

# Legislative Council

Thursday, the 1st November, 1979

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## RESERVES BILL (No. 2)

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

## GOVERNMENT SCHOOL TEACHERS ARBITRATION AND APPEAL BILL

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

## LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

### *Second Reading*

THE HON. R. G. PIKE (North Metropolitan)  
[2.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is introduced as a result of approaches made to me by residents of the Doubleview, Woodlands, and Wembley Downs suburbs, and other areas. These proposals have been discussed with Mr Brian Stempel, Executive Director, Australian Hotels Association, and Mr Coffey of the Local Government Association.

The Bill is directed at four quite separate problems. The first of these is the need for a provisional certificate for the removal of a licence to be included in the Act.

The Act currently makes provision for the issue of a provisional certificate for a licence relating to premises not yet built or premises which require adaptation to make them suitable for the licence. That procedure enables the Licensing Court to consider the merits of the application before the applicant has been called upon to outlay capital in the construction of the proposed premises.

If the application for a provisional certificate is granted, the successful applicant can erect or adapt his premises knowing that any speculation about whether or not the licence will ultimately be granted has been eliminated.

It is possible also for an applicant who has suitable premises to make an application for the full licence in the first place. In that event the

applicant is obliged under section 59 to lodge with the court a certificate from the local authority that the premises comply with all the relevant Acts and by-laws.

It should be noted that the opening words of section 59 exclude that section from the situation where the application is for a provisional certificate only. If the applicant to whom section 59 applies does not file the relevant certificate, the court is not permitted to hear the application.

All this works quite well where the application is for a new licence. However, a serious problem arises when the application is not for a new licence, but for the removal of an existing licence under section 90.

Section 90(2) specifically includes section 59 among the sections with which an applicant for a removal must comply. The court therefore insists that a certificate from the local health authority for the district must be filed before it will hear a removal application.

That does not present a problem where the premises of which the removal is sought are premises which are already in existence because, in that situation, the local authority can physically check the premises and issue a certificate. However, the problem arises where the premises to which the removal is sought are premises which have not yet been constructed or have not yet been adapted to make them suitable to receive a licence. In that situation, some local authorities refuse to issue a certificate by virtue of the fact that they cannot confirm that non-existent premises comply with all the relevant Acts and by-laws.

An applicant who cannot get a certificate from the local authority cannot get his application heard by the court and is thus frustrated completely. The problem arises because there is no machinery in the Act for an application for a provisional certificate for removal in the same general way that an applicant for a new licence can apply for a provisional certificate for that new licence.

The proposed amendments to sections 59, 59A, 62, 90, and 166 provide for this new type of provisional certificate for the removal of a licence and will overcome the problem.

The second problem concerns section 51 of the Act and relates to the need to provide more time for objections to a licence which can be granted under the Liquor Act.

The consequence of a judicial decision on the 16th May, 1977, is that any objections made after 30 days from the date on which the application was lodged by the applicant will not be entitled to

be heard by the court because the notices of objection were lodged out of time. Prior to this ruling, the earliest day referred to in section 51 (2) (a) was interpreted by the court as being the date set for the hearing. Therefore under the present requirements, the 30-day period from the date of application is reduced by the seven-day period required by section 55 (3) and can be reduced by a further seven days under section 51 (2) (c). This means that at present the effective period for lodging an objection can be 16 days.

The proposed amendment to section 51 (2) (a) overcomes this problem by providing for 45 days before the earliest day on which the application may be heard, thus ensuring 31 clear days for the lodging of objections. The period of 31 clear days for the lodgment of objections cannot be considered unreasonable in view of the fact that a person in the affected area needs to familiarise himself with the full details of the proposition before deciding to lodge an objection.

The third problem relates also to section 51 and concerns the size of the sign required to be displayed on or adjoining the premises, the necessity for the latest date by which objections can be lodged to be shown on the sign, and the period for which it is required to be displayed. At present the sign, which is foolscap size, is affixed to a board 400 mm by 400 mm—15¼" by 15¼". This is considered too small and the Bill seeks to make the notice larger—900 mm by 600 mm or 2'11½" by 1'11½"—and more obvious. The amendment provides also that the latest date by which objections can be lodged is required to be shown on the sign.

The existing provisions of section 51 are such as to require a notice of application to be displayed on the premises for 21 days between the lodging of the notice and the hearing of the application.

Many applications are not heard within 60 days from the date of lodgment of the application. In other words, the period for objections can pass prior to the notice being displayed at the premises. This problem is solved by the proposed amendments.

Finally, the Bill deals with the rejection by the court of applications for technical reasons. At present, objectors are disadvantaged in cases where the court rejects an application due to a technical fault. The applicant may resubmit his application immediately the fault has been corrected. However, under the present provisions of the Act, objectors to the initial application are required to submit fresh objections in relation to the second application.

The proposed amendment to section 55 by adding a new subsection will provide that objections against the first application shall be deemed to have been lodged against the second application.

In summary, then, these amendments seek to facilitate the transfer of existing licences and provide better information and additional time for objections for the public.

I commend the Bill to the House.

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

## STAR SWAMP

### *Reservation: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 25th October, on the following motion by the Hon. R. F. Cloughton—

That the Members of the Legislative Council support the efforts of citizens of the Trigg, Marmion and Waterman localities to have set aside a reserve of 100 hectares in the area bounded by Beach Road-Marmion Avenue-North Beach Road and Hope Street, as a permanent natural bush and passive recreation/nature study area to ensure that Star Swamp and its surrounding bushland will be protected from degradation and recognising—

- (a) that the Star Swamp bush area is one of the few remaining locations of natural vegetation typical of the Swan coastal plain left in the Perth metropolitan area;
- (b) its value for recreational and educational purposes;
- (c) the classification of Star Swamp by the National Trust of W.A. for environmental and historical reasons;
- (d) that Star Swamp is one of the few metropolitan wetlands free of salmonella infection;
- (e) the area is being increasingly used as a refuge for plants, birds and animals which are being displaced from the surrounding housing development;
- (f) the area contains an array of plant communities;
- (g) that none of the land in question is privately owned;

urges the Government to reserve the area as requested and facilitate any land transfers and/or exchanges necessary to achieve these purposes.

**THE HON. R. G. PIKE** (North Metropolitan) [2.50 p.m.]: I rise to speak on the motion before the Chair and give notice to the House that in

doing so I intend to move an amendment to it. I have arranged for the amendment to be circularised.

In speaking to the motion, I would like to point out in the first instance that paragraph (g) of it is not correct. Paragraph (g) reads as follows—

that none of the land in question is privately owned;

I point out to the House and to the Hon. R. F. Claughton that the Leader of the House, when he spoke to a similar motion on the 22nd November, 1978, pointed out to the House that paragraph (g), to which I have referred, was not correct. He went on to say—

The land is not all public ownership; for example, a number of private houses exist along the east side of Hope Street and back to the proposed Reserve.

I make this point to illustrate to the House that it would be quite wrong for us to associate ourselves with a motion which contains information that is incorrect and it would be wrong for us to associate ourselves with it in the full knowledge that the Leader of the House, at another time in this House, pointed out that paragraph (g) is incorrect.

#### *Amendment to Motion*

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I move an amendment—

That all words after the word "That" in line 1 be deleted with a view to substituting the following passage—

the Members of the Legislative Council support the efforts of the Citizens of the Trigg, Marmion, North Beach and Waterman localities and of State Government instrumentalities and authorities to have a reserve set aside as a permanent natural bush and passive recreation/nature study area to ensure that Star Swamp and its surrounding bushland will be protected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member knows that if he moves an amendment he must provide a signed written copy of it.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: The whole of the Standing Order to which you, Sir, have referred was complied with, with the exception of the signature.

In speaking to the amendment I would like to emphasise that the Leader of the House, when dealing with a similar motion on another occasion, commended the efforts of the Government at that time for setting aside

approximately 21 hectares in the vicinity of Star Swamp and said that in fact it was a major contribution which had been made by the Government to that date.

I consider the motion before the Chair, which has been moved by the Hon. R. F. Claughton, is too binding, and further restricts capacity to negotiate. This motion which seeks to set aside a specific amount of land, is in fact incorrect in part, and some of the facts which were illustrated by the Leader of the House when he was replying to a similar motion moved by the member on another occasion need to be reconsidered.

I should like to refer to the points made by the Minister which are relevant to the amendment I have moved. Firstly, the Minister said—

The member for Karrinyup (Mr Jim Clarko) has put forward a proposal that a portion of land held by the MRPA as open space and situated to the south of Star Swamp be exchanged for some of the land owned by the State Housing Commission so that an area closer to the swamp could be kept as open space, rather than an area further to the south which, while it is adjacent, is not contiguous with the swamp area. I believe Mr Clarko's proposal is worth considering. I understand it is yet to receive the backing of the Stirling City Council; however, it represents a serious attempt to resolve this problem.

I should like to refer to a further comment made by the Minister in the same speech. It reads as follows—

There is still room for further discussion on this matter. It must be noted that the MRPA originally considered this land was suitable and adequate for its purposes . . .

At the conclusion of that paragraph the Minister said—

Certainly, there is still room for movement on this issue.

The simple issue I wish to present to the House is that negotiations are still proceeding, the motion before the Chair is incorrect in part, and it is too binding because it sets down an absolute area.

Further, I congratulate and commend the Government on the area it has in fact set aside already—namely 21 hectares—and all the departments and members in the area who are continuing to work on this proposal. For instance, the City of Stirling has resolved to meet with the SHC to discuss the issue. I understand the local

member, Mr Jim Clarko, has been associated with that meeting and with the submission.

I hold in my hand a copy of the minutes of the City of Stirling meeting dated the 18th September, 1979, page 9 2/10 and headed, "Subject location—Proposal for community reserve: Beach Road, Marmion Avenue, North Beach Road, and Hope Street". Item 1 reads as follows—

That consideration of this proposal be deferred until the current negotiations are finalised.

#### *Point of Order*

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: Standing Order No. 190 reads as follows—

A question having been proposed may be amended by—

- (a) deleting certain words only;
- (b) inserting or adding certain words; or
- (c) deleting certain words and inserting or adding other words.

All I have in my hand by way of an amendment is a statement. I cannot see any reference to the addition or deletion of words which would ensure that the amendment complied with the Standing Order.

The PRESIDENT: The Chair has received the proposal which will be read when the member resumes his seat at the end of his speech on the amendment. The proposal is to delete certain words and insert certain other words in lieu.

The Hon. D. W. COOLEY: It would have been useful had we had that reference.

