I refer to the Government's action in proroguing Parliament at the end of last year. It was an unprecedented act on the part of the Government. When one hears from members of the Labor Party that this Government is a democratic Government and when one con-

siders that it closed down the Parliament for political purposes, it gives the lie to that assertion. It was a cowardly act which was totally unprecedented. I have a copy of the proclamation which is under the hand of Mr Brian Burke and is dated 27 November 1985 and which states that Parliament would be prorogued from 12.00 noon that day.

This Government purports to be a Government of the people with nothing to hide, yet it closed down Parliament. I suppose that it was because Nero fiddled that they burned Rome. It may be this Government's contempt of Parliament that will bring it down.

I have referred to the time limit on speeches and it appears to me that the Government is trying to use—for whatever reason—this Parliament for its own purposes. As the Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Gordon Masters, said a few days ago, the Parliament is for the members, the representatives of the people, and is not for the convenience of Ministers or for any other Government purpose. It is a Parliament for the people. The Government is like a bashful nudist—it hates to be disclosed to the public. It closed the Parliament for seven months. The Labor Party has not only taken such action in this State, but now, in New South Wales the Labor Party has also "Wran". Things are changing in the Labor Party.

I refer now to the Government's electioneering in the south-west prior to the last election. The Government, through the South-West Development Authority, launched the second stage of "Bunbury 2000" at a special dinner held at the Lighthouse Inn at the end of last year. In response to two questions I asked last week it has been disclosed that the cost of the dinner, at which 300 people are reported to have attended, was \$11 150.30. In answer to a further question about the funding of this exercise the Government advised that the South West Development Authority paid the account with the help of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Public money!

I asked a further question about how many brochures titled, "Bunbury 2000—The Shape of Things to Come", had been printed. I was advised that 3 000 were printed at a cost of \$31 500; that is, a total of \$42 650.30 had been spent on an election. It is an example of the blatant use of public money for electioneering purposes. It is a public scandal that this Government can get away with this exercise for political objectives. It should have launched the second stage of "Bunbury 2000" in a more appropriate way and then I would have

applauded it. Further, the Government has come up with a glossy publication with each copy costing approximately \$10 and on the last page of the brochure is a photograph depicting a rainbow.

Why do we need a rainbow as part of a strategy? Is there to be a pot of gold at the end of it? It is all so much nonsense to have this glossy brochure showing pictures of the bay of Cape Leeuwin, the Koombana Queen parade, etc. It is beautiful to look at, but quite frankly, what does it do to help the area? Not a great deal. It may be that people will look at the pictures and perhaps be attracted by them. However, as a Government document it is in very poor taste indeed. There is no doubt about it. I condemn the Government for spending money in that way. On its own admission the money has come from Consolidated Revenue. Had the cost been paid by the Labor Party from its funds, there would be no argument, but the brochure has been produced to publicise the second stage of "Bunbury 2000".

Recently the Government and the Labor Party members elected certain Ministers to the Ministry. I have no argument whatsoever on a personal basis with any of the Ministers. However, on this occasion the south-west has been clearly snubbed with regard to the members of the Cabinet. The Cabinet does not contain one Minister from a south-west electorate. The south-west has a proud record over many years of having members from that area in the Ministry and I refer to such eminent people as Sir Stewart Bovell, the former member for Vasse; Hon. Graham MacKinnon, to whom I have already referred tonight; and Hon. June Craig. Those three members were all Liberal members; and, indeed, I have been reminded that Hon. Neil McNeill is another member who served with distinction and was Leader of the House under a Liberal Government. The only Labor member who was a Minister in recent years is Hon. David Evans, the member for Warren, but he is no longer in the Cabinet even though he still has the benefit of a Government car.

All this nonsense about the Government caring for the south-west does not hold up under examination. We have a Minister for The South West, Hon. Julian Grill. I have no personal animosity towards Mr Grill, but he represents a far-flung electorate called Esperance-Dundas which is miles and miles from the south-west. Here again, according to the Government handout at the launch in

Bunbury, the so-called centrepiece of the "Bunbury 2000" second stage will be the appointment of a Minister for The South West. The Ministry will be located in Bunbury and it will be the first time in Western Australian history that any ministerial office has been decentralised from Perth to a regional centre. One would have expected that office to be the usual full-blown office of a Minister, and everyone would have applauded that. However, having insulted its Labor members representing electorates in the south-west by appointing a man from a far-flung part of the State many hundreds of miles from the scene of the activity, what has the Government located in the office at Bunbury?

I asked a question on notice and received the answer that the Minister has one man in the office, a secretary. He is a very good man whom I know personally and he has a great capacity. Also the Government hopes to appoint a stenographer in the future. That was the text of the reply I received in this House. We are presented with this great showpiece of "Bunbury 2000" in the south-west, the Minister does not represent the area, and he has one man in the ministerial office. It is a complete charade.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Esperance is in the area.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Hon. Mark Nevill can talk as much as he likes but it does not affect the south-west corner. It is an impossible situation for any Minister. This Minister has the exacting portfolio of Agriculture which requires him to spend a great deal of time over a wide area of the State. He has an electorate to run and also he is worried about the proposed gold tax, as well he might be. He is under a great deal of pressure and battling to do his job. Certainly it is not being carried out in the manner expected by, and projected to, the people in the south-west based on the Labor Party's staging of the appointment.

To continue with matters dealing with the south-west, I refer to the concern and apprehension some people have with regard to the nuclear question. I believe that mankind will benefit from research arising from the mishap at the Chernobyl nuclear reactor plant. I certainly acknowledge the unfortunate loss of life, injury and residual harm to those involved, which is a matter of deep regret. However, science and technology will be enhanced for the safer operation of nuclear power stations in future.

Nuclear power stations have been in use around the world for the last 30 years. At present approximately 370 nuclear stations are located in many countries and I wish to quote for the record some information contained in a newsletter from Uranium Information Centre Limited. It quotes information from the United Kingdom as follows—

#### Radioactive releases from power stations.

It is not generally recognised that the burning of coal in power stations involves the release of radioactive substances into the environment. The Chairman of the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB) Lord Marshall, recently compared radioactive releases from nuclear and coal stations while giving evidence to a Select Committee of the House of Lords on the European Communities. Portions of his evidence are reproduced below:

Earlier this year, British Nuclear Fuels released into the Irish Sea some 400 kilograms of uranium with the full knowledge of the regulations. This attracted considerable media attention and I believe, some 14 parliamentary questions.

I have to inform you that yesterday the CEGB released about 300 kilograms of radioactive uranium, together with all its radioactive decay products into the environment. Furthermore, we released some 300 kilograms of uranium the day before that. We shall be releasing the same amount of radioactive uranium today, and we plan to do the same tomorrow. In fact we do it every day of every year so long as we burn coal in our power stations. And we do not call that 'radioactive waste', we call it coal ash.

This year we have had three separate minor incidents at our nuclear power stations, causing the release of slightly radioactive carbon dioxide from the reactors at Hinkley Point, Sizewell and Trawsfynydd. The total amount of gas released from all three incidents was less than 100 tons. But all gas-cooled reactors regularly release much more of this carbon dioxide gas as part of their routine operations. Again, I must inform you that yesterday the CEGB discharged some 600 000 tons of slightly radioactive carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. We do so every

day—from our coal-fired power stations.

The radioactivity in it is small and gives rise to small doses of radiation to members of the public—of the same order as the doses received due to airborne emissions close to nuclear power stations. In both cases the risks to the public are insignificant.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Would you have a nuclear power station in Bunbury?

Hon. P. G. Pandal: You can do better than that.

Hon. Graham Edwards: I would be interested to hear whether we would have one down there.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Mankind needs and cannot survive without adequate energy. People rely on power for almost every facet of living, be it in the production, processing or transporting of foodstuffs, medical and health care, or quality of life. In view of this need for energy the world will continue to use power from nuclear power plants.

Out of every setback comes a better way of doing things. So it is with the technology to produce power from nuclear sources.

The people of the world will continue to benefit from improved technology. This mishap at Chernobyl will spur scientists to seek safer systems. Indeed, the people will demand this of them.

There is a lot of hysteria associated with nuclear power plants, but I will quote the percentage of electricity derived from nuclear power by various countries in 1986. These figures represent the amount of electricity produced and used in these countries as part of their total energy source—

	per cent
France	64.8
Belgium	59.8
Taiwan	59.0
Sweden	42.3
Switzerland	39.8
Finland	38.2
Bulgaria	31.6
West Germany	31.2
Japan	25.0
Britain	19.3
USA	15.5
USSR	10.0

There are others, but those are sufficient to show the extent of the nuclear power stations, and what they mean to people and their quality of life to have sufficient power.

There are some risks with nuclear power, there is no question about that, no matter what we do. There are also many advantages and we are, as a people, ready to accept those advantages. We are all familiar with many things such as x-rays for medical purposes. As well, I have just picked up a *Nuclear News* No. 23 dated April 1986, issued by the Australian Atomic Energy Commission. It refers to a new diagnostic technique which depends on what is described as cyclotron.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer interjected.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It may be, but that is another use and it gives information about what is happening inside a patient. It is quite relevant to the use.

Hon. P. G. Pental: There are a few of them who are very grateful for it, too.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The article states—

Scientists have been developing new methods of using radioactive tracers to investigate biological function ever since Hevesy first proposed the idea in 1913. Radioactive tracers were first applied clinically in the mid 1920s, and are now used routinely in all major hospitals.

