

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 13 October 1981

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### TRAFFIC: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

#### *Cross Street-Wharf Street Intersection: Petition*

MR BATEMAN (Canning) [4.31 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed to the Honourable Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia. It reads—

We, the undersigned residents in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will do all in its power to have a controlled cross walk placed at the intersection of Wharf and Cross Streets, Queens Park, to enable the hundreds of children crossing at this intersection to cross safely when attending the Queens Park Primary School, as the parents of these children are greatly concerned for their safety and do not want to see a tragedy occur as a result of no cross walk facilities.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition bears 205 signatures and I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

(See petition No. 101.)

### EDUCATION: FUNDING

#### *Cutbacks: Petition*

MR SODEMAN (Pilbara) [4.32 p.m.]: I have a petition addressed to the Honourable Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia. It reads—

We the undersigned, deplore the proposed cuts in the education budget. In our view there are many other areas of expenditure that could be reduced before this vital investment in our children's future.

Your petitioners therefore pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 337 signatures and I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

The SPEAKER: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

(See petition No. 102.)

### PRISONS BILL

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Hassell (Chief Secretary), and read a first time.

### APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

#### *Second Reading: Budget Debate*

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Treasurer) [4.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This, the eighth budget I have presented to Parliament as Treasurer of Western Australia, has been the most difficult in my experience and indeed in the memory of Treasury officers.

The past few years have not been easy times with pressures on public expenditure greatly exceeding the growth of revenue from year to year. The Government has had to live with tight constraints on expenditure which, in itself is no bad thing. But when those constraints make it more difficult, year by year, to provide for the expansion of basic essential services to meet the needs of a growing population and a developing State economy it is a frustrating experience.

The future growth of the State economy and the continued rise in living standards of Western Australians depend vitally on a healthy and expanding private sector.

Higher Government spending fuelled by higher taxation cannot achieve those aims and Governments have an obligation to the people they serve to keep tight restraints on spending and to minimise their demands on the public purse.

Yet it must also be said that most Government services meet real community needs and are in response to the community's own demands and priorities. The provision of those services is as much a part of the real wealth of this nation as the products of our farms, mines and factories.

The task constantly confronting Government, therefore, is to provide for genuine community needs at the least practicable cost to the taxpayer. That has been the constant aim of this Government throughout the past seven years and I believe we can be justifiably proud of our record of financial responsibility.

It is therefore distressing to me to have to bear constant criticism from our federal counterparts on the level and growth of State Governments' expenditure.

There is, I find, a deep seated lack of understanding by the Commonwealth Government as to the nature of the responsibilities borne by the States. I do not minimise the great responsibilities that fall against the Commonwealth budget; I merely ask for recognition of the nature of those that fall to the States.

In all advanced nations the demands for education and health and welfare services call heavily on the resources of Governments. As living standards rise and basic needs for food, clothing and housing are more readily attained, the tendency is for the community to demand better standards of education and health and that the social problems which seem to accompany higher living standards be redressed.

When the architects of the Australian Constitution divided responsibilities and resources between the Commonwealth and the States, they could not foresee the enormous demands that social services would impose on State Governments in the future. Had they been able to, the Constitution would have taken a very different shape.

When the present Commonwealth Government introduced tax sharing as part of the new federalism concept in 1976, I hoped that we had at last found a formula which promised to provide the States with revenue resources commensurate with their responsibilities. We were promised a firm share of personal income tax and consultation on changes to that arrangement.

I must confess to being disillusioned and deeply disappointed at the developments at the May 1981 Premiers' Conference. The drastic and unheralded changes to the tax sharing arrangements announced by the Commonwealth Government at the conference, together with the changed hospital funding arrangements, were the cause of the severe budgetary problems the Government has experienced this year.

Such have been the claims and counterclaims over the changes that I believe I should summarise the facts before going on to outline the measures the Government has been forced to implement to adjust to the resulting severe reduction in available revenue this year.

#### *Tax Sharing Arrangements*

Under the arrangements introduced in 1976 and modified by agreement in 1977, the States

were entitled to share 39.87% of personal income tax collections in the preceding year. To honour an undertaking, given at the inception of the scheme, that the States would be no worse off than under the old arrangements, the new scheme provided for a guarantee, to operate for four years, that no State would receive in any year less than it would have received under the Financial Assistance Grant formula agreed in 1975.

For 1980/81, this guarantee was replaced by an assurance that no State would receive less in real terms than the amount it received in 1979/80 as measured by the movement in the consumer price index over the year ended March 1981.

The arrangements agreed in 1976/77 provided for a review of the operation of the scheme before 30th June 1981 and for the Commonwealth to consult with the States with a view to determining whether any changes were desirable.

In an endeavour to facilitate the review, State Premiers met to formulate a States' viewpoint on the need for any changes. Although there were divergences of opinion on some aspects, the States were able to resolve their differences and submit to the Commonwealth an agreed approach.