The PRESIDENT: I agree with the member that it would have been useful. The member has distributed a statement which shows how the motion will read if his amendment is agreed to. He has not distributed the proposed amendment.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: To continue reading from the minutes—

2. That a meeting be convened between State Housing Commission, Ward Councillors, and officers of the City.
3. That the Trigg, North Beach and Waterman Community Association be advised accordingly.

To repeat: This evidence dated the 18th September indicates that this matter is still under negotiation. Also, as I said before, the member for Karrinyup (Mr Jim Clarko) has embarked upon an initiative to arrange a meeting between the Minister and his experts from the EPA and the

consultants from the local groups. I understand there is some dispute within the area of the EPA about the recommendations made by both bodies. This needs to be resolved.

In consequence of all these facts, I believe the amendment is in order and I ask the House to support it on the basis that it is the continuing belief of the House and my wish that as much land as is possible should be reserved in the vicinity of Star Swamp.

I would like to point out that the motion moved by the Hon. Roy Claughton deleted reference to the North Beach community. Perhaps this was an oversight because the member is aware that that community is vitally associated with this matter and it is the very area in which this reserve is located.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [3.02 p.m.]: I oppose the amendment proposed by the Hon. R. Pike. The honourable member said he supports the actions of the Government in relation to the 21 hectares. However, I think the matter has been left too uncertain by his amendment to be a satisfactory alternative to the proposition I put forward.

I thank the member for pointing out the omission of reference to North Beach. It was a simple oversight and I am not sure how it occurred. Naturally, I would have included that area if I had noticed the omission.

If the honourable member had been in the Chamber at a particular time—I am not reflecting on him at all because he has been absent on business overseas—when the question of the 100 hectares arose by way of interjection between the Leader of the House and myself, he would be aware that 100 hectares was a notational figure and when the detail was decided the Government would make any adjustments according to requirements.

That fact is understood in the motion and it is not necessary to point out that included within those street boundaries are a few private house lots. The 100 hectares of course did not include those particular house lots. It would have been an area much greater than 100 hectares if they had been included. Therefore, that cannot be regarded as an argument against the proposition I have put forward or an indication that part (g) is incorrect. The 100 hectares refers to all those lots other than those privately owned lots.

Apart from that, the itemised sections of the motion are subject to certain qualifications. When the detail is given they are correct. For instance, one reference is made to the area being

salmonella free. Of course it is not 100 per cent salmonella free because there are a few indigenous varieties there. However, it is salmonella free of the exotic diseases types which leads to the enteric infections. So it is not relevant to argue against the motion on these minor details. They do not make the motion or statement incorrect.

It is important to remember that in the opposition put forward by the local people their concern was for the need to preserve the whole of the area. The whole area is interrelated and that point is made in the EPA report. Item 8 of that report to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment dated the 10th September, 1977, under the signature of Brian O'Brien states—

Having examined Star Swamp and its environs and received advice on various aspects from both Government and private sources it is apparent to the EPA that the reservation proposed by the State Housing Commission should be extended. It is also apparent however that some claims made about environmental aspects of the area cannot be substantiated and some are wrong. Although Star Swamp is one of few natural water bodies in the Metropolitan Region which are largely unaffected by salmonella it is not the only one—

The EPA is accepting that point in reference to salmonella. To continue—

—and it cannot be considered to be in a pristine state. Records indicate that the water level in the swamp has risen about one metre in the past 20 years and this may indeed be due to the effects of housing development; some of the swamp's western shore has been grassed and many exotic plants and weeds have encroached its margins; although there are still some healthy tuart trees close to the swamp most tuarts in the area are diseased and old with no signs of recent regeneration; much of the area is devoid of understorey and has been invaded by lupins and annual grasses though still supporting some wildflowers; tracks of off-road vehicles are prevalent and portions are fire damaged—

I pause here to indicate that the EPA saw all those points which it obviously regarded as being indicative. To continue—

—but the recreational, educational and tranquil aspects still remain very important and dominant.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: They also went on to recommend the size of it.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The point being made by the local people is that unless the entire area is reserved, the recreational, educational, and tranquility aspects of the area will no longer be available to be preserved, because the whole of the area is interrelated.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Will you explain that?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I have explained it previously. The proposition is that the plant communities are interrelated.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are explaining something to the EPA which it has not found, so you are giving it rather momentous advice.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not think the Environmental Protection Authority would need to have the matter explained to it. It has been suggested that other limitations were imposed upon what the EPA could recommend, and that led it to make the recommendation it made.

However, let me explain once more: The area has four plant arrays. Firstly there is the paper bark swamp, then the tuart array, then the banksia array—which is in two parts, one to the north and the other to the south—and finally the heath area is between the banksia arrays. All those are interrelated; each carries its own bird, animal, and insect life. If one array is destroyed it means the other plant forms and fauna forms that are dependent upon it cannot survive. That would have a domino effect on the other plant arrays.

Secondly, if the Government's proposal of 21 hectares is adhered to, the heath and the banksia arrays would be removed; so those plant forms which are located there and which have managed to survive to this point, would disappear along with the fauna species dependent upon them. Instead of having 44 bird species in the area, the number would be reduced to those which tolerate only the paper bark and the tuart arrays—if they are large enough to contain them. While birds nest in the hollow branches of the tuart trees, probably they are feeding on the plants and animal forms in the banksia and heath areas. So the two things are interrelated.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Do those birds nest anywhere else apart from Star Swamp?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am talking about only those birds which nest in the 100 hectares of Star Swamp. The swamp itself forms a very small part of the whole area. As the

Minister indicated, originally it was felt five acres would be sufficient land to surround the lake.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: How does Star Swamp compare in size with Perry Lakes?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The area of the water at Perry Lakes probably would be about 21 hectares. The honourable member must remember that Perry Lakes includes the Reabold Hill area, so it is about double the area of Star Swamp.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I am more interested in the dimension of Star Swamp compared with the area of Perry Lakes, without crossing the road and including the Reabold Hill area.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is hard to be precise because there is a marked difference between the two. Perry Lakes has a great deal of open water and the expanse of it is easily seen. Star Swamp has growing within it many paper bark trees and it is difficult to obtain an impression of the total water area.

The water area fluctuates considerably, depending on the wetness of the season. It is larger during a wet season than it is during a dry season.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: That is the case at Perry Lakes, too.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The water area at Perry Lakes does not contract to the same extent, because the whole water area is deeper than is the case at Star Swamp. In the winter months the water area of Star Swamp spreads considerably; but it is only a few inches deep, so the area contracts considerably when the water dries up a little.

The point I was making in reply to the query raised by the Minister is that once the remainder of Star Swamp—apart from the 21 hectares—is cleared, the effect will be to raise the water table. As a consequence of that the paper barks will be lost, and probably the tuarts will be lost. Members will appreciate that a much larger population of people—it is suggested it may be up to 2 000, but even if it were only 1 000 the result would be bad—living that much closer to the swamp area, with all the impingement of human activity on the little area that is left, will make the area much more difficult to manage. Part of the case of the EPA was that the 100 hectares was too small an area; so how much more so would be the case if the area were reduced to 21 hectares? If an area of 100 hectares cannot be maintained, how can an area of 21 hectares be maintained? That seems an illogical proposition. With respect to the other matters raised by the EPA, concerning lupins and other exotic intrusions,

burning, and the lack of regeneration, some members of this Chamber have visited the swamp recently. Those who have been there within the last few months would have noticed how different the area is from when the EPA made its investigation.

Considerable regeneration of the indigenous plants has occurred, to the disadvantage of the exotic plants. For example, lupins are spontaneously dying out in areas where native shrubs have regenerated.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: That is a very unusual situation.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: When the ground is burnt, fertile ash is produced and room is created for herbaceous grasses and plants, and also lupins, to grow. If the ground is left covered by indigenous plants, insufficient room is left for herbaceous grasses and lupins to grow.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I am surprised to hear that, because lupins grow in profusion.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I was at the area only a few weeks ago along with members of the National Trust, and some local councillors. We inspected the area and saw evidence of that.

Also, where the local people had pulled some of the lupins, the open ground created by that activity had not led to the regeneration of grass, but, for the first time anyone can remember, Swan River daisies appeared. It is only a little plant which grows about six inches high and has deep blue flowers.

Members must realise that if we go along with what the Government is proposing and what Mr Pike seems to be supporting, the worthy objective he has stated in his amendment to the motion—the preservation of Star Swamp—simply will not be achieved. I ask that members do not support the amendment to the motion; instead, they should support the motion I have put forward.

It was most unfair to the people of the area for the Minister to claim that it was simply because the State Housing Commission wanted to develop a site for high-density dwellings in the area that the people were objecting. That was a most unjust accusation to have been levelled against them. I shall read from page 15 of their report titled, "Star Swamp Wetlands and its watershed" under the heading of, "Community involvement." It reads as follows—

The Community's insistence that a much larger area than that which is immediately

adjacent to the Swamp arises from two major concerns:

1. that the area preserved will be adequate to ensure the continued existence of Star Swamp as a natural wetland and
2. that the total area preserved should be sufficient to cater for the community's stated needs—for tranquillity, aesthetic beauty, passive recreation and nature study.

The Minister suggested the residents were saying the SHC should be required to forgo the land. I do not think that is really what the local people are on about. They would not want the SHC to suffer any loss. They would support a view that the commission should get an exchange of land for the area it would lose at Star Swamp. However, I think it is unfair to insist that either the local community or the City of Stirling should be required to find such exchange land. The Government is in a much better position than either of those bodies to offer land for exchange.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I appreciate what you are saying, but surely it is a fairly large area.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not think 100 hectares is really all that large.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Would you expect the local authorities not to look to the Government?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We know the total value placed on the area from figures provided during this debate. It was suggested that the total value was \$2.2 million; the SHC land was \$1.2 million and the Public Education Endowment Trust land was valued at \$1 million.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: That is not a small amount.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: No; but when one considers the land was bought for around \$11 000 by the commission it shows how the money value of the land can escalate. Even if we made that payment to the SHC, it could not repurchase land in the area, because there is none available. Certainly there is none available in the City of Stirling, so the commission would have to go somewhere else to find the land. Perhaps some members might think that is not fair.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver interjected.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: My time is limited so I cannot answer all Mr Oliver's interjections.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Why don't they use some of their own residential land that they are auctioning?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: They are not auctioning their own land. The land in scheme 31 actually belongs to the people who own it; all the council is doing is managing the scheme.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Why not reverse it?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Government has only to go to the other side of Marmion Avenue where the R & I Bank has considerable holdings. Why not arrange an exchange of land between two Government instrumentalities—the Minister might refer to them as trading concerns? In its sale of land in the Hamersley area the R & I Bank has made a considerable profit and could well afford to make an exchange with the SHC. Instead of having a blanket SHC development the commission could spread the development in a pepper-and-salt fashion so that we do not have one economic community arising within the area. That is not an unfair proposition to put forward.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It is all right if you are in the salt.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is the Minister saying there is something wrong with living in a State home?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: No.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not get the point of the Minister's comment.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Those who live further away from the area might disagree with your suggestion.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The land held by the R & I Bank for development and which it has been and will be selling to the public for residential purposes should be used for exchange purposes. That would be as reasonable as what Mr Oliver was suggesting; that is, that the City of Stirling should do it.