It goes on to mention that Australia started producing radioactive medical tracers in the 1960s when AAEC commissioned a nuclear reactor called HIFAR. The article continues—

Originally HIFAR was used as a tool for research on power reactors. In the 1960s, the demand for radioactive tracers in Australian medicine grew dramatically, and the AAEC was able to use HIFAR to support this growth with the supply of reactor-produced medical tracers. The AAEC played a 'trail-blazing' role in these activities, and pioneered a system to deliver the tracers across the nation, a system that has been used as a model in other countries. Since that time, Australia has kept up to date with reactor-produced medical tracers, but has never produced medical-grade tracers with a cyclotron.

That goes to show, by some small illustration, that we can learn to use the nuclear benefits rather than have them work against us. We must continue to make substances work for us, and certainly not against us, because the world depends on energy. Our quality of life, no mat-

ter what sort of quality we are looking for, depends on energy whatever we do. That is why so many countries around the world have opted for nuclear reactors to supply them with energy. There are some 370, and the number is still growing because more and more are coming on stream.

Nuclear power is a fact of life. It is nothing new, but unfortunately the fear of radiation is a worry, certainly to younger people.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Fear of military use is not so much an issue!

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Unfortunately, there is a fear of anything associated with nuclear power, and people do associate atomic bombs with nuclear power. I am very concerned. From time to time one hears people referring to conventional weapons as though they are lovely things to have. I wonder what a conventional weapon is. If one goes back in time, one could refer to nulla nullas and spears and knives, quite apart from rifles, cannon, rockets, and a whole host of things. What is a conventional weapon? It is so much nonsense for people to say that we cannot have one particular type of weapon but that a conventional war is fine. I cannot accept that in any shape or form.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Perhaps even our school children should be taken out to Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and shown the uses of nuclear medicine. Perhaps that would give them another side to the story.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It may do so. I am rather concerned at the peace programmes which are being put in place in a number of schools. I query the need for such a programme.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Oh, really!

Hon. Graham Edwards: It isn't a bad alternative.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The alternative is promoting war. Who in this community is promoting war?

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Who is promoting peace?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The member said "alternative". That is the alternative.

Hon. Graham Edwards: That is not a bad alternative, though, is it? To seek to promote peace?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: By creating peace studies, we have created fear, a doubt, an uncertainty, an apprehension amongst young people. We are all concerned.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Do something about it when you are concerned. Don't regret something that has been done by concerned people.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: The Minister is very chirpy—she must have had birdseed for dinner.

I come back to the point that there is no need to have studies of peace, as such, when the fear syndrome takes over. I notice, to the credit of the State School Teachers Union in this State, that teachers are very concerned about the fear syndrome and have taken steps to overcome it.

*The West Australian* of 6 June 1986 contains a headline, "Teachers Hope to Calm WA Pupils' N-Fears". The article states in part—

A GROUP of WA teachers hopes to ease a perceived sense of helplessness among students about the future, particularly in regard to the threat of war.

The teachers decided during a weekend seminar to "look for ways to remove the pessimistic outlook among students."

I am not alone in this. I am a parent and a grandparent. The article goes on to report one delegate being quoted as follows—

She said many students had resigned themselves to the fact that they would die in a nuclear holocaust.

"I think it is important that teachers look at ways of removing this terrible pessimism," she said.

I could not agree more, and peace studies do tend to highlight the problem. Instead of going about their business as young people and learning the good things in life, learning to give of their very best and to have their best capabilities developed within them so they can contribute to society, some of them unfortunately are being preyed upon by people who engender fear within those souls. I deplore that.

There are so many things in this community for which we can be grateful and upon which we can build. We do not want to be destructive in any way. It is fine to have concern for the world. We all do, in our own way. But why make a special feature of it? I come back to the point: Does anyone here know of anyone who is promoting war in Western Australia? I certainly do not.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: What about conflict?

Hon. P. G. Pandal: We are against that.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth): Order! I know Mr Ferry has asked a question, but he has asked it only of the Chair.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It is a fear syndrome. I am very disturbed to think that young people are being encouraged to be more apprehensive than they need to be. They do read newspapers and look at television and can make up their own minds. Young people are very discerning. If they are channelled into thinking along lines which are alarmist, and one talks of peace studies, one finds that all matters come into it. Anyone who has been involved in a conflict would be mad to advocate further conflict but one does not dwell on it. There are ex-servicemen in this place who do not take pride in telling the general public of their experiences. It does not happen. Any member could, any day of the week. We go about our normal lives contributing to society and building on what we have. That is what we aim at. By so doing we are protecting our country and community by being positive and constructive, not destructive. It is easy enough to be pessimistic in this life. If a member of Parliament is pessimistic, that member is likely to lose. One has to have confidence. The peace studies do not engender confidence in people.

I was delighted to learn a few weeks ago that a company in this State with a long record of service and contribution to the State, made a presentation to this Parliament. I refer to Bunnings Ltd and its very generous donation of a magnificent jarrah cabinet which is now displayed in the main foyer of this Parliament. Jarrah is indigenous to this State, and as one who had the privilege of a close association with the timber industry long before I came into Parliament, and having been closely associated with many people working in the industry, from transport operators to tree fellers to craftsmen, I wish to congratulate the craftsmen who manufactured that magnificent cabinet and to thank Bunnings Ltd for its gesture to this Parliament. It is most fitting that it should be given to the Parliament of Western Australia. I am sure that generations will appreciate it as a focal point in this building. I have noticed visitors come into the foyer and go across to the cabinet to look at the memorabilia displayed and to admire the craftsmanship and timber in that cabinet. It is magnificent.

I wish to refer to the moves being made to establish a zoo in the south-west. It is a concept associated with the "Bunbury 2000" programme. I do not knock the project as an objective. It has been ordained that there will be a south-west zoo because the Premier has taken a special interest in that project. The South West Development Authority and others have made it their business to put that zoo in place. I am disappointed by the manner in which it has been progressing.

A number of sites have been considered for a south-west zoo. It is most unfortunate that the site favoured by the South West Development Authority and the Government happens to be the Wokalup Research Station. For honourable members who may not know it, Wokalup is a locality south of Harvey. The research station has been there for many years. I am not sure exactly when it was established but it is doing a good job for agriculture and, more recently, horticulture. As this is a reasonably high rainfall area it is importantly situated because it is an irrigation area and it is the only research station in an irrigation area in this State.

To suggest that this agricultural-horticultural research station should be taken over for a regional zoo is land-use vandalism. It is unfortunate that that site was publicised as the favoured site for a zoo when other sites were available and still are available. It is reported in the *South Western Times* of 29 April 1986 that there are firm plans for a free-range zoo in the south-west which will commit the State Government to spending between \$15 million and \$20 million over the next 15 years. The South West Development Authority wants a substantial first stage in place within three years according to the director, Dr Ernie Manea. I mentioned earlier that the Government is determined that it be established. There are reasons why it wants to do that. The article goes on to say that the area occupied by the Wokalup Research Station is a favoured site for the project. It is the preferred option of the Town Planning Board but Dr Manea said there were 10 locations under review by the State Town Planning board and the WA Zoological Gardens Board. Notwithstanding that, and no feasibility studies having been undertaken on the sites, it was evident to me during May and June that Wokalup would be sacrificed for that purpose. I came out very strongly in the media in the south-west, and a number of farmers also made their feelings known about the situation. I was horrified to realise a deal had been made to sacrifice the

work of the Department of Agriculture for a zoo.

We have a zoo at South Perth that is always battling for funds. There was an appeal recently to do certain things at that zoo. Now we are establishing a south-west zoo to the value of \$15 million to \$20 million according to the Press statements. For what? Political prestige? It is certainly to the disadvantage of agriculture and horticulture. It is quite extraordinary, at a time when rural producers are under considerable stress, that the Government and the South West Development Authority could be promoting further danger to our agricultural industry. Down through the ages agricultural industries and rural production have been the backbone of the community. In fact, they have been the lifeblood of the community and there will always be a need for research facilities. To throw away land with design improvements and a good location is a short-sighted and blinkered proposal.

The Department of Agriculture does depend on Federal funding for a number of its activities. If it were to lose the Wokalup Research Station, it is my understanding that there is every likelihood that Federal funding for that purpose in Western Australia would decrease. We would no longer have that facility. That is not acceptable to me. The proposed mutilation of the Wokalup Research Station would run counter to the decentralisation policy of the Department of Agriculture.

Surely rural research needs to be done in the area it serves. It is to the department's credit that in Bunbury it has very fine regional headquarters. It is part of departmental policy—indeed part of the policy of this and previous Governments—that the Department of Agriculture should be decentralised. And it is. To the Government's credit it has continued that thrust; it has continued to support agricultural industries in that way.

However, it now tries to cut the department's throat by trying to establish a zoo at the Wokalup Research Station, which has special facilities, special watering points, and subdivisional fencing, etc. All this would have to be drastically altered to meet the requirements of a zoo.

We have very faithful departmental scientists and officers at the department's headquarters in Bunbury, and they radiate out into the south-west to assist agriculture and horticulture. Why cut off the finger that points the way to better research? It does not add up.

The Minister for Agriculture, who is also the Minister for The South West (Mr Julian Grill), needs to be censured because he failed miserably and utterly to protect agricultural industries in this move to take over the research station.

I refer now to the *South Western Times* of 20 May and an article headed "Zoo a threat to research centre—Opposition", which reads as follows—

Mr Grill said he did not want to preempt a meeting to be held over the plans for the zoo this Friday.

That is all he said. Obviously there was a cook up—maybe a cock up—for the department to be the sacrificial lamb for the benefit of the south-west zoo.