In brief, State Governments supported the continuation of the arrangements without seeking any addition to the base amount of funds provided under the scheme. In recognition of statements made by Commonwealth Ministers that in future there could be less emphasis on personal income tax and more on indirect taxes, the Premiers were prepared to consider alternative bases for tax sharing, namely personal income tax or total Commonwealth taxation collections.

The States' document pressed for continuation of a guarantee based on the old Financial Assistance Grant formula but recognised that the betterment factor in that formula had proved too high. We stated that we would be prepared to accept a reduction in that formula element from 3% to 1.8 % which was the betterment factor used in the formula which applied from 1971 to 1975.

At the May Conference the Commonwealth announced that it rejected the States' submission and proposed major changes to the tax sharing arrangements that amounted to abandonment of the existing scheme.

Instead of the 1981/82 payments being calculated as 39.87% of personal income tax collections in 1980/81 which would have resulted in a total payment to the States in 1981/82 of \$6 994.5 million, an increase of 16.4%, the Commonwealth proposed to break the nexus with personal income tax collections and restrict the increase to 8%.

I protested strongly about this unilateral abandonment of a scheme which we had accepted in good faith but the most the Commonwealth were prepared to concede was a small increase in the allocation which lifted the total funds for the States under the tax sharing arrangements to \$6 551.6 million, an increase of 9%. This was an effective reduction of \$443 million from the States' tax sharing entitlement. Subsequently the Commonwealth gave a supplementary \$69 million allocated between New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland but nothing to the three smaller States.

The effect of these moves was to appropriate for the Commonwealth's own budgetary purposes a total of \$374 million which rightfully belonged to the States. In the case of Western Australia, the revenue loss in 1981/82 due to the abandonment of the tax sharing formula alone amounts to almost \$58 million.

The reason given by the Commonwealth for this action was simply that the increase in funds flowing to the States under the tax sharing formula was too high and, in the interests of containing the growth of public sector expenditure, should be cut back.

I found this action and the Commonwealth's attitude incredible and without precedent in my experience of Commonwealth/State financial relations. It has subsequently been defended by some Members of the Federal Parliament claiming that the States have done exceptionally well out of the tax sharing arrangements and that burgeoning State expenditures, as they put it, need to be slowed down. The facts show otherwise.

The Commonwealth's own Budget for the current year provides for total outlays to increase by 12.6% or over 15%, excluding payments to the States which are to increase overall by only 8%. At the same time the Commonwealth's budgetary position has improved by \$981 million from an overall deficit of \$1 127 million in 1980/81 to a forecast deficit of only \$146 million in 1981/82. The improvement is even greater on domestic account.

And let there be no doubt as to how a large part of that improvement has been generated. Of the \$981 million gain, \$374 million is accounted for by the reduction in tax sharing payments to the States, not taking into account the savings made by cutting back on funding of hospitals and other specific purpose grants. Including the latter, the total reduction is in excess of \$500 million.

Although an increase in the share of personal income tax receipts payable to the States (in May

estimated at 13.5%—but subsequently emerging as 16.4%) was considered by the Commonwealth to be excessive, the Commonwealth Budget assumes an increase in personal income tax receipts by that Government this year of 18.9%. Our own estimates suggest that actual receipts may be even higher.

Against the budgeted increase in outlays by the Commonwealth on its own services this year of over 15%, the Budget I am presenting tonight provides for State Budget outlays to increase by only 11.3%. As Members will be informed shortly, that minimal increase is only after hard pruning of expenditure proposals and implementation of wide ranging revenue raising measures.

One further point needs to be made. State Premiers and Treasurers are tired of ill-informed criticism of State Government spending in the national press and by Federal Parliamentarians who ought to know better. We are constantly told that the Commonwealth is leading the fight against inflation and is the only Government genuinely trying to reduce the growth of public sector expenditure. Again, the facts tell a different story.

Over the five years from 1976/77 to 1980/81, Commonwealth budget outlays, excluding Payments to the States, but including the Northern Territory, increased by 57.5% against 51.4% by the six States combined.

If the comparison is widened to encompass the whole Commonwealth and State public sectors by including all government authority expenditure, the increase for the Commonwealth was 60.3% against 53.1% by the six States.

The gap is likely to be widened by expenditures in the current year.

Within the overall figures for the States, individual States show differing rates of expenditure growth which is not surprising in view of their very different rates of population growth over the period. Therefore, the only really valid comparison is with the six States as a whole.

Other changes made to the tax sharing arrangements by the Commonwealth without prior consultation with the States were:

- \* A number of specific purpose grants, including Urban Public Transport, Soil Conservation and Agricultural Extension Services were terminated and an amount included in the general purpose payments for the States in lieu of these payments. Western Australia received a total of \$4.8 million on this account, of which only \$2.5 million was provided for Urban Public Transport, a most inadequate allocation as it is \$300 000 less than the minimal amount received in 1980/81 under this program.
- \* From 1982/83 tax sharing is to be based on total Commonwealth taxation receipts with the percentage payable to the States to be based on the reduced 1981/82 allocation. The States will thereby suffer a permanent loss flowing from the 1981/82 reduction in the base.
- \* The only guarantee will be that no State will receive less in any year in absolute or money terms than in the previous year which is really no guarantee at all.
- \* A new specific grant for health purposes is to replace the former hospital cost sharing arrangements and grants for Community Health and School Dental Services. In Western Australia's case the amount provided in 1981/82 is estimated to be about \$19 million less than we would have received if the previous cost sharing formula had been maintained.