Let us consider the land which is owned by the Public Education Endowment Trust. We have been informed that the trust had been required to make an exchange of land it held at Cottesloe. The land it exchanged was valued at \$1 million; that is, the land in the Star Swamp locality. I wonder what the land value is of the land it previously held and which is now occupied by the Cottesloe Golf Club. I suggest to the Minister that that exchange could quite easily be cancelled; it has not been registered on the titles. That land used by the Cottesloe Golf Club could continue to be held by the trust.

I expect that in the past the trust would have been paid some rent for the land and that it would continue to be paid rent for it. The situation would remain as it was before. We have not heard

what the Cottesloe Golf Club will be expected to pay for that land. Was that worth \$1 million, which is the value of the land at Star Swamp? If it is valued at \$1 million, will the golf club be required to pay that amount to the State?

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: You should tell us.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not know. Perhaps the Minister will be able to tell us.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It is vested in the council for recreation.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It is vested in the Crown, according to the Minister's reply.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: At this stage; but it will be vested in the local authority.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Is any money being paid in exchange for it?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: When land is vested in a local authority, it does not usually pay.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That is very nice for the people in that area. The argument has not been made—

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: If you are arguing that local authorities should pay, perhaps payment should be made for the land at Star Swamp. Be consistent in your argument.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister is making the argument.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: No, you are. You started this; not me.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I suggest the Minister open his ears and listen a little, or put some brains in the gap between his ears so that he can understand.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You do not get anywhere by abusing people.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will members please stop interjecting and allow the honourable member to proceed?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Thank you, Mr President. I had not made the suggestion. However, certain land was owned by the Public Education Endowment Trust and we have been told the trust has a responsibility regarding it and that we cannot possibly take away from it the land at Star Swamp.

It has been suggested by the Minister that no payment will be required for the land which had been occupied by the Cottesloe Golf Club. It is good enough for members of the Cottesloe Golf Club to be handed that land for use, but it is a different situation altogether in respect of the people in my electorate. They do not get that consideration.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You mean that the City of Stirling does not have any land vested in it?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The trust must be paid for the land at Star Swamp.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Stirling has bought the land vested in it on the same terms and conditions.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: We are talking about the Public Education Endowment Trust.

The PRESIDENT: Order! What we are talking about is the deletion of certain words, and I ask the honourable member to get round to that subject.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am speaking to the motion.

The PRESIDENT: You should be speaking to the amendment which is to delete all words after the word "That" in line 1.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Could you advise me, Sir, whether, when I sit down, someone else will be allowed to speak?

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: On the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: Yes they will. I will outline the situation to the honourable member in case he wants a bit of clarification. We are talking on the amendment that certain words be deleted. Subject to what happens to that particular proposal, we will decide whether we will debate another proposal; but in the meantime that is the one we are discussing.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not want to argue about it.

I do not think that titter from members is necessary. This is a serious matter. If the motion to delete the words were carried, then there would be no way I could reply to the debate.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, there would be.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The motion would not be there.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Your motion is still there.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am telling the honourable member there will be an opportunity.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It would be too late to talk to the motion when my motion was deleted.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The point is that you are speaking to a proposed amendment that certain words be deleted. Whether it is too late or too early is not for the Chair to determine. The determination for me to make is whether you are



speaking to the proposal that certain words be deleted. I am not suggesting you are not doing that, but it does not seem as though you are.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Perhaps it was not the time to sort out that procedural argument. In order to convince members that the amendment should be defeated and the motion favoured, quite obviously it is necessary for me to indicate that all the 100 acres, which includes the endowment land, is required.

I have made the point I wished to make on that particular aspect; that is, that there is a great difference between the Government's treatment of the community in the North Beach-Waterman area and its treatment of the Cottesloe Golf Club. I do not want to disadvantage the members of the golf club, but the point is that the trust did own that land and I presume it was receiving some income from it.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Let us get this straight, too. The Cottesloe Golf Club is only one of those entitled to use that land. It is available for all passive recreation.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The answer the Minister provided was that it was occupied by the golf club, and I accept his answer. If the transfer were cancelled so that the trust would again hold that land, the trust would not be disadvantaged. According to the annual reports of the trust, over the last few years it has been selling land in various parts of the State, but in the last three years no new land has been vested in it. I am not sure of the Government's general attitude to the trust because it is certainly not getting much from the Government in order to function as was intended.

The last point I want to make is that reference has been made to MRPA land immediately south of Star Swamp. The Minister indicated that Mr Clarko had suggested this should be included and Mr Pike indicated it is already part of that 100 hectares about which we are speaking. No great advantage will be gained by simply changing the location because all the land drains into the swamp and it is necessary that all of it be preserved.

I sum up my remarks by saying that the only way in which the area can be preserved is by accepting that the area of approximately 100 acres is required. It is not a satisfactory answer for the Minister to say that it has been difficult to find land for the purpose of an exchange.

To preserve about 21 hectares is to condemn the swamp to extinction. It will be only a very short time before that has gone as well.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: That is not so.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Minister has presented no contrary information.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You have a report which you have been reading.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Yes, and the report says that the EPA does not consider 100 hectares to be sufficient. So how can 21 hectares be sufficient?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: What do you want, 1 000 or 2 000?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: One hundred hectares is contrary to what the EPA has said. While exotic grasses have intruded, it has been shown over the last couple of years that if an attempt is made to manage it the vegetation can regenerate; but if all that other undeveloped land is cut off and a new housing development is placed right on top of the swamp, it is inconceivable how it could maintain itself. Elsewhere in the metropolitan area there is evidence of the outcome of that sort of practice.

The Government should feel embarrassed in respect of the transfer of the endowment land when it is able to give consideration to the people in Cottesloe and members of the Cottesloe Golf Club, but is not prepared to give consideration to the people in the northern suburbs.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: We have given consideration to both groups.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Government has been quite adamant about this matter. It has given an indication that it would make no concession at all as far as that endowment trust land is concerned. I do not want to press that point, Mr President. I bear in mind what you said and I do not want to speak again.

The remarks of the Minister have demonstrated that there is a serious shortage of regional open space as well as public open space in the northern suburbs and the Minister claims no land is available for exchange. That is not a healthy condition for the metropolitan area to have reached so soon.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You cannot exchange for it land that is open space because it has to be zoned. It has always been zoned for housing by the Stirling City Council.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Government and the Parliament had no qualms about zoning land from public open space to urban residential zoning around the margins of Herdsman Lake recently. It very quickly moved to zone land in the opposite direction. I agree that land is not available. It was certainly available for

residential or factory development, but not for public open space.

I urge members to defeat the amendment moved by Mr Pike. It is in no way satisfactory to the people of the area. It implies that 21 hectares are sufficient, and anyone who is interested can easily satisfy himself that that is not the case.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes 17

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters
Hon. O. N. B. Oliver	

(Teller)

## Noes 8

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. F. E. McKenzie
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. T. McNeil
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. N. F. Moore	Hon. R. Hetherington

Amendment thus passed.

The Hon. R. G. PIKE: I move an amendment—

Substitute for the words deleted the following passage—

the Members of the Legislative Council support the efforts of the Citizens of the Trigg, Marmion, North Beach and Waterman localities and of State Government instrumentalities and authorities to have a reserve set aside as a permanent natural bush and passive recreation/nature study area to ensure that Star Swamp and its surrounding bushland will be protected.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes 18

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. O. N. B. Oliver
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. W. M. Piesse
Hon. H. W. Gayfer	Hon. R. G. Pike
Hon. T. Knight	Hon. I. G. Pratt
Hon. A. A. Lewis	Hon. J. C. Tozer
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. R. J. L. Williams
Hon. Margaret McAleer	Hon. W. R. Withers
Hon. N. McNeill	Hon. D. J. Wordsworth
Hon. I. G. Medcalf	Hon. G. E. Masters

(Teller)

## Noes 7

Hon. D. W. Cooley	Hon. T. McNeil
Hon. D. K. Dans	Hon. Grace Vaughan
Hon. Lyla Elliott	Hon. R. F. Cloughton
Hon. F. E. McKenzie	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. N. F. Moore	Hon. R. T. Leeson
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. R. Hetherington

Amendment thus passed.

## Motion, as Amended

Motion, as amended, put and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 3.50 to 4.04 p.m.*

## FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 31st October.

**THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON** (South-West—Leader of the House) [4.04 p.m.]: As you are aware, Mr President, I was not here yesterday as I had to visit the country on some urgent business. Unfortunately I missed what were reported to me as very good speeches to this Bill.

I am told that Mr Withers spoke to the debate, and I know he has been concerned very seriously about the current arrangement for the funding of fire brigades. Of course there are no professional fire brigades in his province, although there may be some company brigades in some of the mining towns.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: There are no fire officers employed by or associated with the Fire Brigades Board.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: So both he and Mr Tozer have been concerned about this matter for some time. Mr Williams referred to a Bill introduced in 1972 by the then Chief Secretary (Mr Stubbs), as I think did Mr Neil McNeill. These two members compared the current attitude expressed by Mr McKenzie with the attitude contained in the speeches to that Bill, and they pointed out that there were some contradictions. However, I do not think we should hold that against the Opposition—anyone is entitled to change his mind; and if someone is honest enough to stand up and do it in public, we should applaud him for it. I regret I was not here to listen to the speeches.

The examination of the contents and purposes of this Bill during my introductory speech was an explanation of the informative statement provided by the Treasurer when introducing the Budget. When listening to Mr McKenzie I had the feeling he was not aware of that. If that is the case and he would like a copy of the Treasurer's statement,

I will arrange for him to receive a copy from my secretary. It might make one or two aspects of the legislation clearer to him.