I condemn Mr Grill for not strongly opposing this move, particularly when rural people throughout the State are facing increasing pressures as they try to remain viable. They need all the help they can get whether in the general taxation area, the fuel tax area, or research. Here we have the Minister for Agriculture failing miserably to help them when he had a great opportunity by saying that while he was the Minister there was no way the research station would be used as a zoo. But that did not happen.

We must bear in mind that over the preceding couple of weeks before the meeting took place there had been many articles in the local Press, including some covering comments I had made, to have the proposal thrown out. The Department of Agriculture to its credit said that the move was not on. Commonsense finally prevailed, but overall the Government's handling of the entire matter was quite extraordinary. An article in the *South Western Times* of 17 June had the heading "Handling of zoo affair 'atrocious' ". It certainly was.

No feasibility study for a south-west zoo has been carried out. Apparently a couple of sites were considered. One would think a complete feasibility study would have been done on the different options and the public made aware of these and invited to contribute suggestions. That was not the case. When the Government pretends to assist the south-west, one wonders why it should take this sort of action. It has been very disappointing. I doubt that a zoo is a viable concept. It has been said that such a zoo would be modelled largely on the one at Dubbo in New South Wales.

I am mindful of the fact that the privately-run wildlife park, which was not far from the Wokalup Research Station, closed down a couple of years ago because it was not financially viable. A deer park based on private money is located at Donnybrook. The people there are ploughing their profits back into the venture every year.

A south-west zoo would run in direct competition with these privately run concerns. The Bannamah wildlife park in Dunsborough, although further south, could still be affected by the proposed zoo. We all know that families have only a certain amount of money for their children to see these things. With the Government's promoting a south-west zoo, having invested some \$20 million for starters, it would be after every possible dollar going through its entrance. This would detract from the profitability of the wildlife parks in the area.

Another venture being considered is an agrodome in the Mundijong area. That is in the early stages as yet but it will be a private concern if it gets off the ground, and so it should be. But that agrodome would also suffer from the promotion of the south-west zoo; it would work against private enterprise.

I hope the Government, the South West Development Authority, and anyone else associated with the proposed zoo get down to brass tacks, have a feasibility study carried out, and make sure that everything is done in the open so that the public know what is happening. I know the Harvey Shire is very keen to have a zoo in its area, and I do not wish to see the shire harmed in any way. Nevertheless if a zoo is to be established I want it to be done in the proper way, on a proper financial basis, without disadvantaging other going concerns in the south-west community—concerns such as the Wokalup Research Station and the privately-run wildlife parks.

One of the problems of the Government's thrust into the south-west is its concept of regional government. The South West Development Authority has done some very good things, as has the Western Australian Development Corporation; but there are other aspects of their operations which concern me greatly. The Government's promotion of a regional zoo is an example of a Government's leaning on other sources for its own political advantage. I do not believe it will gain any advantage, because the agriculturists and the horticulturists in the region are very aware of what the Government has done in suggesting that the Wokalup Research Station be used as a zoo.

They are not pleased, as one can imagine. The Government is promoting the scheme because of perceived political advantage. I am concerned that unelected organisations seem to have the power to influence the community in which they operate.

I am delighted to know that the Government has at last taken an interest in providing a new hospital for Margaret River. During the run-up to the last election, the Liberal Party gave a public undertaking to do just that; this was 12 months before the election. The commitment was that upon becoming the Government the Liberal Party would build a new hospital at Margaret River.

Shortly after the election the Premier visited Margaret River and committed himself to examining the possibility of building a new hospital there. He indicated that the Minister for Health would follow up the matter. That is great because the people there need that assistance. I hope this year's Budget will have an allocation for a new hospital at Margaret River.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Why didn't you do it the last time you were in power?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: There were other priorities. Augusta is not far from Margaret River and it has a very good hospital, which is currently being extended. Busselton has a new hospital and that is also close to Margaret River. These things have been phased in steadily.

That argument is ridiculous. I applaud projects being carried out where there is a need.

Another popular local feature in Busselton is the famous Busselton jetty, which is, I think, about a mile and a quarter long. We all know it has suffered grievously in previous years, not only from cyclone "Alby", but also from the ravages of time. The Government is trying to preserve that structure and I recommend it do so. The Government is presently looking for tourist developments in the south-west. It has no better attraction than that fascinating wooden structure. It is costly to maintain, but it is a feature which attracts tens of thousands of tourists who walk along it every year. People love to be able to walk along the longest jetty in the southern hemisphere.

I refer now to the mineral sands industry, especially the industry in the south-west. It has been a most valuable industry based mainly at Capel. However, some mining is taking place in the Busselton area and in the Boyanup area. There is a mine also near Waroona. I do not

think enough attention has been given to the impact of this industry on the south-west. Hon. Doug Wenn made a special mention of this industry in his maiden speech and of its value to the Port of Bunbury. The industry has been in operation for about 30 years and is expanding. It is intended to open a new mine at Boyanup next year. A local committee has been formed to try to alleviate some of the transport problems and the inconvenience caused by the handling of that ore from that site.

The Minister for Transport visited the area about two weeks ago and looked at the site and spoke to local people. I thank him for that. A number of issues were raised about the increased heavy haulage vehicles that would travel through the town of Boyanup and great concern was expressed about the possible dangers of that increased activity. A local committee was formed. In company with Mr David Smith, MLA for Bunbury, I had discussions with Westralian Sands Ltd, the company involved in the mining. We had those discussions in the company's offices at Capel. It was an interesting exchange. It was interesting to note that, although there are real concerns about the transportation of the ore from the mine site to the treatment site located at Capel, not one resident complained about the possibility of there being a mine site near their township.

The mine is expected to last about eight years before the ore is fully extracted. The main concerns of the people in that area are the safety of the children and the noise from the heavy transport going through the town. I commend the local residents for their responsible attitude and the company for its appreciation of those concerns.

The local committee has requested that, as an alternative, Westrail be requested to undertake a feasibility study on the costing of an alternative transport mode to take the ore the short distance. My view is that Westrail may find it difficult to come up with an economical rate in order that the company can take advantage of its heavy haulage system. It is more likely that road transport will be used. Nevertheless, the Minister has been requested to prevail upon Westrail to busy itself with a study and costing analysis so that the two modes of transport can be considered. We await the results of that study with great interest.

I am concerned about the continuing unemployment figures for the Bunbury area. Hon. Doug Wenn said that I would probably take him to task on the figures he supplied during

his speech on the Address-in-Reply. I do not wish to take him to task but I wish to continue with my view on the unemployment figure as expressed in this House on a number of occasions. The Commonwealth Employment Service figures show that the unemployment rate in Bunbury is still much higher than the unemployment rate when the Burke Government came to office in 1983. Those figures cannot be denied. Despite the Government's thrust for development in the area, it is unfortunate that the unemployment rate remains unacceptably high. We cannot prove the figures. However, it is believed that the rate is certainly beyond the official statistic and that is extremely disappointing.

When I was in Bunbury last Friday I took the opportunity to survey a number of businesses and it is apparent that there has been a downturn in business in the town. It must be borne in mind that since the Government came to office, and despite its best efforts, there has not been one new resource development in the south-west area. Everything in that area was put there by the previous Government. In saying that I refer to bauxite mining at Pinjarra. The development at Waroona and Worsley was put in train under the previous Government. Mineral sands mining and coal mining have been a part of the south-west for some time as were the agricultural and horticultural industries. No new industries have been introduced under this Government. It has tried desperately to have an alumina smelter developed in the area.

It is rather sad that the Government has made much play of that development, particularly in the last 12 to 18 months. The Premier pulled the plug last year and said it would not go ahead. I would have liked that development to go ahead.

Hon. Garry Kelly: There was also the proviso about the cost of electricity.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I refer to a South West Development Authority newsletter No. 4 of 1985 which states—

The Minister for Fuels and Energy, David Parker, made a ministerial statement in the Parliament on March 7. He said the purpose of his remarks was to invite the public of Western Australia to take part in what he described as one of the most momentous economic decisions of the decade. He was referring to the establishment of an Aluminium Smelter in the South West.

He was referring to the establishment of an alumina smelter in the south-west. It was never established; it was a Clayton's smelter. However, the expectation created from all this propaganda caused much concern and many people lost money. It was the householders and the little people in the community who lost out. They bought houses and committed themselves to mortgages with the expectation that there would be a lot of activity and an influx of people; in other words, that the place would boom. Now, many people cannot sell the places which they bought around Bunbury and Australind because they bought at a high price and the price has now dropped. They bought because the Government had painted a rainbow, but the rainbow disappeared with the next shower. Then the Premier pulled the plug and said that the smelter development was not on. I hope that it will be established in the future.

I commend the Government for trying, but I do not commend it for building up expectations in people's minds. At present, the building industry in Bunbury is on a downward trend. One firm last week announced that it was folding up its operations. That firm had been active for many years; it was not a fly-by-night operation. It was not an incompetent operation, but one run by very competent people who decided that they could no longer continue. They decided to fold up before they went bankrupt because of the severe downturn in the cottage industry.

Such is the case right across the board. One or two food outlets, for example, are finding that people are not buying the packs of food they used to buy. They are buying a whole chicken and taking it home to make up into sandwiches or whatever. Previously, they would buy a pack ready-prepared. The motor industry is under great stress, particularly now, with the fringe benefits tax and the other taxes that have been imposed on the vehicle industry generally. This includes heavy machinery industries which are also under dire threat. Much of their condition can be attributed to the taxing formula under which they must operate. It will get much worse. Both the State and the Federal Labor Governments have much to answer for, because the condition of the industry is largely Government-caused.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It does not sound too good for "Bunbury 2000", does it?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: It certainly does not. It is a case of talking it up again.