I must emphasise that the Government of Western Australia has not agreed to the new arrangements for tax sharing and that I do not regard the matter as closed.

I make no apology for dealing at some length with the changes in Commonwealth funding for general revenue purposes imposed on us this year. Receipts under the tax sharing arrangements and health grants represent close to 50% of State revenue and are a dominating influence on our Budget.

Indeed the overall effect of the Commonwealth Government's actions on our tax sharing entitlement on hospitals and health funding, and on specific purpose grants, is that Commonwealth payments to Western Australia will increase by only 7.1% this year, which is a significant reduction in real terms.

This minimum increase in half of the State's revenue, together with other factors mentioned in the course of this speech, gave us a potential

deficit of \$124 million even with tight constraints on expenditure.

It will no doubt be said that I have used the medium of the Budget Speech to attack the Commonwealth Government over the changes. That has not been my intention. I have been concerned to set out the facts to this Parliament and to defend the States against the unwarranted claims that we have "waxed fat" at the expense of the Commonwealth and are not doing enough to contain expenditure.

I hope what I have said tonight will set the record straight and that we have heard the last of this propaganda.

#### *Review of Tax Sharing Relativities*

Another matter which has been of great concern to the Government in shaping its financial program for this year is the threat of a drastic reduction in Western Australia's share of the All-States pool of revenue from tax sharing.

Honourable Members will recall that on the initiative of the Commonwealth Government, the Commonwealth Grants Commission, augmented by additional members, undertook a review of State relativities and commenced inspections and taking evidence in 1979/80.

The principle on which the Commission was to base its review was broadly the same as that used in determining special grants payable to claimant States, namely that the respective payments should be such as to enable each State to provide services at standards not appreciably different from those in other States without imposing taxes and charges at appreciably different levels.

The Commission's report which was presented early in June 1981 proposed substantial reductions in the payments to Western Australia, South Australia, and Tasmania, with corresponding additions to the shares for the three larger States.

In our case the assessed reduction in the distribution factor for Western Australia would mean a cut in our percentage share of the funds on present population relativities from 12.28% to 9.83%.

If the new factors had been applied in 1981/82 we would have received \$160 million less than we are to receive from the already reduced tax share.

At the other end of the scale, Queensland, which has been a claimant State in receipt of special grants to equate it with New South Wales and Victoria, would receive an additional \$128 million.

I have had much to say on the Grants Commission's findings on other occasions and time does not permit me to deal at any length with the subject now. I merely wish to say that I find the recommendations unbelievable and completely unacceptable to this Government, especially in the light of the very detailed submissions made by State officers and the evidence given.

Moreover, the Commission's recommendations are completely contrary to the needs of a fast growing State contributing so much to the national economy.

To put the size of the proposed reduction in perspective, it would mean a further drop of 20% in the tax share payable to Western Australia this year and a reduction of nearly 8% in total revenue available to the Government.

The effects of such a cut would be drastic indeed. It could not be absorbed without widespread retrenchments of Government employees and termination of many Government services. The alternative would be savage increases in all State taxes, some of which would have to be doubled; and of course that is not an acceptable alternative.

Honourable Members may be assured that this Government has pursued its objections to the substance of the report in the strongest possible terms.

The report was discussed at the June 1981 Premiers' Conference with, as was to be expected, the States evenly divided on the implementation of the recommendations.

As a result of our representations the Commonwealth decided not to implement the report this year but to ask the Commission to review its recommendations before 1982/83.

I was not happy with the decision to refer the matter back to the Commission as I do not see how the Commission could be expected to change its recommendations. As I see it, the question should now be decided by Governments, and as soon as practicable, as we cannot be left with such a sword hanging over our heads with all the resulting uncertainty and inability to plan ahead with any confidence.

Nevertheless if the Commission is to be asked to review its recommendations, we will bend every effort to convince them that the proposed new relativities are inappropriate and point out where we believe the methodology used was less than just to this State.

The severe cuts imposed by the Commonwealth in items which comprise half of our revenue and

the added uncertainties arising from the Grants Commission report made formulation of this year's Budget a formidable task, as I shall explain shortly. But the end result is a Budget that I believe will be acknowledged as meeting all basic needs notwithstanding the problems with which we began.

Let me make it clear that what has been achieved has been through our own efforts and is the result of long hours and hard work. We have no choice but to call upon the public of Western Australia to provide some additional funds but that call will be much less than may have been expected in the circumstances and the amount sought is far short of the funds denied to the State by the Commonwealth.

However, before outlining the steps taken and proposed to cope with the problem, I wish to comment briefly on the out-turn for 1980/81.

#### *Financial Results 1980-81*

When presenting the Budget last year I commented that it would be difficult to maintain the Government's record of the previous five years in balancing its accounts or achieving a small surplus.