Mr McKenzie made a great deal of the Tasmanian situation, and he referred to some suggested proposals for that State. However, as yet these proposals have not been tested by experience, and it really cannot be assumed that they will provide a satisfactory solution to the problem in Tasmania. Time was when we thought that the system we had here was satisfactory, and it was only as conditions changed that it became unsatisfactory, or unsatisfactory to the point of being quite untenable. So we are now introducing a new system.

In this measure we propose to put into effect all the reforms available to us at the present time; and members must bear in mind that one of the guiding factors is cost. It is estimated that the cost to the Government in the first year of operation of the new scheme will be \$1.7 million, including the cost of the volunteer fire services and a reduction because of the new contributions to be made by the State Government Insurance Office and the State Housing Commission.

In presenting this Bill the Government has weighed carefully the advice and views of all parties, including those of local government, which was well represented. I would like to express my appreciation to those members of the Government who undertook a tremendous amount of work on this particular problem. It has been a vexing problem for quite a time now, and particularly in some country areas. I repeat that this measure is but the first phase of a series of measures that seem to be required; and the matter will continue to receive Government attention. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), and passed.

### **APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)**

#### *Consideration of Tabled Paper*

Debate resumed from the 31st October.

**THE HON. O. N. B. OLIVER** (West) [4.11 p.m.]: When examining the Budget and the financial statements applicable to it, one can only be pleased that history is repeating itself. In the 1960s we saw tremendous development in Western Australia; and that development projected us not only onto the Australian scene, but also onto the world scene.

Not only is history repeating itself in the context of the development that will occur, but also it is repeating itself in the area of the management by the Government of all the services applicable to these projects.

Some people take the view that we should look to our successes, while others believe we should look to our weaknesses. However, the way the Government is poised for the future development of this State, it can be nothing but a great future.

Western Australia is in its 150th Anniversary year, and I believe it was last year that we coined the phrase, "The State of Excitement". Throughout the world people are asking whether Western Australia will continue to live up to the phraseology that was used to promote it.

I am concerned about a group of people in our community—the knockers. These people regard themselves as so-called experts on every aspect of Government policy, and I often wonder about their long-term aim. As these people start to come out of the woodwork, one cannot help but wonder who are their leaders. I believe the public has a right to a better deal than the one it is receiving from these so-called experts.

**The Hon. N. E. Baxter:** So-called or self-styled experts?

**The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER:** Yes, they are self-styled experts. The bauxite protesters misled the public by using the salinity problem to back up their case. Now that it is all over and the publicity has died down, we see the establishment of two refineries, to be in full operation in 1982. A Bill was passed through this House, and it later became an Act. We now learn that the plants that have been installed are to have their capacities increased. I understand that Alcoa has already extended its capacity.

I turn to another matter with which these so-called knockers, or so-called experts, have dealt. That is in relation to railway protesters. I know, when the motion which was moved by the Hon. Fred McKenzie was debated in this House, he

was absolutely stunned to learn that the Labor Party when in Government had introduced the Perth Regional Railway Bill. Of course, no publicity was given to that. The Hon. Fred McKenzie used to be the Assistant Secretary of the Australian Railways Union. He was surprised to learn that the Labor Party had introduced that Bill.

Not only have the railway protesters been wrong on every fact, but also they have been wrong on the vital fact that a quarter of 1 per cent of Perth's travelling public would be up for a subsidy of \$50 million in the 1980s.

The member to whom I have just referred has always voiced his concern about whether the Government of Western Australia will continue to foster and improve the railway system. Every report I read in the newspapers says that the Government of today is dedicated to improving the railway system that is already in existence. I cite as an example the Kelmscott railway transit station. That is not a major project. It does not involve the buying of any rolling stock, and it does not involve the upgrading of the country rail system. Within a fortnight of a Press release indicating the work would be commenced at Kelmscott I visited the site, last Thursday, and I saw the work being done. That is a project which will cost \$61 500. That will enable buses to move onto the platform for the rapid transit of passengers into railcars.

This is the first stage of a programme that will cost in excess of \$400 000. Surely this indicates the Government's support for the railway system.

May I trace the progress of these so-called experts or so-called knockers? In the last few weeks they have started to attack, through the Conservation Council, the North-West Shelf gas project. Once again they have gathered their facts together, and once again those facts are of an incredibly low standard.

As I move around my electorate, it has been suggested to me that a freedom from misinformation Bill should be introduced into this Parliament, to protect the public from the dubious salesmen who cast shadows of doom and who have done so over the bauxite industry, over our railways, and now over the North-West Shelf gas project. There are many other areas over which they have cast these shadows.

I cannot understand the arguments of the Opposition in respect of deficit budgeting. I cannot understand them because I am aware that this State has limited opportunities to gather revenue, and therefore we are dependent on the Federal Government to provide the basic funds

for our Budget. Obviously the Opposition does not realise or understand the democratic conviction or the intelligence which is spread amongst our people.

It is regrettable that the Opposition does not realise that the understanding of economics is shared in a democratic manner amongst the people. It is not concentrated in parliamentary circles only. In this regard, I believe the people understand the problems associated with deficit budgeting, and they do not wish to be patronised. They know also about inflation and the effect of Government spending.

The Opposition's attitude to budgeting leads one to believe that it considers the people must be stupid. I assure members that one cannot run a democratic society on trickery.

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Fraser has been trying for years.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Since the people are not stupid, the Government has acted with responsibility, as evidenced by the Budget. Take 1979-80. The efforts of the Opposition relating to investments on short-term money markets are, frankly, totally farcical. One cannot but laugh at them. What is the Opposition talking about? A money box? Does it mean that one should put the surplus funds of this State in a money box, not working for the benefit of the people of Western Australia?

The Hon. Grace Vaughan: Some of the people.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: If the Opposition believes in the money box, if it believes that when surplus funds are available one puts them in a money box and does not use them for the benefit of Western Australians, I would be interested to hear what future speakers from the Opposition have to say about the matter.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I thought it was supposed to be a balanced Budget.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: A balanced Budget, yes.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: But it seems to be bringing money in from somewhere—\$100 000 in today's news. Where did that come from?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: That money came out of the short-term money market by gaining investment over a weekend. Is Mr Cloughton against that?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Do you mean the Budget wasn't balanced?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: The Budget makes allowances for income from short-term money investments, as any ordinary Government or any ordinary business would do.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: When it is said there should be more money spent on this and that, the Government says it cannot be done because there is no money available; it is a balanced Budget.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It is already contained in the Budget papers.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: The Budget runs for 12 months. The revenue does not come in every day.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Is Mr Cloughton saying one would not make an estimate of the \$75 million that one hopes to receive from these investments?

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I would have thought a balanced Budget would take into account the fact that the money does come in for 12 months.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It is a Budget. Mr Cloughton is saying that the rates from shire councils will come in, that the pay-roll taxes will be collected, and that all of the sources of revenue for the State will be channelled through the Budget.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You are talking to a self-styled economic expert.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Mr Cloughton is saying one should not budget for the short-term money market. One should put all the money in the money box and leave it there.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Are you saying there is a balanced Budget at all?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It is a balanced Budget.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: A balanced Budget would have taken into account what you are likely to get from all sources.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It does so.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: Where do these extra funds come from that the Premier finds to pay out, such as this \$100 000 recently?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: We are talking about \$652 million, and Mr Cloughton asks me where \$100 000 comes from!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The member on his feet would do well to address the Chair rather than carry on a private conversation.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I was led off the economic track by a student of economics.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: You are the philosopher. I never called myself an economic expert.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have asked the honourable member on his feet to continue his speech. I would like the interjections to cease.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Mr Cooley laid down a challenge. I will be only too happy to outline to him and to the Opposition the magnificent management and advancement of Western Australia in the past five years.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: It is a pity Mr Cooley is not here.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It is unfortunate Mr Cooley is not here. When he was speaking, he thought I was not in the Chamber because I was sitting on the opposite side of the House. My place is immediately in front of him and I cannot hear him. Therefore I sit on the opposite of the House to listen to him. As he looked at the opposite side of the House, it was like a barrister appearing before a judge when he is not clothed properly in his wig and gown, and the judge says, "I can see you but I cannot hear you."

To challenge Mr Cooley, I would say there has been management and advancement of Western Australia in the past five years—not promises. Many matters have been passed through the Parliament by way of legislation already. Not promises; facts. Legislation has been passed. For the benefit of members, I would like to list some of the legislation. The abolition of probate duty was keenly fought by the Opposition in this House.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: What?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Was keenly opposed.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: That is news to me. That is a principle in our platform. We would hardly be opposing it.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I sat here and listened. There was a whole evening when the Opposition opposed the Government's election promise to abolish probate duty.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: We voted for that. We supported you. What are you talking about?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Mr McKenzie had better read *Hansard* again. I sat here and listened to every speaker saying he was against it. I remember hearing the Leader of the Government (the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) saying how wrong the Opposition was. I realised the next day—

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: We supported the Bill.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: The Opposition did not support it. Mr McKenzie has it wrong. What he is saying is that Mr Wran, in the New

South Wales Government, passed a Bill at the time the Opposition here was not supporting the same Bill.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You talk to the Tonkin Government and see where they eased probate duty.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Obviously members of the Opposition have not read *Hansard*. Why do they not go out and read what they were talking about? They did not support the abolition of probate duty. They never supported the abolition of probate duty. The member should read *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is not an accurate statement.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I am quite happy to read *Hansard* and retract my statement if it is incorrect; but I sat in this House and heard speaker after speaker from the Opposition benches oppose the measure.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I think what you are talking about is the fact that we believed probate duty should be removed gradually. That is what you are arguing about.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I remember the comments made by the Leader of the Government. He said anybody who was financially wealthy had other ways to get around paying probate duty and in fact it affected the poor people of the State only.

I am aware of the anguish probate duty has caused a number of people in the province represented by the Hon. Gordon Masters and me. If the member does not understand what was said on that particular occasion, he should go back and read it again.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You are quite wrong.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I should like to refer to pay-roll tax. On page 7 of the financial statement we see the comment, "The exemptions are to be increased for the fourth time in five years." That is an incredible achievement. The promise made by the Government has become a reality. I was interested in the remarks made by the Hon. John Tozer when he proposed that pay-roll tax exemptions be used as an incentive for decentralisation.

Previously the States collected stamp duty. This was a form of revenue for the State Governments. However, the practice proved to be unconstitutional. Therefore, the Federal Government handed the administration of pay-roll tax to the States.