I commend the Government for trying to help, but it has been unsuccessful in some cases. The redevelopment of the Bunbury central area is to be applauded; there is to be a very big shopping centre.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If you haven't got people or businesses, what is the point?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Many of the existing businesses will find it hard going if they are not incorporated in the new complex. I have yet to receive an answer to a question I asked only last week about what arrangements had been made for the parking of vehicles in and around the new office tower. It will be the first high-rise in Bunbury and will be paid for by the taxpayer. There will be chaos on the roads around that part of the city if parking provisions are not made. I do not think anyone seriously thought about the parking problems. To my knowledge, there is very little parking in the building itself and the roads around it are already used to capacity by cars dealing with present traders.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Who is going to be housed there?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: That is an interesting point. The Government has set its heart on transferring many public servants from the metropolitan area to Bunbury. If it can do it, I will applaud it. I just wonder what sorts of incentives the Government will have to offer people to get them to transfer to Bunbury.

Bunbury is a delightful place in which to live, and many people go there willingly. However, people with young families who may have bought their homes in the metropolitan area with the expectation of creating their environment around that home, whether it be at Duncraig, Kingsley, or South Lakes, may feel that it would be to their disadvantage financially to make a move. Fourteen or 15 such people have told me that if they are expected to transfer away from Perth, they will resign from their positions. That is their choice, but it will have a converse effect. There are many very good Public Service people already in Bunbury. They have been there for many years because under the previous Government many regional offices were set up in Bunbury. We put in the State Housing Commission regional office—now Homeswest—the Department of Agriculture office; the regional hospital complex; the regional educational setup and others.

Those public servants who already reside in Bunbury ask me about the incentives to be given to new people who may be transferred. They feel it is not fair that the people transferring from elsewhere to Bunbury should be assisted financially when they were not. I also ask whether it is fair. Thus, the Government has problems in overcoming such attitudes. My guess is that the building will not be fully occupied. I believe the surplus space will not be fully utilised for quite some time and, by moving some of the departments from existing premises into that building, the premises at present occupied may not be filled by new tenants.

One real estate gentleman told me that land values around the Bunbury office tower had dropped markedly. He said that one owner would have lost between \$90 000 and \$100 000 in value on the present market because of the office tower. Whether that is right or not, I am not to judge. That real estate agent told me that the tower had depressed land values around it because of oversupply. Such are the difficulties in attempting to decentralise in that way.

Decentralisation has always occurred in the south-west, despite the problems, because previous Governments have put in place various industries and the like. It is not possible to decentralise artificially to any extent. The sending of people to remote areas must be based on the resources of that area; the area must be able to stand on its own feet. We cannot artificially create influxes of people. To a minor degree, such influxes can be encouraged, but they cannot be pushed to any great extent.

We know that the Government is reducing the number of Westrail employees throughout the State. The figures I have gleaned from answers given thus far indicate that in the last 11 months in the south-west area there has been a decrease of 79 employees on the payroll of Westrail. Although the Government wants to put people in the tower, 79 jobs have been lost from Westrail, so the net result will be rather interesting. I remind members that the south-west had been well based in the past, but the Minister for The South West continues to say that previous Governments used a shotgun approach to development; in other words, he means that they scattered people over the State instead of homing in on one particular area as the Government has with the Bunbury region. The Government believed that it should put resources into a particular place and make it go before moving on somewhere else, but it has come to realise that that is politically unsound.

A Government Minister nearly lost his seat in Geraldton because the Government put too much emphasis on "Bunbury 2000", and the people in Geraldton felt that everything was happening in Bunbury and that Geraldton was being neglected.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: That's part of "Bunbury 2000" and "Albany Tomorrow"; with both of them it's a case of never.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I was going to mention "Albany Tomorrow". The people of Albany, having seen what happened to Bunbury, did not like the plans for Albany. They supported the Government's spending money down there, but did not like to support the Government's candidate because they objected to the Government's homing in on one area and neglecting others.

Hon. Garry Kelly: They cannot do everything at once.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: In regional centres and country areas one can only use natural features. That is why previous Governments have been successful in covering the State with the so-called scatter-gun method.

Hon. Garry Kelly: It has been successful, has it?

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Indeed it has. The greatest regionalisation in recent times has been in the Pilbara. Before this it was desert, rocks and boulders. That is an example of Government moving in to assist. That applied also in the Kimberley. It is going on throughout the State. One does not tell someone to go out and live on the dole in the desert. So the previous Government's method has proved to be good, and the present Government is acknowledging that—not publicly but very grudgingly.

Mr Grill was invited to open a subdivision of industrial land in Bunbury. To his credit he did the job and went off again. During his remarks he praised the Government's homing in on Bunbury and its method of developing the city and its environs.

At the end of his speech he said, in effect, "I congratulate the subdividers, they are very brave people, because in this economic climate they are taking a risk; they may not get their money back for several years."

That does not add up. On the one hand he is praising the system and its opening up of the country, yet on the other hand he is saying that the subdividers may not get their money back because of the economic climate; an economic

climate caused largely by Government action. The climate in which we operate today includes Government taxes and charges, both Federal and State.

I want to congratulate the City of Bunbury on its 150th anniversary celebrations this year. During the calendar year a series of events will take place to mark that occasion. It is really a milestone for any community to be in existence for 150 years.

The dairy industry forms quite a large part of my province. It comes under the much-publicised Kerin plan of the Commonwealth Government, which is placing an intolerable burden on producers. All sorts of estimates are given as to how much it will cost individual dairymen, but they vary from \$2 000 to \$6 000 a year. This money is used to prop up the Victorian dairy farmers. That is all it is for.

The dairy industry in Western Australia set its house in order some years ago under the Dairy Industry Authority of Western Australia, and because its house is in order and running fairly well, while the people in the Eastern States are not, the national plan disadvantages our own producers. They must find extra money amounting to something between \$2 000 and \$6 000 a year, depending on the size of their dairy operation, to prop up an industry 2 000 miles away in other State. This is an intolerable situation.

That, of course, affects not only the south-west but Bunbury as well, "Bunbury 2000" will feel the effect of this, because much of the trade comes from the hinterland. The dairy farmers have been there for a long time. I am not sure if many of them will stay under this imposition.

I could continue to talk on many things, but I will finish on the topic of land drainage rating. The south-west area over many years has had a rating system for land drainage. This system was originally designed in the main to help agriculture and to improve the roads and bridges further downstream.

I am not sure of the exact figures, but I believe something like 1 500 miles or 2 200 kilometres of man-made drains exist in the south-west of Western Australia. Many people do not realise that these drains are there. They were put in specifically to assist production on that land.

Recently the Government decided that it had to rate three pockets of land which had hitherto not been rated. In such cases the land fell within drainage areas, but because of its topography—it is high land not subject to flood-

ing, though water flows from that high land to the low areas—those high areas have not been rated before.

It seems that from 1 July these new areas will be rated. I was party to a deputation last week from the Augusta-Margaret River Shire where some 40 land owners are affected. We went to see the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Water Resources, Hon. Ernie Bridge. At the end of last week I was party to assisting another deputation from Capel Shire on much the same mission.

The third area to which I refer is in the Mundijong area. I do not represent that patch, but I know some people are concerned, although I believe their concerns are less because of the size of the holdings in the Mundijong area; they are rather smaller. Certainly the people in Augusta-Margaret River and Capel Shires have reason to be concerned.

By way of example, one gentleman said he pays rates now of \$1 100, and in the future he expects to pay double that. That is another \$1 100 he must find just to pay drainage rates. That is another imposition. That is a real problem inasmuch as the system of rating for drainage purposes is inequitable. There must be a better way of doing it. I urge the Government and the Minister to look into these things.

I place on record my view that the total assistance to agriculture for drainage purposes should be reviewed. A fairer and more equitable system should be found. It does not seem right that some people pay high rates and others nothing at all or a lesser amount. There are all sorts of anomalies in the system. It is high time these were tackled. I urge the Government to do this within the next 12 months as a matter of urgency.

My advice to the Government, and to the Minister especially, is to use his ministerial discretion to defer the rating in these three areas of land for at least 12 months, and in that time review the whole system so that a better result can be obtained. It is terribly important that that be done.

I thank members for their attention during my speech. I make no apology for the time I have taken up, because it is almost seven months since this House last met and members need to address many things. I have no doubt that in the next few weeks there will be other subjects to which I shall give attention through the forum of this House.

I again wish to commend the members, and I hope they get much satisfaction out of serving their people and the State generally.

**HON. GARRY KELLY** (South Metropolitan) [10.10 p.m.]: As one of the last members of "speaking unlimited" I assure the House that, although we are fast approaching the witching hour, I will not be using all the time between now and the ushering in of the new rules.

Before I start my Address-in-Reply speech proper, I must mention the passing of Clive Hughes, my former colleague and member for Cockburn. Clive had a long battle with cancer and it reached its inevitable conclusion in April of this year. It is sad, because when Clive was elected at the end of November 1984 he was a young man who had an expectation of a long political career in front of him which was cut short in tragic circumstances. Of course, I have already given my condolences to his wife, Liz, and his family; but it is important to put on record the fact that Clive's efforts and the way he conducted himself during the time he was aware that he had the terminal illness was an example to all of us.

On a happier note, I congratulate the newly-elected members to this House, particularly the members on this side of the Chamber. They bring our numbers up to 16 which is pretty close to having a majority. We look forward to improving our representation in this Chamber at the next election.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Hear, Hear!

Hon. GARRY KELLY: I congratulate also the respective frontbenchers, in particular Hon. Kay Hallahan who has been elected as the first woman Minister in this Chamber.