In the event the out-turn was effectively a balanced budget as we ended the year with a small deficit of \$1.46 million which is barely significant in a total budget of \$1.9 billion.

Actual expenditure exceeded the Budget Estimate by \$4.7 million while receipts to the Consolidated Revenue Fund were \$3.2 million greater than had been forecast.

A statement has already been issued to Members summarising the principal items of revenue and expenditure for 1980/81 and the more significant deviations from the Estimates approved by Parliament.

Full details of the Public Accounts will be made available with the Auditor General's Report and details of the Budget out-turn are shown in the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

However, there is one item which warrants particular comment. That is the additional outlay of \$3.3 million on natural disaster relief arrangements.

A total of \$8.3 million was provided for disaster relief last year mainly on concessional loans and freight subsidies for drought affected farmers and restoration of assets and personal hardship assistance as a result of the Carnarvon flood.

The extended drought in the Northern wheatbelt and the wider areas which received

poor rains last season have imposed severe and worrying burdens on a large section of the farming community. The Government did everything in its power to assist but it will be a considerable time before farmers in many areas have fully recovered from one of the severest and most prolonged droughts in our history. The manner in which the country community has responded to and coped with the crisis is deserving of high praise.

#### *Presentation of the Estimates*

Before turning to the Revenue and Expenditure Estimates for the current year, I wish to draw Honourable Members' attention to some further changes that have been made in the format of the Estimates.

During the Budget Debate last year, I advised that I was conferring with Treasury officers on ways of changing the presentation of some items in the Miscellaneous Services Division to relate them to the responsible Minister and to provide more information on them.

In accordance with this undertaking, grants to Statutory Authorities for operating expenses are now shown as separate divisions under the respective Ministerial portfolios. Details of salary costs and other expenses are shown in a similar form to that provided for departments.

The Public Utilities section of the Estimates has been discontinued and the divisions included in the relevant Ministerial portfolio.

In addition, the section relating to Business Undertakings in the Financial Statement has been recast. Previously the details supplied repeated in summary form information contained in the Auditor General's Report. A revised presentation setting out operating costs and incorporating Estimates for the current year has been provided to help overcome the lack of information previously available to Members on the transactions of these undertakings.

As a result of the revised presentation, information previously provided on these undertakings in an attachment to the Estimates is now included in the Financial Statement. Also included in this Statement are financial details of the State Housing Commission and State Government Insurance Office which were previously shown as separate divisions in the Estimates with a nominal provision of \$10.

These changes continue the progressive improvement in financial information provided to members in recent years without introducing drastic changes to the familiar form of the Estimates.

#### *Financial Year 1981-82*

Mr Speaker, I now turn to consideration of the Estimates for the current year and the steps taken and proposed to provide for the services of Government in 1981/82.

On the first assessment of our financial position this year, in the aftermath of the May and June Premiers' Conferences, the Government was facing a seemingly intractable problem.

Initial estimates of the revenue likely to be available this year indicated an increase of about 8% in the absence of any corrective measures. On the other hand, Treasury calculations of the likely cost in 1981/82 of simply maintaining existing activities and allowing only minimal growth of services to meet the needs of an increased population indicated a prospective expenditure increase of 14%.

The latter figure is not surprising in view of the Federal Treasurer's estimate that average weekly earnings could increase by some 13.5% in the current year, following substantial increases in the latter part of last year, and recognising the preponderance of wages costs in total Government expenditure.

As I indicated earlier, these predictions indicated a potential deficit of \$124 million and clearly drastic steps had to be taken to close that gap.

The rising cost of providing commercial services such as Railways, Metropolitan Bus and Rail Services and Water Supplies in relation to revenue from service charges had to be our first concern. The Government was in no position to carry greatly increased deficits on these services and steps were taken earlier this year to increase user charges to arrest the increase in the losses on these utilities.

Charges for a wide range of services and materials supplied to the public have also been reviewed and generally increased in line with the increased cost to provide them. It is essential that charges of this nature be kept continually under review or the cost of providing the services to users falls increasingly against the taxpayer.

Charges for hospital patients and related medical services have also had to be introduced under the new Commonwealth Health Funding Arrangements and I will have more to say on that point when dealing with the Revenue Estimates for this year.

Notwithstanding these moves, the Government was still faced with a revenue shortfall of unprecedented proportions. A deficit on recurrent account this year could not be contemplated as

our treatment at the hands of the Commonwealth in Loan Council has given us a Capital Works Budget problem of comparable magnitude and drawing on scarce capital funds to support recurrent expenditure was not a rational alternative.

If anything, it was apparent that the Government had to find ways of injecting more funds into capital works from our own resources.

After weighing all the options the Government decided that it had no choice but to hard-prune all expenditure proposals and, in particular, to seek ways of reducing or terminating some existing activities and payments. Only after that process had been carried as far as practicable would we consider means of raising additional revenue.

At the same time we were determined to avoid a stand still Budget. There is much that needs to be done and by a careful reassignment of priorities real progress could still be made in many areas.