I was interested to hear the remarks made by the Hon. John Tozer on pay-roll tax. I believe in the early 1950s the Federal Government of the day introduced incentives for what was called "export action". The Government arrived at a base year and if a business improved its exports over a certain period of time from that base year, it obtained a rebate.

I support the remarks made by the Hon. John Tozer, but I should like the Government also to examine the possibility of using pay-roll tax incentives in the area of exports by the manufacturing sector. This part of our economy is not particularly strong.

I should like now to turn to the matter of education and quote from a report published by the Minister for Education (Mr P. V. Jones) which is titled, "Education, Cultural Affairs, and Recreation". It is a review of achievements since the coalition Government was elected to office on the 30th March, 1974. One of the statements which appears in the report reads as follows—

Enrolments at Government schools increased by 42 421 or by 22.5 per cent from August 1974 to August 1978.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Was that over five years?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Mr Cooley said he would like Government members to stand up and tell the House what had been achieved by the Government. I am endeavouring to do that. To continue—

Real progress towards improved quality of education is reflected in teacher employment statistics.

I know the Hon. Roy Claughton will understand the statistics, because he has worked in this area and understands pupil-teacher ratios. To continue—

In the same period, the number of secondary teachers increased by almost 22 per cent from 3 960 to 4 828 while numbers of primary school teachers increased by 32.4 per cent.

Year 1 pupils are now organised into groups containing no more than 30 pupils.

Significant improvements have been made to pupil teacher ratios. The primary ratio has been reduced to 23.2 pupils per teacher from 28 in 1974, secondary 13.6 (15 in 1974) and special education to 8.9 (9.4 in 1974).

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Thanks to the Schools Commission established by the Federal Government.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: That may well be, but members should bear in mind that the administration of education in Western Australia is vested in the State Government. Educational spending is purely a proportion of total Government spending.

In 1973-74, including Loan Fund expenditure, the Education Vote was approximately \$116 million or 20.23 per cent of the total State expenditure. For the 1978-79 financial year expenditure on a comparative basis was 22.9 per cent.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Do you think that is a good thing?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: It depends to which area one is referring. If one is referring to technical education, tertiary education, primary and secondary education—

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Let us take it overall.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: If one is referring to education as a whole, I believe it is a good move, but I have spoken already in the House about the problems in regard to technical education.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: You do not agree with the members on your side who say there is too much spent on education, do you?

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I do not know who has said that in this Chamber. I do not remember that being said. All I know is that the Court Government has put more money into education than has any previous Government in the history of Western Australia.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: That is because it had the Whitlam Government making the funds available.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: The member should not drag that red herring across the trail.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: Keep to the facts.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: I have given the member the facts. A certain amount of money is available and the allocations are worked out accordingly. The point I am making is that in 1973-74, 20.23 per cent of the total State expenditure was in the realm of education, whereas in the 1978-79 financial year the comparative figure was 22.9 per cent.

I should like to turn to the area of rate rebates for pensioners. The Government made a promise in this regard and this became a reality on the 1st July. Rate rebates for pensioners increased from 25 per cent to 50 per cent.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton interjected.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Mr Claughton supported the legislation relating to purple titles. That legislation has now been passed by Parliament. It provided further rate concessions for pensioners.

I should like to refer to page 36 of the financial statement which deals with the matter of health services. It is interesting to note that in the area of public health in the Budget introduced in 1975-76 capital expenditure was \$184.94 per head of population and in the current year it will be \$303.97.

The figures I have quoted are accurate and cannot be refuted. They show that the Government is interested in the welfare of the people of Western Australia in the areas of education and health. Disadvantaged people should be looked after.

I should like to mention the comments made by the Hon. Tom Knight in regard to the delays and frustrations which are experienced in the area of planning, and I will quote part of the first speech I made in this House. It appears on page 34 of the 1977 volume of *Hansard*. The relevant portion of the speech reads as follows—

In planning, the same strangling influence is felt. The present purpose, one tends to feel, is to fight against rather than facilitate response to public demand for places to live. Scandalous delay now is the norm; scandalous, unnecessary escalation of cost to the ordinary homeseeker and property user is the result. I will be developing this position also during my service in this House. For the moment, I introduce these references as pointers to the attitude I intend to adopt on the legislative process.

The frustrations and delays experienced by people when choosing their mode of environment are unbelievable. The frustrations faced by the people living in rural areas in the province represented by the Hon. Gordon Masters and me are scandalous.

Whilst it may be the wish of the local government authority and the MRPA to preserve the character of the countryside, they place enormous financial and personal burdens in the way of elderly and sick landowners. Those people wish to adhere to the aims of the MRPA. The plans and aspirations of the people who reside in rural areas, of the local government authority, and of the MRPA are in accord. These people wish to reside on their properties and continue to farm them. They wish to pursue what the MRPA calls a "rural occupation". However, many of these people face failing health and this creates frustrations for them.

It is impossible for rural landowners to provide a residence for a son, daughter, son-in-law, or daughter-in-law if they wish to reside on the property also. That is the policy of the MRPA and the local government authority.

I will not go into all the details of the various situations involved; but I can assure members that when I examine each case I take into account the health of the applicant. I also check medical documents to the extent of telephoning the particular doctor concerned.

I should like to refer to one example. A man suffering from glaucoma is unable to continue farming his property. His wife is suffering from a serious health disorder and her life expectancy will not exceed three years. However, they have been denied the right to erect a dwelling on their property so that it can be occupied by their daughter and son-in-law. The young couple travel from Bayswater, or somewhere in that vicinity, to work on the property. It does not matter whether or not the property concerned is made up of arable land. It is not possible for a separate title to be drawn up so that a house can be erected on the property.

The argument put forward by the authority is that if a piece of ground is annexed for one family, a tremendous number of requests will be received from other people. In fact, that is not the case.

The other question asked by the MRPA is, "What do they hope to gain out of it? What is their financial advantage? Surely there must be some financial advantage." That is not so. The property which consists of approximately 400 acres will be passed on to four daughters and two sons.

This son and daughter-in-law want to live close to the family so that they can do whatever they can for their parents. However, they cannot do this unless they obtain a mortgage on their property. They are not people who can command great funds. They just wish to reside on the property so that they may look after their father and mother.

Bearing in mind the Hon. Tom Knight's comment, could members imagine eight houses situated along a highway, of which two are condemned, surrounded on all sides by commercial or land zoned industrial? The plans have been recommended by the Eastern Hills Study Scheme, the Hills Study Plan, etc.; I do not know how many other plans have been produced. Even though the scheme says that the land should be zoned commercial those six people and two landowners who cannot live in their homes are

still being frustrated. A development involving the expenditure of a sum of \$500 000 which would provide jobs and opportunities for people, with five future landowners, has been proposed. However, to provide a commercial area it was necessary to remove any access to the highway and yet the objection to the application is that it will increase the number of vehicles entering the highway. There are eight houses involved and if all the cars come out of the area and move onto the highway then I do not know what is what. It is an incredible bureaucratic situation.

I might just mention that the MRPA is concerned as to whether the project is aesthetically pleasing to the people in the area. I thought the local government authority was responsible for that. Whether the building facade should be aesthetically pleasing to other people in the area is the problem of the local government authority. What is the reason for the MRPA putting its nose in here?

Is it not the role of the local Government authority to issue permits to build? I cannot believe the hurdles placed before the ordinary man and woman. The Hon. Tom Knight also spoke about a delay of 18 months. I have many records of delays of five years before it could be known whether a project may go ahead.

Is this the way we are going to launch this State and get it on the move? Some people are prepared to take the risk today but anyone who wishes to have a go gets knocked over by bureaucratic red tape or hurdles are placed in front of them. Even after a great deal of research and inquiry people find that the ground rules have been changed when they put forward a proposal; so it takes still more time.

Unless we can get a consensus or some realism or there is a sense of urgency to get on with the job, Western Australia will not go ahead. Western Australia has a great opportunity. It has always been the envy of all other States of Australia so why should we be placing these hurdles in front of people and holding up development?

It was interesting to hear the Hon. Ron Leeson and the Hon. Claude Stubbs talking excitedly about the regeneration of gold mining in Kalgoorlie and Norseman. I read in the paper this morning that even the Hon. Don Cooley's favourite BHP is about to search for gold. This mineral activity is heartening to see. I also recall how envious those members were of the bauxite and alumina industry which is now a reality and due to be operating in 1982 with further increased capacity to that which was agreed to in the legislation when it came before this House. One



finds many factors associated with projects such as this such as feasibility studies, the raising of finance, etc., and I cannot commend the Government enough for the way in which it has acted.

Of course, the real interest is in our main energy prospect of the offshore North-West Shelf natural gas project. This project will provide thousands of jobs in the direct construction of the pipeline. Apart from that there will be thousands of jobs, a great spin-off to more jobs also created by subcontracting firms, and there will be a general spin-off throughout the State economy. It is truly a wonderful period of progress that we see being repeated in Western Australia, not in one's lifetime, but within a span of only 25 years.

There will be problems. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition asking various questions about the services to be provided for the North-West Shelf gas project. Of course there will be problems; life is not easy. Even if one cares to look back into history one finds there have been some bad times, but really one should always look to the successes rather than to the failures. We really have not done a bad job.

In 1827, before Western Australia was founded, the first steam locomotive reached a speed of 13 miles per hour. In little more than a century—or two generations—man was in the air at speeds reaching 400 miles per hour. It took only another 20 years to reach 800 miles per hour and another one year to reach 4 000 miles per hour. By the end of 1960 man was circling the earth at the rate of 18 000 miles per hour.

The working day has been cut by a third with a doubling of per capita output. Most of this has happened in the last 50 years, and concurrently our life expectancy has been increased by 50 per cent.

No longer do we live in the fear of typhus, plagues, diphtheria epidemics, smallpox, scarlet fever, poliomyelitis, or tuberculosis. Tuberculosis is almost unheard of in Western Australia. To many of the members present and even in my own life span these were widespread and dreaded diseases. Members here will have lived through the holocaust of world-wide war and a savage economic depression, and know what it is to be frightened, hungry, cold, and hopeless.

However, today those who are disadvantaged or unable to gain employment, which is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, are subsidised by the taxpayers of this country in order that we do not emulate the circumstances that so many members will recall and some experienced.

I have already spoken on education. However, in my lifetime and even since my conclusion of school life, it is incredible the number of teenagers who go on to tertiary education. If the next generation of today wishes to use the tools forged by their fathers' and mothers' generation and passed on to them by their teachers, particularly the tools of education and learning, what a great future it will be for the next generation of Western Australians.