I thank the electors of South Metropolitan Province for their indication of confidence in me by re-electing me to this House on 8 February.

For the benefit of those who do not know where South Metropolitan Province lies, it extends in a north-south direction from Stock Road in Palmyra down to Singleton Beach at the southern extremity of the Rockingham electorate. It includes the Assembly seats of Melville, Fremantle, Cockburn, and Rockingham.

I interpolate here a comment about the confusing aspects of the naming of the Assembly electorates using geographic names. A curious anomaly arises in the seat of Melville. It is called the seat of Melville, but the locality of Melville is actually in the electorate of East

Melville which is rather strange. Perhaps that seat should be called Bicton or Palmyra. I do not know how this tradition has grown up, but we should look at renaming the Assembly electorates after people, as occurs in the Federal sphere. "Tonkin" would be the obvious choice in the Melville case.

Hon. Tom Stephens: They should be named after the sitting members!

Hon. P. G. Pental: Of more than six years' standing.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: That may be confusing as well. However, we should look at naming electorates after people or by some other means because that practice restricts the number of names that may be chosen and this causes some curious anomalies to arise. People become confused about the electorate of Cockburn and the Cockburn City Council area. If a move were made away from geographical names, the situation would be less confusing.

My electorate contains 83 000 electors. I do not want to enter into a debate on electoral reform—we shall have that later in the session—but when the population of my electorate is compared to that of Lower North Province which contains 9 000 electors, it can be seen we have a weighting of 9:1. Members of the Opposition may accept that situation, but a weighting of 9:1 in any definition of democratic government represents a gross imbalance and I hope that the Opposition adopts a more reasonable attitude than it has in the past to the electoral reform package which will be introduced into this House later in the session.

The Governor's Speech covered several topics but, in relation to South Metropolitan Province, he mentioned the environmental monitoring unit which is to be established at Kwinana. This is a long overdue move. The people of Kwinana are pleased to see this action being taken. They have been making complaints—and I believe those complaints are justified—about the level of pollution emanating from the industrial strip and, for the first time, a Government has actually taken notice of those complaints and is doing something about them.

The Minister is to be commended on his actions. The new Environmental Protection Act will also make the management of pollution problems in Kwinana and elsewhere much easier.

In the Kwinana area the Government has taken a number of initiatives. One of particular importance in terms of pollution control was

the renegotiation of the Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Limited) Act which, along with other initiatives, ended the ability for BP to avoid paying wharfage dues to the Fremantle Port Authority. Therefore, as a result of that renegotiation, the Government obtained a little more revenue and the refinery became subject to the State's environmental laws. Previously it was exempt.

Most of the problem in Kwinana is related to the sulphur smell. When one drives down Stock Road on a bad day the first thing one notices is the sulphur emission, most of which comes from the refinery. By making the refinery subject to the environmental laws, the Government will have an instrument which it may use to bring BP into line with modern environmental standards. Indeed, it is already having that effect. The company has undertaken to spend between \$11 million and \$12 million to install a sulphur absorption system in the refinery. Once that money is spent and the system is in place, the environment of the Kwinana area will improve markedly.

The Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr David Parker) has also set up the Kwinana industry coordinating committee. That committee was established to liaise with local authorities and local citizens' groups to encourage dialogue as to ways in which the communities in the area can interact with Government, both State and local, and with the industries involved. By that means, everyone will have a say in what is happening in the area and any problems which are identified can be addressed at a semi-official level. The activities of that committee are having a very positive effect in the region.

I move on now to some other topics. In his contribution to this debate, Hon. Fred McKenzie mentioned an Alcohol and Drug Authority research paper produced by Ian Smith and Professor Burvil titled "The Effect on Juvenile Crime of Lowering the Drinking Age in Three Australian States". This document purportedly showed that, since the drinking age was lowered to 18 in the early 1970s, the number of criminal offences committed by mainly young males had increased. The conclusion was drawn that that increase was due to the fact that they were consuming alcohol. It is rather a long bow to draw and many other factors are involved. Since the drinking age was lowered, unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, has increased greatly.

I do not think one could say that any increase in the overall crime rate for juveniles over the age of 18 would be due to simply lowering the drinking age. I do not think we could say that by raising the drinking age to 20 or 21 years, as the report advocates, we could control this problem further. I do not think we could seriously entertain a proposition that the age of majority, the drinking age, at 18 years, should be raised to 20 or 21. Eighteen-year-olds have the right to all manner of things; they are able to vote and sign contracts, and so to prevent them from going into a hotel or bottle shop and buying liquor is ridiculous.

It has been tried in the United States of America. In fact the Reagan Administration made it a condition of some States receiving road funding that they first of all agreed to increase the drinking age of their youth from 18 to 21. That may work in America, but I do not know whether it would work here. I do not know the dangers. I am not advocating raising the drinking age. There is, however, a definite relationship between drinking and road accidents. I do not think anyone could deny that we have a problem with the present drinking age because at 18 most people are still learning to drive. People can get a driver's licence at 17, and they are legally entitled to acquire alcohol at 18. Drinking and driving is a dangerous mix at the best of times, but the combination of inexperienced drivers and alcohol is a recipe for disaster.

I think there is room to address this problem of the drinking and driving age. The Police Department has done a survey, and if members remember back to 1982, this House passed legislation which subjected probationary drivers, in their first year of driving, to a 0.02 gm/100 millilitres blood alcohol limit, the lowest detectable limit. The Police Department surveyed the events surrounding a number of accidents, both before and after the introduction of the new law. I would just read the abstract of that report, and then look at the conclusion. It reads—

The statutory alcohol limit for first year (probationary) drivers was lowered from 0.08 to 0.02 GM/100ML as from December 9, 1982. Driver involvement in casualty traffic accidents was compared for one year periods before and after the change.

The conclusion of the report refers to the night-time casualties as the surrogate measure for drink-driving accidents, while day-time casualties represented non-alcohol related acci-

dents. Surrogate measures were used also for probationary drivers and non-probationary drivers since driver licence status was not recorded on the accident database. Drivers under 18 years represented probationary drivers and older drivers represented non-probationary drivers. Accidents involving older drivers represented the control group. The effects of this drink-driving legislation introduced in 1983 were deemed to be concurrent with other drink-driving legislation.

The results read as follows—

There was 17 per cent net reduction in the expected number of drivers under 18 years involved in night-time casualty accidents after the introduction of the 0.02 law. On the heavy drink-driving nights—

Heavy drink-driving nights, for the uninitiated, are Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights. The report continues as follows—

—there was a similar 17 per cent net reduction in accident involvement for drivers under 18 years compared with older drivers.

The report stated later that the results are not statistically significant because the sample cited was small, but even so the figures indicate that instead of talking about raising the drinking age, the way to go would be to extend the probationary period for a driver's licence to two or perhaps three years. Then the 0.02 law would apply to probationary drivers for a longer period, which would not mean they would not be able to drink, but they would not be able to drink and be in control of a vehicle. That is something which must be looked at. There has been a hue and cry about an AIDS epidemic, but if the road toll were a disease, there would be a hue and cry about its epidemic proportions.

Hon. P. G. Pandal: Which it is, of course, in numerical terms.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: It is indeed. We should treat the road toll as an epidemic, and a fairly reasonable way of controlling it would be to increase drivers' probationary period. Otherwise this blight on the youth of our country will continue and we will condemn many of them not only to death, but to living death. The accident fatalities are only the tip of the iceberg. Those who are injured in car accidents tell another story.

In my maiden speech, I mentioned the plight of the head-injured, and the number of such people in society is increasing. I said at that time that we have the technology to keep alive people who would previously have died. Most

head injuries are the result of road accidents. Usually these people, tragically, are young and in good health. They will live a long while. Their brains are damaged, and they present a particularly tragic statistic because the families of such severely head-injured victims must support them, and they are, for the most part, only able to lie around. They cannot lead full lives. The families of these people cannot grieve properly. The victim is a different person; that is effectively "dead", but is still breathing.

I think that the number of people who are badly injured, with injuries needing long-term rehabilitation and care, must be lessened. I think the extending of the present probationary period would be one way in which to go.

A couple of previous speakers, Hon. Gordon Masters and Hon. Neil Oliver, mentioned the

level of Australia's overseas debt. The comparison was made between that debt and debts which exist in third world countries, particularly the South American countries.

I think the figures that Hon. Gordon Masters alluded to have been misinterpreted. It is important that those figures be put into perspective because in no way can the level of Australia's overseas debt, although a cause for concern, be compared with the indebtedness of countries such as Argentina, Brazil, or Chile. To help put this matter into perspective, I seek leave to incorporate a table in *Hansard* from a publication called *Foreign Investment, Australia, December Quarter 1985*.

*The following material was incorporated by leave of the House—*

TABLE 4. LEVELS OF EXTERNAL DEBT  
(\$A million)

Period	Foreign borrowing				Australian lending abroad and reserve assets			Net external debt (c)		
	Official	Non-official		Total	Official	Non-official	Total	Official	Non-official	Total
		Public sector (a)	Private sector (b)							
YEAR—										
1982-83	7 681	6 242	21 723	35 646	10 751	1 891	12 642	—3 070	26 076	23 004
1983-84	8 342	8 717	26 595	43 654	12 420	2 135	14 555	—3 878	33 177	29 299
1984-85	12 949	15 359	40 395	68 703	13 521	3 773	17 294	—572	51 981	51 409
					(d)					
QUARTER ENDED—										
1984—										
SEPTEMBER	8 993	9 738	30 161	48 892	12 431	na	na	—3 438	na	na
					(d)					
DECEMBER	9 776	11 294	31 852	52 922	12 063	na	na	—2 287	na	na
1985—										
MARCH	11 494	14 420	37 184	63 098	13 131	na	na	—1 637	na	na
JUNE	12 949	15 359	40 395	68 703	13 521	3 773	17 294	—572	51 981	51 409
SEPTEMBER	13 738	14 712	41 396	69 846	12 509	4 699	17 208	1 229	51 409	52 638
DECEMBER	15 174	16 103	43 312	74 589	12 222	5 693	17 915	2 952	53 722	56 674

(a) Excludes public sector trading banks which are included in the private sector.