To supplement the work of the Treasury in scrutinising and trimming all expenditure proposals, the Government established a Cabinet Expenditure Review Committee under the chairmanship of the Deputy Premier to review the existing activities and payments of all departments and authorities and recommend functions that might be terminated or reduced. Reductions to current activities and payments totalling \$12 million in 1981/82 and \$17 million in a full year recommended by the Committee have been taken into account in the Expenditure Estimates I am presenting tonight.

In addition, the Committee considered requirements for growth of services and proposed new initiatives and recommended cuts totalling \$20 million in 1981/82 which are also reflected in the Budget.

Further reductions in current activities are proposed for implementation from the beginning of 1982/83 and others are under consideration by the Government for possible implementation as the year progresses.

Time does not permit me to give details of these items tonight and I propose to provide a statement to Parliament in due course following presentation of the Budget.

I remarked earlier that despite all the setbacks, the Government has framed a budget that will take us forward in many areas. We are not prepared to stand still.

This year major extensions to Fremantle Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth II Complex

will be completed and need to be brought into commission. Despite the high costs involved, the facilities are needed and will allow for continued rationalisation and a better balance of acute hospital facilities in the metropolitan area to serve the State as a whole. Provision has been made for this to be done on a planned and controlled basis.

The Government shares the public view that a strong and well equipped police force is essential to protect lives and property against the depredations of anti-social elements in the community. We are committed to a progressive augmentation of police strength and provision has been made for an increase in police establishment this year, of which I will have more to say later.

We are not prepared to depart from the program for replacement of inadequate prison facilities and the upgrading of others. Funds have been provided to continue the program of works in that area and for the additional prison staff required.

Equally, the Government declined to take the easy course of reducing expenditure on maintenance and minor works and replacement of vehicles and equipment. It is a short sighted policy to permit a run-down of assets in a time of financial stringency as there is inevitably a day of reckoning.

Indeed we are proposing to increase substantially funds for maintenance, minor works and vehicle and equipment replacement, the latter in the interests of maintaining our thrust towards the use of up to date technology to make more efficient use of costly labour resources and to enhance productivity in the public sector.

We propose to provide significant support to the Capital Works Program to offset so far as practicable the real decline in Loan Council borrowing allocations to the States. In particular, the ceiling figure for the value of individual minor works financed from Consolidated Revenue is to be lifted from \$15 000 to \$25 000 thus permitting a greater number of smaller works to be financed from the Budget and releasing Loan Funds for larger capital works.

It is also proposed that the cost of furnishings and partitions in leased office premises be a charge against Consolidated Revenue Fund instead of against Loan Funds.

Moreover, as the first run of the Capital Works Program indicated that a number of important works including the State Library Building, could not proceed if additional funds could not be found, the Government took the view that the Consolidated Revenue Budget had to be so structured as to enable some part of the 1980/81

short term investment earnings to be paid to General Loan Fund for capital works.

The aggregate effect of these moves is that more than \$8 million is to be injected into capital works from general revenue resources.

Other expenditure proposals will be outlined when I am dealing with departmental allocations. However, before moving on I should make some mention of the proposed allocation for award wage increases this year.

With the suspension of indexation adjustments and the replacement procedures likely to be substituted by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission yet to be clarified, the problem of making a reasonable estimate of the likely cost of wage increases to be awarded during the year has been made even more difficult than usual.

A number of claims are in the pipeline including a work value claim by teachers and provision needs to be made for a general increase flowing from the proposed national wage hearing early in 1982.

It has been the practice for some years to make an overall provision for this contingency and to allocate it broadly on a pro rata basis across all departments. However, increases granted to various sectors of the workforce are now less likely to occur at the same time and we have thought it advisable to change this procedure.

Accordingly, a two part approach has been adopted with a basic provision being spread across departmental allocations and a lump sum provision provided in the Miscellaneous Services Division of the Estimates which is to be allocated as necessary.

It is clear evidence of the growing size of the expenditure base relating to wages costs in the Budget and the financial problem this presents for the Government that we have felt it necessary to provide an overall sum of \$76 million this year for the cost of award increases on the payrolls of all departments and authorities financed from Consolidated Revenue.

This is a large sum but it certainly does not imply that there is capacity in the Budget to meet all wage demands. On the contrary, it assumes wage increases in the public sector only in line with movements in the community generally. There is no capacity to meet exorbitant wage claims.

Just one example will illustrate the point. The Teachers' Union currently has a claim before the State School Teachers' Tribunal for a 15% salary increase to be back dated to January. That claim, if granted, would cost no less than \$65 million

which alone would require an increase in the Education Department vote of 15% over last year.

To be resisting implementation of any measures aimed at achieving reasonable economies in expenditure on education while pursuing a salary claim of that magnitude is nothing short of irresponsible.

The teachers may well have a case for some increase and how much is for the tribunal to decide having regard to relative wage movements. But the public might reasonably question the motives behind the union's campaign on so-called budget cuts.

Let me make one point clear. The Government does not oppose wage adjustments for Government employees that represent wage justice in line with community standards. We expect claims to be justified before the appropriate tribunals and a case to be established. Moreover, we accept the verdicts of tribunals in these cases.