I am envious of the great future of Western Australians within the next generation. I say again that no-one would expect it to be easy, but it is possible that we will forge ahead in the same manner as our predecessors. It is up to the members of Parliament to give people optimism, faith, and respect for the future generation.

As I said previously, the State Government has limited taxing powers, and relies heavily on Federal Government tax collections for its revenue. However, the Government is closely involved with the welfare of the citizens of Western Australia in the areas of education, public health, and law and order.

Within my electorate, much has been said about the amount of funds available for roads. I am very pleased the Government has placed a high priority on upgrading that section of Welshpool Road which is often called the Lesmurdie hill section. I am pleased a grant of \$375 000 has been made so that the works may be carried out earlier than was originally anticipated.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: That is a very important road.

The Hon. O. N. B. OLIVER: Yes, and it has been a matter of concern to the honourable member as well as to me; and we have not seen funds coming forward even though we have anxiously awaited them. We realise the problems of providing finance within budgetary confines has not enabled the work to be carried out in the past. However, we are now extremely pleased this work is being done. If anyone cares to drive along Welshpool Road to the Lesmurdie hill and Pickering Brook he will see the road is actually being upgraded at the moment. I commend the Government for putting forward these roadworks, obviously at a disadvantage to works in other areas. The Government has given the work the priority it should have.

Frankly, I can feel nothing but pride when I stand here before you, Mr President, as a member of the Government team and speak to a Budget which is properly balanced. There is no room in our Treasury for deficit funding. The Government should be congratulated on its use of surplus

funds in the short-term money market to gain an additional \$72 million in revenue for the benefit of Western Australians. That is an achievement in itself. The Opposition has constantly condemned the Government for doing this.

Obviously the Opposition would place surplus funds in a money box without using them to the benefit of the people of Western Australia. I cannot understand the line of reasoning of members opposite in that matter. If they would like to expound to me why additional revenue should not be raised in this manner, I would be most interested to listen to their arguments.

This is not an easy time for Governments to raise additional revenue. We have already been through the 1973-74 era of using taxpayers' money as though it could be printed at will, and spending it in every area one can think of.

I am pleased that not only in Western Australia, but also in Australia as a whole, we have come back to reality. Western Australians now have an opportunity to adjust; they have an opportunity to attune themselves to the financial state of the country and its future. Now is the time for Western Australians to sharpen their pencils and become a more efficient group of entrepreneurs.

Western Australia is certainly two hours behind the Eastern States—it is now three hours behind because the Eastern States have introduced daylight saving—and it was once said that this State is not two hours, but two years behind the other side of the continent. Today Western Australia might be two or three hours behind the other side of the continent in summer daylight time, but it is 10 years ahead in other respects, because it is planning for the 1980s and the turn of the century. What a wonderful, exciting time it is, and why should not Western Australia be called the State of excitement? I am certainly looking forward to the future of our great State.

In conclusion, I believe the record of the Court Government will be recognised. It has provided stability to enable this great State of ours to continue to advance in a manner which will be the envy, not only of the other States of Australia, but also of some of the major countries of the world. I support the motion.

**THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN** (South-East Metropolitan) [5.07 p.m.]: I want to commence by indicating how in some areas the Government appears to have been very niggardly in looking after important community organisations which make our society work. I am interested particularly, and have been for some time, in the Western Australian Branch of the Royal Life

Saving Society. I was most disappointed it has not received an increase on the poor sum of money it received last year; certainly it is a poor sum of money when one considers the work done by the association, the lives it has saved, and the potential danger in our community with the increase in backyard swimming pools.

**The Hon. A. A. Lewis:** Does the society have anything to do with backyard swimming pools?

**The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN:** Oh, yes; the Royal Life Saving Society is responsible for the tuition of people in lifesaving methods. The Surf Life Saving Association is a separate body, but nevertheless it does a tremendous job and should be encouraged, particularly in respect of recruits. It is experiencing a great deal of trouble in attracting sufficient of those hefty, beautiful young men who in my girlhood days seemed to people the beaches and attract me there. The association is having a great deal of difficulty in persuading young men that the beach is a good place to go not only to save lives, but to attract the opposite sex. Some States have a very acceptable innovation of young women forming surf lifesaving clubs, and they are swelling the number of people who can help others in difficulties.

**The Hon. R. J. L. Williams:** I have never noticed a shortage of volunteers at Swanbourne.

**The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN:** I am sure Mr Williams is in a better position than I am to judge who goes to Swanbourne. I would very much like to meet him there one day, so we can investigate the problem together.

As far as the Surf Life Saving Association is concerned, it was not my intention to speak about that, because it is reasonably well looked after with a donation of some \$30 000 from the Government.

When one considers the tremendous ocean front of Western Australia, \$30 000 perhaps is a small amount. However, when one considers the work being done by the Royal Life Saving Society, and the amount it receives from the Government—only \$10 000—one can realise the great problem it faces in attempting to train people who will be able to spread the message of how to preserve life, and how to act in an emergency, as well as people who are employed at public swimming pools, etc. I hope the Government will see fit to increase the grant to the society.

Another area in which I have some knowledge of need, is the Council of Social Service of Western Australia. The Councils of Social Service throughout Australia frequently are

called upon by Governments to advise them in what directions social welfare expenditure should be made, or what incentive community organisations need to look after a certain social welfare problem. The Council of Social Service of Western Australia has not had an increase in its grant since 1978, and receives only the paltry sum of \$17 000.

An ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure, and I think the Government should be seeking ways to bring about that prevention by seeding the community—as it were—and getting people to go on with the job. That would appear to be consonant with the philosophy of conservative Governments, which think the community should be able to help itself. If people are to be able to help themselves, they must have incentive in the way of money to marshal their forces in order to cope with the important aspects of our society's needs.

A matter which must be prominent in one's mind when one is speaking on the Estimates is unemployment. I was interested to listen to what the Hon. Neil McNeill said recently. He said the present recession is not in line with the patterns which emerged during the great depression. Certainly during that time the unemployed were to be found mostly amongst the breadwinners. That was a terrible time, and I have personal experience of it because my father was out of work for a matter of five or six years at a time when unemployment was at 35 per cent. That, of course, was a depression which approached the proportions of a catastrophe or a holocaust; and I am not saying we are in any way in a situation like that.

However, we are in a situation which in the long term will be perhaps almost as serious; and the reason is that so many young people are feeling the crush and are carrying the weight of the unemployment situation at the moment. During the great depression young people were employed. In fact they were employed widely and were very much sought after by employers because—ironically enough—they were paid miserable wages compared with adults. Over the years, as a result of union action and Government agreement, the wages and conditions of employment of young people have improved vastly.

So we have a situation now in which employers are looking for experienced people and, therefore, are much more likely to employ older people who by definition are more likely to be breadwinners and supporters of families.

So we find the crushing weight of the unemployment situation falling on the young

people. Thus in a society which is depending very greatly on the work ethic and its respect by the community, unemployment among the young is not auguring very well for the future. If we follow the usual trend of capitalist economies with troughs and booms, we may find when we get another boom that young people have perhaps decided that this uneven type of economic situation is not to their liking. They may have decided on different life styles, which will make it very difficult for this country to find the people for the jobs.

An article in the *Far Eastern Economic Review* comments on the jobless generation rejecting the work ethic because they have been brought up in high expectations that if they were to work hard at school and get qualifications, and if they went bright-eyed and bushy-tailed into the workaday world, they would receive rewards commensurate with the amount of work they had put in during their school and tertiary institution days.

We find that the sorts of factors which are perhaps covering up this very serious situation of young people being most highly likely to be unemployed are quite interesting to consider. In 50 per cent of Australian families both parents are working. This means among other things that they are able to support unemployed children. So this hides the fact of unemployed youth.

If we had numerous young people—and many of the underprivileged countries do—wandering around uncared for, living by their wits, and getting into all sorts of trouble, this would be an obvious thing needing correction.

Although some efforts are being made at job training and that sort of thing, the facts are the young people know there are perhaps 50 or 60 of them, according to the figures available, applying for every job which occurs. Of course that is only a mean and the mean or average is always a little misleading in that if a job is very attractive, a person might find there are 150 people applying, whereas if a job is one that a person would not accept if he had any sense, only one or two people might apply. I am referring now to people in the 15 to 19 age group. The situation can be really much worse. The article went on as follows—

Most unemployed are young and unskilled. The proportion of breadwinners is low. Job-seekers are also far more choosy than in the depression, when unemployment hit one in three of the work force.

Further on it states—

They are better educated than previous generations, or at least have been longer at school, and have higher expectations.

We have trained them to do this. We have said, "If you seek a higher education and stay longer at school you will get more rewards when you go out into the workaday world seeking jobs." Their expectations are not met, so is it any wonder they begin to emerge as a jobless generation? It seems this is worrying sociologists more than the Government.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Is it not also a question of whether they really are better educated, when one considers the numeracy and literacy situation as it is?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That is not a matter for the young people to decide; it is up to the education system.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: You said they were staying longer at school.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We are encouraging them to do this. We are saying to them, "You need to be better equipped in this technological age; you need a longer education." Whether they are getting a better education should be looked at by the employers and the educationists. They should be providing the sort of job seekers we really want.

The point I am making is that we are encouraging young people to try to better themselves in the world and we tell them the way to do this is to stay at school at least until they are 15. This way they will be more useful to employers. However, when they go out into the world they find that despite their hard work they do not get jobs.

I really do need to take to task Mr Moore and several others who have spoken about the number of jobs that this Government has been able to generate. We have not received even one of those 100 000 jobs promised in 1977. But even if we had, what is the point, if at the same time we are having 50 000 dismissals? The generating of jobs *per se* is not enough to improve the unemployment rate.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: They are not all dismissals.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: There were more jobs.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: There is an inability to gain jobs rather than being retrenched.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I have figures from the Bureau of Statistics for February, 1977, when Court promised 100 000 jobs.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Who promised them?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Court. The statistics show that 526 500 people were then employed. In August, 1979, there were 526 000

people in employment in Western Australia. That was the total civilian labour force in WA.

So, in fact, we had 500 fewer people in the work force in August, 1979, than in February, 1977. Members opposite might answer and say that in fact 100 000 jobs have been found. Perhaps so, but that means 100 500 jobs have been lost. The figures I have are irrefutable.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: The point Mr Moore made was that the claim by the Premier was for the next seven years; it was up to 1984, not immediately.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Certainly the Premier will have to improve his record, because he has lost 500 jobs in the last 2½ years. If he goes on like this he will have to provide an awfully high number of jobs.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry interjected.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is very easy for members to just sit and open their mouths and blame the Labor Party for this and the trade union movement for that. This is the Government which in 1977 was going to fix everything in the State in six months. It was going to fix inflation, unemployment, and all sorts of things.