(b) Includes all trading banks; see footnote (a).

(c) Foreign borrowing by Australian residents less the sum of Australian lending abroad and reserve assets.

(d) From September quarter 1984, figures for official reserve assets are not fully comparable with earlier data due to changes in the Reserve Bank's accounting procedures.

### Debate Resumed

Hon. GARRY KELLY: I thank the House. For the purposes of my contribution to this debate I will confine myself to the figures for the December 1985 quarter.

At that time Australia's gross foreign debt was \$74 589 million. It was made up of an official Commonwealth Government debt of \$15 174 million. The non-official public sector debt, which includes State authorities such as the electricity commissions, water authorities, and Qantas Airways Limited, amounted to \$16 103 million, and the private sector debt amounted to \$43 312 million. Those figures have to be adjusted and qualified.

We need to subtract from those figures the amount lent abroad and the reserve assets held abroad under those categories. The Commonwealth holds abroad assets amounting to \$12 222 million. The non-official assets—State authorities and Commonwealth enterprises do not hold any reserves—total \$5 693 million, which makes a total of \$17 915 million which has to be subtracted from the previous net profit.

Australia's net foreign debt is \$56 674 million, of that only \$2 952 million is net Commonwealth Government debt. I think that gives the lie to the figures presented by people who say that the Commonwealth Government has run up this huge debt. An amount of

\$16 103 million is the net and gross debt of State authorities and Commonwealth enterprises. The remaining two-thirds of Australia's net foreign debt—\$37 619 million—is the private sector's debt. I think those figures put the situation into perspective. There is a big difference between Australia's debt and the debt incurred by some Latin American countries. In some Third World Latin American countries the debt is a sovereign debt and is charged against the Government and paid for by the taxpayers. It is usually for recurrent expenditure.

As I said, most of Australia's debt is private debt. Some of it is borrowed for public purposes for investment. Presumably those investments will generate income which will eventually help to repay the loan. I do not think those people who seek to compare us with South American countries in terms of the level of foreign debt have a feather to fly with. Most of the debt is private and that debt can be attributed to Government instrumentalities and to Government investment in infrastructure.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: Why do international bankers have such an effect on the Australian dollar?

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Decisions in relation to the Australian dollar often baffle me. I sometimes wonder how the decisions are made.

Hon. E. J. Charlton interjected.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Interest rates attract investment which help to keep the value of the dollar up. They have brought in foreign currency.

Much has been made about the level of Australia's debt and, in terms of April's figures, international trade. Despite what some people say, Mr Keating's much-vaunted J-curve is working. The volume of exports has increased and the volume of imports has decreased. However, the bottom has dropped out of the prices that we are getting for our export commodities. The long-term solution to Australia's terms of trade will not be simply to tell workers to tighten their belts—

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Put up Government charges.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Maybe. However, it will be done by doing something about our old style of manufacturing and the reliance on the export of minerals and of primary products.

Hon. Barry Jones, the Federal Minister for Science, made a speech in April of this year. One section of the speech is headed "Manufacturing and Truncated Development". It shows the problem that the manufacturing sector in this country faces. After the second World War, the Chifley Government promoted rapid population growth through the migration programme, expanded the manufacturing sector, and vastly increased consumption of goods and services.

I remember that during the 1950s and 1960s one heard references being made to things like "over-full employment". It is interesting to note that manufacturing employment in Australia reached a plateau in 1947 at just one-quarter of the labour force, and it stayed there virtually for two decades. That is a bit anomalous. We often hear of farmers complaining about high tariff rates and their inability to survive. One of the architects of the policy was Jack McEwen, a Country Party Minister.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It may not have been suitable in those days to set industries off.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Let me develop my argument further. Jack McEwen headed various trade Ministries for an incredible 22 years. In that time Australia pursued a line of import substitution—obtaining rights to products which had been originated overseas and making them here—while concentrating export efforts on developing our abundant raw materials. We therefore made products under licence but did not innovate new products. The McEwen policy was popular at that time. However, I am not saying that a Labor Administration would have done anything different.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The union movement supported it.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: That is what I just said. The union movement, the labour movement, and the Labor Party supported it because it had a short-term, job-creating effect.

Perhaps I used the metaphor that Barry Jones would have used. He said—

Sir John was a Frankenstein who created an increasingly helpless monster. Australian industry was programmed *not* to specialise and *not* to excel in particular areas of expertise.

We were encouraged to become mere assemblers, duplicating products designed by people cleverer than ourselves. Australian management has to develop in-

dustrial strategies of its own and to employ inventors, researchers and technological innovators to follow the lead of small nations like Switzerland and Sweden in developing an autonomous and exportable technology.

I think that is the crux of the matter. In the 1950s and 1960s the general trend was to say that Japanese products were junk. Japan did copy, but it acquired skills along the way which is something Australia did not do. Australia never learnt, it just borrowed technology from overseas and many of the inventions by Australian inventors and scientists were taken overseas to be developed.

What I am saying is that Australian industry is not prepared to invest in basic research which is looked on as something of a luxury. If we are to turn our terms of trade around and secure for Australia long-term stability in the export field we cannot rely on the manufacturing industries of the 1950s and 1960s, and exporting minerals and primary produce. We must find those areas in which we can specialise and find the markets that we can service.

If Sweden, with a population in the order of the Australian population, can do it I do not know why it cannot be done here.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: We would if we were given an incentive.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: That may be true. Government policy in the past favoured protection through high tariffs, but the whole community will have to change its attitude and adopt a more rational and scientific approach to the problem instead of resorting to rhetoric.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: How do you expect the people to do it?

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Industry must take the lead. The amount of basic research in this country is limited. Unless the level of research and the finding of alternative products and markets is undertaken, we will languish in a situation where our terms of trade will fluctuate from month to month and year to year without any real long-term recovery.

Having solved the world's economic problems I would once again like to congratulate the newly elected members, and I hope that their stay in this House is productive and fulfilling.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. P. G. Pandal.

## TREASURER'S ADVANCE AUTHORIZATION BILL

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The need for a Treasurer's Advance Authorization Bill arises out of the Financial Administration and Audit Act 1985, and if that Act is to operate from 1 July this year, it is essential that the Bill be passed prior to that date.

Members will recall that the Financial Administration and Audit Act passed in the last session, proposed to formalise the existing Treasurer's advance arrangements by establishing the Treasurer's Advance Account as a statutory account, to record drawings from the Public Bank Account for those purposes.

The Act also provides for the authorisation for Treasurer's advance to be included in an annual Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act, which would specify both the monetary limit to which the Treasurer could draw moneys from the Public Bank Account and the purposes for which the Treasurer's Advance Account may be applied. The Act would lapse at 30 June each year.

Members should note that under the new arrangements the monetary limit prescribed within the Treasurer's Advance Authorization Act will be an authorisation, as opposed to the current practice of seeking an appropriation in both the Supply Act and the Appropriation (Consolidated Revenue Fund) Act.

Where payments are made in respect of the new items or for supplementation of appropriation, those payments will be chargeable against the Consolidated Revenue Fund or General Loan and Capital Works Fund pending parliamentary appropriation in the next financial year. Payments for other purposes, by way of advance, will be repayable by the recipient.

The Bill now before the House seeks to authorise the purposes for which the Treasurer's Advance Account may be applied and to specify a limit of \$150 million for advances from that account during the financial year commencing 1 July 1986.

I would point out that the limit specified represents an increase of only \$5 million on the amount in the current year's Consolidated Revenue Fund appropriation "Advance to Treasurer".

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. G. E. Masters (Leader of the Opposition).

*House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

#### *"Indian Pacific": Industrial Record*

84. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

Can the Minister inform the House of the industrial record of the *Indian Pacific's* service in each of the past five years?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The number of *Indian Pacific* trains cancelled due to industrial disputes were as follows—

Year	East Bound	West Bound	Total	Percentage of normal Service %
1982.....	20	20	40	9.7
1983.....	73	75	148	48
1984.....	5	5	10	3
1985.....	2	2	4	1.3
1986 January to May.....	2	—	2	1.5
	102	102	204	12.7

Details prior to 1982 are not available.

An industrial dispute over manning levels in New South Wales from December 1982 to July 1983 caused disruptions to the service over that period.

### RACING AND TROTTING

#### *Geraldton Turf Club: Minister's Meeting*

86. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Is it correct the Minister met with representatives of the Geraldton Turf Club in April?
- (2) Was the question of the casino's effect on country racing raised?
- (3) If so, what was her response?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The discussions with the representatives of the Geraldton Turf Club were in regard to matters unrelated to the Burswood Island resort.

### TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

#### *"Indian Pacific": Timetable*

90. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Why cannot the *Indian Pacific* timetable be arranged so that at least some of the Western Australian section, i.e. Northam-Perth be travelled in daylight hours for the benefit of tourism?
- (2) What is the average passenger fill percentage wise?
- (3) How many pensioner concession tickets are sold on average per trip?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The present schedule of the *Indian Pacific* is largely governed by the requirements in the other States.

The question of speeding up the service and improvements to the train timetable has been pursued in the past by Westrail but without success.