What we will not accept are unsubstantiated wage claims against the taxpayer backed by disruptive tactics and industrial threats which unfortunately is becoming an insidious intrusion into the professional areas of Government service.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Sir CHARLES COURT: To continue—

### *The Budget Proposals*

After the most stringent review of expenditure but taking into account the needs I have outlined, the Government concluded that it had no alternative but to raise additional revenue.

It is a measure of the problem we face that such action is necessary after restricting the overall increase in expenditure to 11.3% which is virtually no increase in real terms if one has regard to the expected impact of wage increases in addition to other costs.

At the same time we are proposing some worthwhile concessions which will provide relief in important areas to individuals and small businesses.

### *Payroll Tax*

The Government is conscious of the increasing impact of payroll tax as wage levels increase, particularly in respect of small businesses. We are fully aware of the economic problems facing the private sector as a result of inescapable wage cost pressures and consider that some easing of the burden of payroll tax is warranted, notwithstanding our difficult budgetary position.



Accordingly, the Government has decided to increase the maximum annual payroll tax exemption for the fifth time in the last seven years and to introduce further payroll tax concessions for all employers.

From the 1st January 1982 the maximum annual exemption will be increased by 42% from \$72 000 to \$102 000. As is the case now, the exemption will be reduced by \$2.00 for every \$3.00 that the annual payroll exceeds \$102 000 up to a maximum payroll of \$201 000. Employers with annual payrolls of \$201 000 or more will be able to deduct \$36 000 before assessing their tax liability compared with \$32 400 at present.

As a result of these moves, businesses with annual payrolls of \$102 000 or less will not be liable for payroll tax. The increase will mean that another 750 small businesses currently paying tax will be exempted while all employers with annual payrolls in excess of \$102 000 will have their yearly tax bills reduced by amounts ranging up to \$2 500.

The cost of the concessions is estimated at \$1.9 million in 1981/82 and \$4.4 million in a full year.

At the same time it is proposed to amend the legislation to simplify future administration and changes to the Act. A number of other minor amendments are also proposed to standardise objection and appeal provisions and to facilitate the collection and recovery of revenue. The opportunity will also be taken to close potential tax avoidance loopholes which have become apparent in some other States.

Legislation will be introduced shortly to give effect to these proposals.

#### *Stamp Duty on Conveyances*

Duties levied on conveyances in Western Australia are currently the lowest of any State, a fact noted by the Grants Commission and taken into account in the recent review of State relativities.

It is proposed to increase the basic scale of duty to apply on conveyances on or after the 1st January 1982.

The new scale of duty is to be structured to result in only marginal increases in conveyance duty on transactions up to \$80 000. Moreover, the new rates proposed on properties valued between \$80 000 and \$250 000 will still be lower than in the other States.

However, duty on higher valued transactions in excess of \$500 000 is to be increased to a level comparable to that applying in other States.

At the same time it is proposed to reduce stamp duty payable by purchasers of homes to be used as the principal family residence and to buyers of small businesses, in both cases where the dutiable value of the transaction is \$50 000 or less. The concession is to be provided by way of a part rebate of stamp duty and will provide a welcome measure of relief to home buyers who are being pressed by rising real estate values and escalating interest rates.

The rebate will have the effect of reducing the rate of duty in the cases specified to \$1.25 per \$100 for dutiable transactions up to \$50 000. At present this concessional rate applies only to transactions up to \$10 000 with the rate applicable to the amount above that figure being \$1.50 per \$100 of dutiable value. The effect of this measure is that duty payable on a conveyance of \$50 000 will be reduced by \$100 in the case of those qualified to receive the concession.

The cost of the rebate to assist the genuine home buyer and purchaser of smaller businesses is estimated to be \$1.5 million in the current financial year and \$2.75 million in a full year.

It is estimated that the net effect of the new scale after allowing for the concessional rebate will be to yield additional revenue of \$5.5 million in 1981/82 and \$11.3 million in a full year.

#### *Business Franchise (Tobacco) Licences*

It is proposed to increase the turnover component of this licence fee from 10% of the value of tobacco products sold to 12.5% with effect from the first bi-monthly licensing period commencing on the 1st March 1982. Wholesalers can be expected to recover the fee during the sales period to which the licence relates, namely from the 1st December 1981.

The increase will bring the licence fee in Western Australia up to the maximum rate levied in other States and will yield an estimated \$1.4 million in 1981/82 and \$2.8 million in a full year.

#### *Stamp Duty on Motor Vehicle Licences and Transfers*

The stamp duty currently applying in Western Australia to motor vehicle licences and transfers is 75 cents per \$100 of the value of the vehicle, subject to a maximum taxable value of \$20 000. As is the case in other areas of stamp duty, the rate of duty is considerably below the amounts levied in other States.

It is proposed to increase the rate of duty to \$1.50 per \$100 with no maximum taxable value except in respect of trucks and buses where a maximum taxable value of \$60 000 will apply.