Supposing for the time being we were to accept that unemployment is unavoidable while there was a changeover in this industry or a building-up of that industry, or while we were waiting for overseas markets that had been promised, but had not occurred. If we were at least to modify the work ethic and say that people have been victimised by the Government's economic policies and victimised because it has not achieved what it had hoped to achieve, then let us compensate those people who are suffering. This might be acceptable. Instead, we find this very sad situation of electricity being cut off and water being cut off or reduced to a trickle so as to make it impossible for anyone to bathe a child.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It was a big improvement on the situation we had when Mr Jamieson was the Minister. He used to cut off water supplies—period. We give people one or 1½ litres a minute.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We would not have cut off the supply of many people.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You would not know how many were cut off.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We know how many services are being cut off now. Their numbers are far in excess of what is warranted.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How many people in Perth are without water?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am talking about the general attitude of not compensating people who are the victims of the economic policies of this Government. If it is only one person who had his electricity and water services cut off, even for a reason that was not as a result of the economic policies of this Government, that should be a tragedy for this House. To talk about numbers is simply to beg the question.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why do you people do the same things yourselves?

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I didn't hear you complain when we were in office.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Instead of this back and forth banter about who did this and who did not do that, and how much water is going through the pipes—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Do you think it is all right to withdraw labour if you are not getting any work done?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We are talking about people who are the victims of this Government's economic policies. Instead of this defensiveness we hear from the Minister we ought to be thinking of ways to assist people and compensate them because they are unemployed.

We cannot blame the State Government for the miserable amount of money paid to people when they are unemployed or when they are supporting mothers, widows, or aged persons. However, we can say to the Government that it should be responsible for some compensating measures. There is no reason that we cannot get this.

If one thinks about it in terms of economic problems—and this is the way most people in the conservative parties think—for a long-term better economy of this State we ought to be making sure people do not get into the situation where we have to bring in health officers or community welfare people; where we have to think about the numbers of people in prisons and all the other extreme measures which need to be taken in order to try to rehabilitate people who have suffered because they did not have electricity, water, proper housing, and all the rest of it. I include the SHC in this too. I believe the Cabinet ought to set up a subcommittee of Ministers responsible for these areas; such as the Ministers for Fuel and Energy, Community Welfare, Health, Housing, and Works. They should get together to try to work out some system to alleviate the problem.

I can enumerate dozens of cases brought to me by the social security union. In *The West Australian* of the 25th October, appeared the following article by Jill Crommelin—

Poor heart patient has power cut

A woman recovering from open-heart surgery was unable to pay her State Energy Commission bill, and after rising from her bed found the SEC technician on her front veranda.

She pleaded with him not to cut off the power till she could pay the bill but he refused. The power was disconnected.

I am not blaming that fellow.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: That is not water.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I was talking about water, electricity, and housing and how in the first place people who are unemployed and have no resources—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is not only people without resources or who are unemployed who have their services disconnected. I had mine cut off the other day. You are not crying about me. It was my fault. I had not paid the bill.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not suggesting that everyone who forgets to pay his bill should be reprieved. I am saying that some system ought to be devised. For heaven's sake, we have people who have been chosen because of their ability, intellect, previous experience, etc. They are appointed as Ministers and they should get together and realise that it is not very bright to disconnect electricity or water services or to toss someone out of a home because the bills have not been paid. It is not a bright idea to refuse to house someone because that person has a bad record. It is a much better idea to plan so that these people might be supported rather than have them pushed down further.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: All they have to do is talk to the people to whom they owe money.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: This reminds me of what someone said when I was speaking about the homosexual Bill. I was told, "Madam, all that needs to be done for the problem to be overcome is for people to stop being homosexuals." All that must be done in this instance is that the people who owe the money should pay the bills!

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If you owed Boans money you would have to go to see Boans. You talk such rubbish.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Sometimes people do not have money with which to pay their bills. Sometimes people have no choice in the matter. Obviously people opposite have never had this trouble, or they would have a little more understanding and compassion. However, that is a little too much to expect of members opposite.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are getting worse, you know.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: They sit there and argue that there is no sense in attempting to solve the short-term problem in such a way that it will not develop into a long-term problem. The facts are that people of a low socio-economic status are usually the ones who are in poor health, are most likely to be admitted to psychiatric hospitals, and are most likely to be imprisoned.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is utter rubbish.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: It is an established fact.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The bulk of the people who have their power supplies cut off pay their bills the next day.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not talking about most of the people who have the ability to pay their bills. I am talking about the others. As usual the Minister fails to open his mind a tiny bit to allow in a little of what I am saying.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You talk such awful gobbledeygook.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: His head is so full of gobbledeygook that he will not open his mind to allow in a little of my gobbledeygook. I would be happy if he would take in what I am saying—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is too silly to take it in.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: —consider it, and then even reject it. Let him say it is not feasible that the Ministers should get together and help these people. In the long run it will cost the Government more if it does not help these people.

We will consider a hypothetical case of a supporting mother who finds she does not have sufficient money to pay her bills because she has gambled her money away or used it in any other way which is considered to be reprehensible, so that she is considered to be lacking in moral rectitude. This is the usual thing which is said. They are lacking moral rectitude because they have spent their money on the wrong things. They have gambled it, drunk it, or given it away to some nasty man. So many people are prepared to say that they are so full of moral rectitude that such a thing could never happen to them. However, it does happen to some people.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Has it happened to you?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Have I had my water cut off?

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Yes.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I can tell the honourable member that I have been in the situation where I have had to make decisions as to which bill I would pay and I have had to duck around a street corner in order to avoid someone to whom I owed money. I have been so ashamed that I could not face that person.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you think you are an orphan?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No, of course I do not.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Then why go on with this moralistic garbage?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Leader of the House thinks that what I am saying is moralistic garbage because he does not want to get down to the nitty gritty of the situation and make a decision about people who are in these situations.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I make such decisions every day.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Many women are in a situation where they cannot pay their electricity bills and as a result could be accused of neglecting their children because they are unable to cook for them, heat the house for them, or bathe them properly. What happens when such a woman is in despair? Frequently she will go to the Department for Community Welfare and hand over her kiddies because she cannot look after them. How much does this cost the Government? It is all for the sake of a miserable SEC bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You know you are talking nonsense.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am talking good sense.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not at all.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Minister closes his eyes to people like this. Such people reach the stage where their resources are so low and they themselves are so psychologically depressed that they take their kiddies along to the department. Nearly always they do this on a Friday when the department is thrown into a panic in an effort to get the children into Bridgwater or Mount Lawley for the weekend. Even if it takes only the weekend to find someone to help the woman or to persuade the maintenance people to provide more relief money

for her, the children are cared for by the department over the weekend and the cost involved in connection with those children would be enough to pay for the woman's electricity for many years.

It is a short-sighted policy for the departmental officers not to be prepared to make some sort of investigation before they have electricity or water services disconnected. Cabinet should form a subcommittee empowered to make such decisions.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Do you think that 14 days' notice, followed by another 30 days' notice, is not sufficient?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No. From where will the money come?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: She has only to explain the situation to the department.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: This is the sort of moralising we get from the Minister. He says that all the woman must do is explain the situation. I can recall what my own poor mother had to do during the depression. Of course she had hope for the future; but many of the people about whom I am speaking do not have any hope because they do not expect to earn any more in the future. They must live from week to week.

Each week my mother budgeted with the small amount of money she received. She would put 10d in one receptacle and 6d in another receptacle which she kept in the dresser. These amounts she saved in order that she might pay her bills. This is the kind of thing which resourceful people do when they fall on hard times. But what about those without any resourcefulness? I am referring to those people who are beaten down so far that they cannot raise their heads to even think about their situation. How can they prepare for the future? Those who ignore such people are demonstrating that they have no compassion and this is a very sad situation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have had none come to you because you have never made representations to me.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: She does not need to go to the Minister.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The bulk of these people are perfectly capable of paying.

The Hon. R. F. Cloughton: I very seldom approach a Minister. I make the bulk of my representations to the department.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: When considering the Estimates and what is to be spent this year, and when considering how we can reduce costs, we must realise that an ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure. Many of the

people who have had their electricity or water supplies disconnected or who find it impossible to obtain State housing because they are known to be poor payers find life impossible. The situation is paradoxical, but it can be remedied by a little co-operation between various Ministers.

The subject about which I now wish to speak was dealt with a few weeks ago by W. W. Mitchell in a letter he wrote to the Press challenging what Archbishop Sambell had said about our society. He believes that society is so concerned about material possessions that it thinks of nothing else. I do not really need to say much more about that subject because that contention has been demonstrated amply today because members opposite who have material possessions are inclined to look upon those who do not have them as being cripples who drag society back. Instead, members opposite should be accepting these people as their responsibility.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is absolute rot!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We have a responsibility to every person in our society and we ought to be doing something about preserving people's rights so that they might be better adjusted and happy human beings.

On the 3rd September in *Time* magazine an article appeared on this subject and it was entitled, "Searching for Confidence". It was having a little dig at our ditties, one of which is as follows—

Let's pull together with all our weight,  
If we're going to make Australia great.  
'Cause if we don't, it'll be too late.  
Let's advance Australia  
And give it all we've got.

People who have more than they need should give some of it to others. The other socialist principle which would not be adopted by members opposite is as follows—

From each according to his abilities, to  
each according to his needs.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You should not refer to it as being a socialist principle. It is a Communist principle, and you know its source! So do not refer to its being a socialist principle!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Is it not amazing the way Mr Pike pricks up his ears when any reference is made to socialism or communism? It is a pity he did not do more about the needs of people who do not have any resources.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I am not talking about that.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr Pike always know better than I do what I am saying.

I want now to deal with matters which are not materialistic; that is, the environment and its preservation. Mr President, you and I represent the same province and we have a good illustration of how the people themselves will challenge the established way things are done, and they will say, "No, this is not good enough." I am referring to the proposed Spencer-Chapman Roads link which, mercifully, appears to have been shelved by the Government *pro tem*. It has been shelved as the result of representations by you, Sir, me, and the members in the lower House whose electorates come into the South-East Metropolitan Province.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Mr Barry MacKinnon and Mr Tony Williams.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The representations made by us have made the powers that be realise that we must preserve the portion of Canning River which is involved.