As the member may be aware it has recently been decided to establish a separate central management organisation to run intersystem passenger train services. The new organisation will give attention to the various aspects required to improve services.

- (2) Average occupancy sleeper accommodation 65 per cent.

Average occupancy sit-up accommodation 75 per cent.

- (3) Average of 34 pensioner concession tickets sold per trip which represents approximately 25 per cent of the occupancy rate.

### TRANSPORT

#### *Bus Stop: Victoria Park*

94. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that with the recent demolition of the Victoria Park Town Hall and therefore the cantilever verandah attached to it there is no longer a convenient covered bus stop in this area particularly for the elderly?

- (2) Would he investigate the possibility of converting the open bus stop near Meads in Victoria Park to a covered shelter?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes. The responsibility for the provision of bus shelters rests with local councils. However as a result of a previous complaint, the MTT has made a recommendation to the Perth City Council to have a shelter placed at that site as part of the PCC 1986-87 shelter programme.
- (2) The MTT will liaise with the Perth City Council with a view to providing a shelter in the 1986-87 shelter programme.

### TRANSPORT

#### *Bus Stops: Victoria Park Passengers*

96. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that in the city between Council House and Newspaper House there are no bus stops catering for Victoria Park commuters?
- (2) Is he aware that elderly people in particular are critical of this situation?
- (3) Will he investigate the possibility of rectifying the matter?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Prior to 17 November 1985 the Victoria Park buses stopped at the following points on the south side of St George's Terrace in the central city area—

- (a) 65 metres west of Barrack Street  
(b) 100 metres west of William Street

Since the change of bus rank locations on 17 November the stop at (a) was changed to 60 metres east of Barrack Street, an additional walk of 125 metres for some passengers and a reduction for others; (b) remained unaltered.

Should some commuters still wish to travel to the stop west of Barrack Street, they have the opportunity to board a less frequent Route No. 27 bus which travels through the centre of Victoria Park.

- (2) The November 1985 change was brought about by excessive traffic congestion and all ranks along the south side of St George's Terrace were reorganised. This was a major operation because it affected approximately 15 000 commuters daily. The number of complaints received by the MTT was only eight.

Of those eight, two were from commuters from the western suburbs, five were from South Perth, and one from Mt Pleasant.

When compared with the magnitude of the change, the small number of complaints received by the MTT would indicate an excellent result.

- (3) As all available kerbside space is fully utilised, it is not possible to make any changes without inconveniencing some passengers.

The present arrangements are now well accepted by the majority of passengers and as all bus services cater for a high proportion of elderly people further changes would only result in transferring the problem.

### GAMBLING: LOTTERIES

#### *Instant: Distributions*

98. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Since the introduction by the O'Connor Government in 1982 of the Instant Lottery how much money has been directed to—

- (a) sporting; and  
(b) cultural pursuits?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The member is referred to the response to question 14 of 12 June 1986.

### TOURISM

#### *Eastern States Visitors: Statistics*

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

- (1) What figures are kept by the WA Tourism Commission or Holiday WA Centre concerning the volume of business written in the Eastern States for

people intending to visit Western Australia?

- (2) How does this compare with figures for each of the previous three years?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Tourism Commission keeps statistics on total financial collections and on the number of visitor reservations from each of its Eastern States Holiday WA Centres. The financial collections refer to the amount paid by clients for travel to WA. In many instances these payments are deposits only with the balance paid direct to Western Australian operators.

- (2) Figures for the past three years are as follows—

	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86 (to 31 May 86)
* People	23 270	25 560	28 897	19 749
Financial Collections	\$7 006 432	\$8 256 587	\$9 570 399	\$9 339 890

\*Prior to 1 August 1985 reservations were accepted on behalf of travel agents and the figures for these people are included for all years with the exception of 1985-86.

## TOURISM

### *Japanese Tourists Visas*

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

- (1) Has the Minister made any representations to the Federal Government for Japanese tourists to be allowed to enter Australia on a basis similar to New Zealanders; that is, without the need for visas?

- (2) If so, what has been the result?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Minister raised the issue of visas for overseas tourists at the Tourism Ministers' Council meeting in Hobart on 20 June 1986. The Tourism Ministers' Council unanimously agreed to urge the Federal Government to remove the visa requirements for short-term visitors to Australia from certain selected countries. Japan would be one of the countries the Tourism Ministers' Council would expect to be among those selected.

## AMERICA'S CUP

### *Visitors: Visa Applications*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the promise of the Federal Minister for Immigration in *The West Australian* of 5 April 1986 that his department would streamline the overseas processing of visa applications from intending America's Cup visitors?
- (2) Does he acknowledge that such streamlining should apply in any case, not just for the Cup?
- (3) Will the Minister convey that view to Mr Hurford?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The member in asking this question is obviously unaware that the streamlining of customs and immigration procedures for international travellers is a part of the State Government's tourism policy 1986-89 released early in 1986.

## EDUCATION

### *South-east Regional Office: Transfer*

115. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the rationale behind the decision to transfer the Education Department's south-east regional office from Welshpool to Armadale?

- (2) Is the Minister aware that the transfer will greatly inconvenience many teachers?

- (3) Will the Minister reconsider this decision?

- (4) If not, why not?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) to (4) In accord with its policy to support and promote development of the subregional centres the Government earlier this year decided to relocate the south-east regional office of the Education Department in Welshpool to Armadale.

As it is now estimated that such a relocation could cost up to \$600 000 the Government is reconsidering the proposal.

### TRANSPORT

#### *Westrail: Staff*

124. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

How many people were employed with Westrail as at—

- (a) 30 June 1985; and
- (b) 31 May 1986 at
  - (i) Bunbury;
  - (ii) all other centres of the south-west, each detailed separately?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (a) and (b)

	30-6-85	31-5-86
Bunbury .....	242	164
Boyup Brook .....	2	2
Bridgetown .....	9	10
Busselton .....	4	1
Collic .....	60	37
Donnybrook .....	11	10
Margaret River .....	1	1
Manjimup .....	28	21
Picton .....	81	118
Darkan .....	5	3
Brunswick .....	6	6
Waroona .....	6	4
Pemberton .....	1	—

### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

#### *Television Advertisement*

142. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Industry and Technology:

- (1) When was the current television advertisement of the Department of Industrial Development produced?
- (2) How much did it cost and who produced it?
- (3) How many versions of the television advertisement were produced?
- (4) How much has been spent to date on showing the advertisement in—
  - (a) the metropolitan area; and
  - (b) the country areas?
- (5) What is the purpose of the advertisement?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) August 1985.
- (2) \$165 477—Jenkin Morgan Aitken, advertising consultants.
- (3) Three.
- (4) (a) \$353 000—has been spent on screening time for television advertisements in the metropolitan area.
- (b) \$62 000—has been spent on screening time for television advertisements in the country area.
- (5) To encourage modernisation of industry in Western Australia.

### DEFENCE

#### *Submarines Contract: Government Case*

144. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Defence Liaison:

What funds has the State Government spent to date in presenting a case for the contract to build the Royal Australian Navy's replacement submarines in Western Australia?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

1984-85 \$54 493

1985-86 to date \$271 563.

### TOURISM

#### *Hotham Valley Tourist Railway:*

#### *Costs*

148. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Hotham Valley tourist railway which carried 60 000 tourists in Western Australia last winter is in danger of having to close shop because of increased operating costs by way of penalty rates to Westrail engine crews and guards?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the Hotham Valley railway, the Australian Railways Historical Society and Kevin Pearce Productions have been hit by Westrail fee increases of 30 to 40 per cent this season?
- (3) Is the Minister aware of the large team of volunteers who give of their time without charge to act as captains of the 16 coaches, the voluntary crews

that get the engines cleaned, oiled and fired up on Saturdays ready for Sunday's run and who are responsible on Sunday night for shedding the locos after the fires have been dropped, carriage cleaners and many others who help because of their love for the steam train and the pleasure it gives to so many?

- (4) Is it possible in the interest of tourism and the promotion of this unique and fascinating hobby the Government could give serious consideration to seeing what the problem is and endeavour to come to some arrangement which would keep this segment of our tourist industry alive?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (4) The Minister is aware of a recent submission from Hotham Valley Tourist Railway WA Inc. to the Minister for Transport, requesting a review of Westrail charges. It is recognised that the charges imposed by Westrail represent a major portion of operating costs for the Hotham Valley tourist railway and that a reduction of these fees would contribute substantially to the viability of each steam rail service.

The Western Australian Tourism Commission has been closely associated with the Hotham Valley tourist railway over a long period of time and has been very supportive of the work being undertaken by the many dedicated volunteers who have developed this facility as a major tourist attraction for the State.

The Minister will be making representation to the Minister for Transport on the matters covered in the Hotham Valley tourist railway submission and will be seeking every cooperation in a review of the present Westrail charges.

## TRANSPORT

### *Metropolitan Transport Trust: Passenger Costs*

157. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

What is the cost per passenger/kilometre for the Metropolitan Transport Trust over the past five years?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

	Cost per passenger kilometre	
	\$ c	\$ c
1980-81.....	1.01	1.41
1981-82.....	1.16	1.60
1982-83.....	1.40	1.81
1983-84.....	1.55	1.98
1984-85.....	1.67	2.11

## HEALTH

### *Mental: Patients Discharged*

164. Hon. FRED McKENZIE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many patients under the care of Mental Health Services have been discharged from its care in each year, during the last three years?
- (2) When a patient is discharged is the next of kin advised?
- (3) If not, why not?
- (4) When patients are discharged what follow-up procedures are undertaken to ensure the welfare of the discharged patient is adequately catered for?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Mental Health Services was amalgamated, along with two other departments, into the Health Department on 1 July 1984.