Even with the proposed increase, the duty payable in Western Australia will still be below that generally applying to comparable vehicles in most other States. For example, the rates of duty applying in South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania range up to \$4.00 per \$100.

With regard to the taxable maximum, it should be noted that the current limit has remained unchanged for almost sixteen years and, if updated by the movement in the consumer price index over this period, would amount to \$68 000. Moreover, no other State legislation includes a maximum duty.

The new rate of duty is to operate from the 1st January 1982 and is estimated to yield an additional \$4.4 million this financial year and \$8.7 million in a full year.

#### *Stamp Duty on Credit Facilities*

It is proposed to increase the stamp duty applying to credit and rental transactions and on hire purchase and credit purchase agreements from 1.5% to 1.8%.

Application of the higher rate of duty of 1.8% on all relevant credit facilities is estimated to raise an additional \$3.7 million in a full year and \$1.9 million in 1981/82, assuming the new rate applies to transactions entered into on or after the 1st December 1981.

As part of these new arrangements the Government proposes to remove the present exemption which applies to credit unions. These institutions have significantly increased their range of financial operations in recent years and now compete directly with banks and other financial institutions. The Government therefore believes that credit unions should now compete on an equal footing.

#### *Stamp Duty on Cheques, Orders, Procurations, etc.*

Stamp duty on cheques and other bills of exchange and promissory notes is to be increased from eight cents to ten cents.

Such an increase would bring Western Australia into line with all other States except Tasmania which has recently increased the rate to fifteen cents.

The new rate, which is to operate from the 1st January 1982, is expected to yield an additional \$800 000 in 1981/82 and \$1.7 million in a full year.

#### *Stamp Duty on Leases*

The rate of stamp duty on leases or arrangements for leases is to be increased to thirty-five cents per \$100 of total rent in respect of definite term leases of more than one year, and to seventy cents per \$100 of annual rent in respect of indefinite term leases.

This will make our rates more comparable with those elsewhere in Australia and will remove the present anomalous situation whereby different charges are imposed depending on the duration of a definite term lease.

The new rates will apply from the 1st January 1982 and are expected to result in additional revenue of \$250 000 in 1981/82 and \$500 000 in a full year.

Full details of the new stamp duty rates and related measures will be given when the amending Bills are introduced.

#### *Mineral Royalties and Lease Rentals*

Honourable Members are aware that the Government has been reviewing the level of mineral royalties. In this respect we are conscious of the need to set royalty rates at levels which provide a fair and reasonable return to the people of this State for the utilisation of non-renewable mineral resources.

At the same time we are also concerned to ensure that royalties are not punitive or a major disincentive to the development of our mineral resources, particularly at a time when the current market outlook for many of our minerals and mineral products is uncertain. The development of our natural resources is the key to the growth of the State economy and it would be irresponsible to jeopardise that development and the job opportunities that it brings for transitory financial gain.

The Minister for Mines will be issuing a statement shortly outlining the details of the Government's decisions in respect of mineral royalties and I will not take up time by itemising the proposed rates other than to say that the royalty rates specified in the Mining Act Regulations are to be substantially increased from the one-half per cent of realised values which generally currently applies.

In brief, the Government's aim will be to obtain 5% of the realised value in respect of mineral concentrates and 7½% in respect of general bulk minerals. However, for a limited range of products produced in metallic or finished form, including nickel and silver, a basic rate of 2½% of the value of the contained metal will apply.

This rate of 2½% will also apply for the present to the mineral sands industry which is currently confronted with difficult marketing conditions.

Royalty on construction materials is to be increased to a minimum of thirty cents per tonne.

The estimated additional revenue resulting from increasing royalties under the Regulations as proposed is \$7 million in a full year and \$3 million in 1981/82. The new higher rates are to apply from the 1st December 1981.

In addition, royalties on minerals covered by agreements are to be progressively renegotiated. But no estimates of the higher income likely to be derived can be accurately made at this stage, substantial sums being invested in opening mines which could be marginal even at the higher prices obtained for gold today.

There is still considerable uncertainty as to the future course of gold prices and the Government considers that a bedding down period should be allowed to pass before further consideration is given to this question.

Apart from lifting the level of royalties, the Government has also decided to substantially increase other charges and rentals levied by the Mines Department. The decision follows a comprehensive review of existing departmental charges and fees, and rentals imposed under the Mining Act and Regulations and various Petroleum Acts.

In particular, mineral lease rentals which have been unchanged for almost a decade are to be significantly increased as are fees relating to petroleum exploration permits and production licences.

The additional revenue generated from these increases is estimated to be almost \$2 million in 1981/82 and \$3.6 million in a full year.

#### *Estimated Revenue*

After taking into account the measures I have just announced, total revenue is estimated to amount to \$2 072.1 million in 1981/82, an increase of 11.4% on last year.

Collections from State Taxation are estimated to rise by \$73.5 million to \$451.5 million with the main increases expected in Stamp Duty—\$35.5 million; Payroll Tax—\$30.6 million; and Land Tax—\$6.3 million.