This matter has been under discussion for some time and I have attended many meetings called by the MRPA. The authority has good intentions, but many members of authorities and Government departments are not used to people saying to them, "We think we know better than you do." So, they just churn out a large number of terminological sayings and produce many experts with letters after their names and all the rest of it, saying, "These people have told us this is right."

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Who in this place has the most letters after her name?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I do not claim to know anything because I have letters after my name. That is not very important. The important thing is to keep on learning and understanding. We have heard a great deal from the people in our province. They get in there like bulldogs and really believe that part of the river should be preserved. They approached societies in the community and the meetings called by the MRPA were very well attended. But instead of the MRPA preaching to the people, the people were telling the MRPA what should happen.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: I have been to three of those meetings. Were the officers dictatorial? Did they say, "This is the way it must be", or did they invite discussions by the people?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The MRPA was dictatorial. They were not meetings at which people were asked to make an input. They were

meetings at which people were talked at and told what was good. Every time somebody stood up an expert got up and said, "Yes, this, that, and the other"; but the people were determined.

We read in the newspaper that the Minister was reconsidering the matter, and the people in the area hope this will be the last they will hear of it. From the beginning it was floated as something which might happen. In addition to myself, The President, Mr Grayden, Mr Bateman, Mr Williams, and Mr MacKinnon were among the politicians who went out to see the pegs which had been put there. We said, "Where there are pegs there are plans," as where there is smoke there is fire.

I asked questions of the Minister and the Minister said, "It is nothing important; there is nothing definite yet." But fortunately the people out there were not lulled into a sense of false security. They continued to press and we are hoping the proposal will be forgotten. The alternatives offered were alternatives of only one style. They were saying, "If we do not make the Canning River flow with cement we will have to put an extra road here or there."

They did not think about the alternative of having less traffic on it. That was the important point people were trying to impress upon them. The people who were living out there were pressing in full force, and the people at Armadale were not very keen about it, either. Certainly the people of South Perth were not keen about it because the traffic would be going through South Perth in increased numbers, banking up at the Narrows Bridge. Again, people were concerned about the long term, not the short term as was the Government.

What will happen eventually? If we continue facilitating the ingress of cars to the city we will have to construct bigger and better roads and more and wider bridges. We should be considering some of the things which have been suggested. *The Economist* is warning about what will happen with the urban crawl which will be the heir of the urban sprawl.

I think the only sensible remark I have heard Mr Pike make in the House was his remark last year about the centre of the city falling in population density instead of increasing, and the conurbation resulting from people living further and further away from the city. In a city like Perth the urban crawl and congestion will become worse as people cling to the idea of having a quarter-acre block and move further away from the city.

We should be thinking about ways to increase the population density close to the centre of the city and give people more choices—



The Hon. G. E. Masters: Are you talking about big flat development?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Not necessarily. It is possible to have high density without high rise, and high rise properly designed is not a disaster.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Tell me where it is successful.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The honourable member should look at Strathearn and Crawley House at Nedlands. What is wrong with them? There are some very nice places in Park Avenue in New York, too. There is nothing wrong with high rise *per se*. But I am not talking about high rise; I am talking about population density. In Peking, for instance, the population density is very high indeed, but very few buildings are over two storeys.

The big problem we have is to reduce our urban crawl and reduce the congestion by such methods as increasing the population density in certain areas and giving people the choice of living in high-density areas if they so wish. We are not giving people sufficient choice, and that is one of the failings of our town planning. Not enough thought has been given to increasing the population density in areas close to the city and encouraging people to live closer to the centre of the city.

That is only one factor. The important aspect is to stop the ingress of vehicles to the city. This has been successfully accomplished in Singapore, for instance.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: You are not trying to compare Singapore and Western Australia, surely.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I find it very disheartening to speak to people who are privileged in regard to education, natural intellect, and sometimes even charm, but who will not listen to what is being said. I am suggesting ways in which to stop the ingress of cars to the city. I was about to say something in relation to Singapore, and I heard from the learned Mr Oliver the remark, "You are not comparing us with Singapore, surely." It is so ridiculous. I am saying other cities have made certain plans to overcome their problems and have carried them out.

Only an idiot would suggest that Singapore's solution could be adopted *holus-bolus* in Perth. The Singapore Government has designated a pay

zone of two square miles in the middle of the city and drivers have to buy a daily or monthly licence to enter the zone during morning rush hours. Parking charges were raised at the same time. After some initial adjustments the tolls were established at the equivalent of US \$1.80 a day or \$36 a month for private cars and twice as much for company-owned cars. Enforcement officers stationed on the kerb note the registration numbers of any vehicles entering without licences on their windscreens, and then prosecute the owners. Licences can be bought at post offices and side-street kiosks. The results have been revolutionary. The number of cars entering the business district between 7.30 and 10.15 a.m. has been cut by 73 per cent. Taxis pay half rate; buses, vans, motorcycles, and cars carrying four or more persons pay nothing at all.

That is one of the secrets. If it is made expensive for people to go into the city, they will be discouraged from doing so. They will use initiative and band together in the use of private vehicles to make another type of transport, so we will not even need extra buses in the long run. This is what was found in Singapore. They have not had to increase their public transport.

The Canning River would be destroyed if the MRPA had its way. There are alternatives and the people at the grass roots know what those alternatives are. If the authority will listen, they can suggest alternatives which can be used.

Before I leave the Canning River, which is very near and dear to the heart of many people in Perth, and particularly those in the area which you and I represent, Mr President, I wish to indicate that the area about which I am speaking has been classified by the National Trust of Australia. The trust has classified 1 000 acres of the Canning River wetlands as being essential to the heritage of Australia. However we work out the problem of traffic congestion and the urban crawl, this area of wetlands is essential not only to the beauty of Perth, but also to its general ecology, and those who brought the area to the notice of the National Trust have performed a great service to this society.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters.

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

*House adjourned at 6.04 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### POLICE

#### *Nedlands Park Hotel*

317. The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of an incident at Nedlands Park Hotel on the evening of the 26th October, 1979, when it is alleged a group of police assaulted a number of patrons at the hotel?
- (2) Will the Minister advise—
  - (a) whether in fact such an incident occurred;
  - (b) how many police were involved;
  - (c) how many persons were interviewed, or otherwise approached by the police;
  - (d) what was the purpose of the police action; and
  - (e) how many persons were arrested, and the nature of any charges?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No complaint of assault by police has been received.
- (2) (a) No.  
 (b) Four uniformed police.  
 (c) Not known.  
 (d) To quell a reported disturbance.  
 (e) Nil.

### WATER SUPPLIES

#### *Country Area Scheme*

318. The Hon. N. E. Baxter (for the Hon. H. W. GAYFER), to the Leader of the House:

- (1) In each of the last three years, how many farms, not previously connected, have now been connected to the country water supply?
- (2) How many are estimated will be similarly serviced this financial year?
- (3) (a) In respect of question (2), for how many of these extensions has the farmer been required to make a contribution towards the laying of the pipe for the making of those connections; and

(b) in each of the above cases, what was the distance of the connection and the cash cost to the landholder?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) to (3) The intent of this question is not completely clear. The member may be interested only in farmland services from the comprehensive water supply. However, he has asked for farm services from the country water supply. The provision of domestic services to farm houses is quite common and these would constitute a farm service. The scope of the question is therefore very broad. The data to answer it would need to be obtained from a number of district offices. It would be appreciated if the member would clarify the intent of his question.

### RECREATION: FOOTBALL

#### *Victorian Football League Finals: Golden West Television Network*

319. The Hon. T. McNEIL, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Recreation:

- (1) Did any Government department or semi-Government department make a direct payment, or intend making payment, to the Golden West television network (Bunbury) for the direct telecast of the VFL Grand Final?
- (2) If "Yes"—
  - (a) what department;
  - (b) what amount was paid, or is about to be paid;
  - (c) why was this done;
  - (d) is it the practice of the Government to spend public moneys in financing a commercial enterprise; and
  - (e) is this a precedent to be carried on in the future?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (for the Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH) replied:

- (1) and (2) The Minister for Recreation refers the member to the information already provided in his answer to question 1865 in the Legislative Assembly on Tuesday, the 23rd October. Neither the Minister nor the Government is willing to reveal details of confidential commercial transactions.

## ENERGY: ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

*Contributory Extension Scheme*

320. The Hon. N. E. Baxter (for the Hon. H. W. GAYFER), to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) How many contributory extensions were provided to farms by the State Energy Commission in each of the last three years?
- (2) How many contributory extensions to farms are expected to be completed this financial year?
- (3) What is the average contributory cost for the new contributory SEC connections being made, or proposed to be made, in the Kulin and Kondinin Shires?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) The total number of connections under the State Energy Commission's contributory extension scheme were—

1977—1 378

1978—1 422

1979—1 217 so far.

- (2) 1 200.

- (3) Capital contribution of \$6 400 plus \$104 quarterly on the standard basis for charging under the contributory extension scheme. These costs involve an SEC subsidy on the actual extension cost of approximately 40 per cent.

## LAND: RESERVE

*Dragon Rocks*

321. The Hon. N. E. Baxter (for the Hon. H. W. GAYFER), to the Minister for Lands:

Further to my question 360 of Wednesday, the 11th October, 1978, and in respect of the Dragon Rocks Reserve in the Kulin Shire—

- (1) How many hectares are now to be contained within the Dragon Rocks reserve?
- (2) For what purpose has the reserve been vested?

- (3) What area is in each of the three blocks now not contained within the reserve and to be released for agricultural purposes?
- (4) Is it still intended that these three blocks will be available for farm build-up?
- (5) When is it proposed applications will be called for the allocation of this land?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (for the Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH) replied:

- (1) and (2) The descriptive details of reserve 36128, Dragon Rocks are available in the *Government Gazette* dated the 22nd June 1979.
- (3) Although the boundaries of the three locations are identified by ground survey, other action in regard to examination of the survey data has not been finalised. The Minister will inform the member as soon as this information is available.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Actions outlined in (3) are being expedited with a view to early release.

## WATER SUPPLIES

*Lake Varley*

322. The Hon. N. E. Baxter (for the Hon. H. W. GAYFER), to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Are the existing head works at Dempster Rock competent to supply sufficient water for the needs of the town of Lake Varley and for carting by farmers?
- (2) If not, what action is proposed to remedy this situation?
- (3) If action is contemplated, when is it proposed such action will be implemented?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Investigations were commenced this financial year to determine whether the existing works could be successfully utilised and augmented to act as head works for a town water supply for Lake Varley.
- (3) It is anticipated that these investigations will be completed this financial year.