The following information relates to approved hospital, child and adolescent inpatients units, psychogeriatric extended care units and Whitby Falls Hostel. Discharge figures include deaths.

	1982-83 1986	1983-84 1973	1984-85 1635
Approved hospitals.....			
Psychiatric extended care units.....	15	31	99
Whitby Falls hostel.....	21	18	22
Child and adolescent psychiatry inpatient units.....	49	68	201
TOTALS	2 071	2 090	1 957

- (2) Yes, it is customary to advise next-of-kin when appropriate.
- (3) On some occasions patients request that no-one be informed of their presence in hospital or of their discharge.
- (4) The department has no legal responsibility for patients discharged from hospital who are assessed as requiring no further treatment.

Appointments are made at community psychiatric outpatient clinics or alternative arrangements are made with the referring general practitioner

or other agencies where follow-up is considered desirable for the person. After-care can be prescribed for persons who were admitted under certificate and are discharged from hospital for treatment in the community but who are not discharged from treatment.

## BILL OF RIGHTS

### *Portfolio: Effect*

170. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Community Services:

What are the implications of the Federal Government's Bill of Rights legislation, presently before the Senate, on the portfolio responsibilities of the Minister?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

As the Bill of Rights Bill has yet to be passed by the Senate, its implications on my portfolio responsibilities cannot be determined.

Notwithstanding, the Bill of Rights Bill is too complex a piece of legislation to allow such a generalised question to be dealt with satisfactorily.

If the member has any particular implication in mind, he should specify it to allow proper detailed consideration.

## LIQUOR LAWS

### *Honorary Royal Commission: Recommendations*

172. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Which of the recommendations of the report of the Honorary Royal Commission on Liquor Laws in Western Australia will be implemented?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The matter is still receiving consideration. It is hoped to put recommendations to Government in the near future.

## GAMBLING

### *Mossenson Report: Recommendations*

173. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

Which of the recommendations of the Mossenson gaming report will the Minister be implementing?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

It is anticipated that legislation to reflect the main recommendations of the Mossenson report will be before Parliament in the spring session.

## TRANSPORT: BUSES

### *School: Policy Review Committee*

176. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Were all Parents and Citizens' Associations, and their school bus advisory committees, notified of the establishment of the Education Department school bus policy review committee?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) Were all school principals notified of the establishment of this committee?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) Is it correct that an advertisement was placed in the *Weekend News* of 7 June 1986 calling for submissions to this committee?
- (6) Is it the intention of the Government to place another advertisement in *The West Australian* of 21 June 1986 calling for submissions to this committee?
- (7) Is it correct that the closing date for submissions to this committee is 30 June 1986?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) to (4) Parents and Citizens' Associations have been advised through the Western Australian Council of State School Organisations and both primary and secondary principals are represented on the committee through their respective principals' associations.
- (5) No—the advertisement was placed in *The West Australian* of that date.

(6) I have agreed to an extension of the closing date for submissions and an advertisement will be run on 21 June 1986.

(7) The closing date for submissions is 15 August 1986.

## HEALTH: EDUCATION

### *Course: Finalisation*

177. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the health education K-10 course been finalised?
- (2) What documents have been prepared for this course?
- (3) Are these documents available to—
  - (a) teachers;
  - (b) parents;
  - (c) members of Parliament; and
  - (d) interested citizens?
- (4) What was the cost of—
  - (a) producing these documents; and
  - (b) printing these documents?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Course document— The health education K-10 syllabus

Support documents—Teachers, materials for Years 1, 4, 7, 8 and 9. Other year levels currently being prepared.

- (3) (a) Yes;
- (b) Yes;
- (c) Yes;
- (d) Yes.
- (4) (a) \$300 000;
- (b) Syllabus and teachers guides \$78 184.

## ARTS: EDUCATION

### *Report: Recommendations*

178. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Community Services representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Minister received and read the WAPSEC report on the future of art education in WA?
- (2) Have any of its recommendations been acted on?
- (3) Does he expect to implement all the recommendations contained in the report?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) WAPSEC has considered the report from its Visual Arts Committee and responses from the public and academic institutions. It has prepared a statement of its conclusions and advised the institutions concerned.
- (3) The major principles involved in the report are accepted and the specific recommendations are subject to decisions to be made in connection with planning for the 1988-90 triennium. I will be issuing a statement on this matter in the near future.

## ROTTNEST ISLAND

### *Management Plan: Release*

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

When is the Minister planning to release the management plan for Rottneest Island?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Following consideration of the management plan by Cabinet, the plan will be released.

## WATER RESOURCES: DAM

### *Harris River: Assurance*

180. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the assurance given to a deputation of the Collie Shire Council last year that the Harris River dam near Collie would be the next dam built by the Government in Western Australia?

- (2) Does the present Minister stand by this previous Minister's assurance?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes, although the commencement of construction of the Harris Dam has always been stated as being subject to an environmental clearance and the resolution of funding arrangements involving the Commonwealth Government.

### FIRE STATIONS

#### Type 5

181. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) Could the Minister advise me what are the criteria set by the WA Fire Brigades Board for a type 5 fire station?
- (2) Do the towns of Two Rocks, Yanchep, and Quinns meet this criteria?
- (3) If so, is there any firm proposal to provide any or all of them with a type 5 fire station?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) When last assessed in 1984 none of the towns of Two Rocks, Yanchep, or Quinns qualified for the establishment of a volunteer fire protection service under the present method of assessment involving a population/fire risk matrix.
- (3) The eligibility of the towns is presently being re-assessed on the basis that they or some of them may qualify by reason of population growth since the previous assessment.

### ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

#### *Commonwealth-State Programmes*

186. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs:

Following the announcement of Commonwealth/State Government initiatives regarding the range of programmes for Aboriginal communities, will the Minister advise:

- (1) Which State Government department will be responsible for the implementation of the initiatives?

- (2) Will consultants be utilized?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority will be responsible for the implementation of the State Government initiatives.
- (2) Yes.

### GAMBLING: TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

#### *Functional Review Committee: Assessment*

188. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

- (1) Is there a functional review committee looking at the TAB?
- (2) Who are the members of this committee?
- (3) When was it established?
- (4) For what purpose?
- (5) Has a report been prepared by the committee?
- (6) When will the report be made public?
- (7) If not, why not?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Government functional review committee has reviewed the TAB in accordance with its terms of reference to review all Government organisations.
- (2) The members of the Committee are—  
Mr K. E. Mann, (Chairman)  
Deputy Chairman, Public Service Board  
Mr W. F. Rolston, Auditor General  
Mr A. J. Lloyd, Assistant Under Treasurer  
Mr K. Edwards, Executive Director, Policy Division,  
Department of the Premier and Cabinet  
Mr M. J. Bowler, Assistant General Secretary, Civil Service Association.

- (3) September 1983.
- (4) To review all Government agencies.
- (5) to (7) The committee's work forms part of the ordinary advice to Government and in the normal course of events is regarded as confidential.

## LIQUOR: PREMIUMS

*Revenue*

189. Hon P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) In each of the past five years how much revenue has been raised via the Licensing Court from premiums imposed on—
  - (a) the upgrading of existing licensed premises; and
  - (b) the establishment of new premises?
- (2) Is it still the court's policy to keep the method of calculation of such premiums secret from the Government?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The break-up of revenue received from premiums sought in (a) and (b) is not available.

The total amount of premiums is—

1980-81	\$668 950
1981-82	\$544 045
1982-83	\$461 525
1983-84	\$662 200
1984-85	\$679 150

- (2) The method of calculation has always been confidential to the court which, as the member would be aware, is an independent judicial body not subject to ministerial direction.

## ROTTNEST ISLAND

*Boat Moorings: Thompson's Bay*

190. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it correct that the Department of Marine and Harbours is planning 50 to 70 new moorings at the eastern end of Thompson's Bay at Rottneest?
- (2) If so, what is the total cost of the moorings?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The Department of Marine and Harbours is planning to install approximately 40 new moorings in Thompson's Bay.
- (2) The moorings are estimated to cost \$120 000.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

## MIDLAND SALEYARDS

*Order of the Day: Debate*

45. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House:

I refer the Leader of the House to the Notice Paper. I note that the motion for the Select Committee on the Midland saleyards is Order of the Day No. 13. When is it proposed that this item will be debated?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

It will be debated when I have come to a decision on the matter.

## INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

*Annual Leave Loading: Abolition*

46. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

Does the Minister support the Premier's reported statement in *The West Australian* with respect to the desirability of abolishing the 17.5 per cent annual leave loading?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The Premier speaks on behalf of the Government, but is misrepresented in the description of his comments by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, the Premier's statement was in the negative; that is, he did not believe that action on that question should be taken except on a national basis.

## INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

*Productivity Claim: Support*

47. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

I thank the Minister for his indirect answer to the last question. Do the Minister and his Government still support the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the Trades and Labor Council application for a three per cent productivity claim, in view of the cost to the Western Australian Government and the effect of such a successful claim on the State Budget?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

The Government has not moved from its expression of support in the hearing itself.

**TAXES AND CHARGES***Tobacco Tax: Revenue*

48. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Budget Management:

Has the revenue from State tobacco tax increased over the past six months?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I do not have that information in my head, but if the honourable member wishes to put the question on notice, I will obtain the detail.

**COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT***Staff: Annual Leave Loading*

49. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Community Services:

Does the Minister support the call by the Premier for the removal of the 17.5 per cent annual leave loading for employees in the Department of Community Services?

Hon. KAY HALLAHAN replied:

I refer the member to the answer given by the Minister for Budget Management.