The estimate for Territorial Revenue is \$118.9 million, \$16.8 million higher than 1980/81. The major component of this increase is mining royalties and mineral lease rentals which are expected to rise by \$11.6 million.

Collections under the heading of Law Courts and Departmental Revenue are estimated to increase by \$29.8 million this year, due in part to higher departmental fees and charges following the comprehensive review I mentioned earlier.

Revenue of Public Utilities taken into Consolidated Revenue is expected to increase by \$23.5 million this year.

Total revenue from the Commonwealth in 1981/82 is of the tax sharing payment for this year and to changes in the hospitals and health funding arrangements.

Honourable Members will note that the sum shown in the Revenue Estimates under the heading of Health Grants for this year is \$150.9 million against \$157.9 million in 1980/81. This block grant replaces the separate payments previously made under the Hospitals Cost Sharing Arrangements and for the Community Health Program and School Dental Service.

The new block grant is an interim step towards full absorption of the Health Grant into the tax sharing arrangements.

The grant for this year was determined by increasing the amounts paid in 1980/81 by 10% and by deducting from that sum 60% of the Commonwealth's assessment of the State's capacity to raise additional revenue if we were to impose charges of \$80 a day for shared room accommodation, \$110 a day for single room accommodation, \$15 per outpatient service and an average cost per bed day for compensation patients.

State Governments had no alternative but to implement the proposed charges and, in our case, additional revenue had to be sought because of the particular impact on this State of the new arrangements.

No provision has been made in the 1981/82 grant in respect of the cost of additional hospital beds opening this year whereas, under the previous arrangement, the Commonwealth would have met 50% of the cost of these beds.

As we have been left with no Commonwealth funds for the new and costly facilities due to open

at Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre and Fremantle Hospital this year, the new arrangements discriminate heavily against Western Australia and have greatly added to our budgetary problems.

One other point needs to be made about the Commonwealth assessment of funds for hospitals. The impression has been given by the Federal Minister for Health that in reducing the grant by 60% of the assessed revenue from the new charges, the Commonwealth is taking only part of the additional income.

That is not so. The somewhat arbitrary choice of 60% of an assessed full year's collections simply recognised that the new charges could not be introduced until part of the year had passed and that inevitably there is a lag between billing and collection.

The Commonwealth's intention of appropriating all of the additional revenue the States will obtain from introducing the standard charges is made clear in their calculation of the grant to be paid in 1982/83. For that year the grant will be determined by increasing the 1980/81 payment by the movement in the consumer price index over the two years to March 1982 and subtracting 100% of the additional revenue the Commonwealth assesses could be raised in a full year if the new charges were in place.

Again there is no provision for the costs associated with any new facilities.

I believe the facts about the new arrangements and the manner in which they have been implemented speak for themselves.

#### *Estimated Expenditure*

The Estimates of expenditure provide for a total outlay of \$2 072.1 million which, as I stated earlier, is an increase of 11.3% over expenditure last year.

As proposed expenditure has been limited to estimated revenue available to the Government this year, inclusive of \$12.6 million to be paid to Consolidated Revenue from earnings on the investment of Treasury cash balances during 1980/81, the Budget is in balance.

This is the seventh consecutive balanced Budget I have presented to this Parliament and I take some pride in that achievement in the face of the severe financial constraints we have had to surmount this year. On only one occasion have we fallen short of the target when a small deficit of \$1.46 million was incurred last year.

Mr Bryce: That is what one calls good housekeeping.

Sir CHARLES COURT: However, that shortfall was more than covered by surpluses achieved in earlier years and, as a result no capital funds have had to be diverted to fund Consolidated Revenue Fund deficits during the last six years. Moreover, throughout that time the Government has given strong support to the Capital Works Program from recurrent revenues and that achievement has been maintained in the current Budget.

Mr Speaker, it is also interesting to note in passing that this year we are budgeting to receive and expend over \$2 billion for the first time. It is a commentary on the pressure of inflation in recent times that it was only five years ago when I introduced the first \$1 billion Budget in the history of the State.

I now turn to the details of our expenditure proposals, the main items of which, in addition to the provisions I mentioned earlier, are:

- \* An increase of \$53.1 million or 12.4% in funds for the Education Department.

Mr O'Connor: Hear, hear!

Sir CHARLES COURT: To continue—

- \* Substantially increased funding for the new community colleges at Port Hedland and Karratha.
- \* Gross expenditure on Hospitals and Allied Services to increase by 12.7%, with special provision for expanded home care services for the aged.
- \* A total allocation of \$90.8 million for the Police and Road Traffic Authority including an increase of sixty in establishment notwithstanding the difficult financial situation this year.
- \* An allocation of \$827 000 to assist applegrowers under the tree-pull program and related projects and an increase of \$4.3 million or 13% in funds for agriculture, with increased emphasis on soil conservation and salinity control.
- \* Provision for 113 additional staff for the Department of Corrections and an overall increase of nearly \$5 million in funds for prison services.
- \* An amount of \$605 000 provided in the allocation for Community Welfare for upgrading residential reserves.
- \* Increased subsidy payments for State wards and children in private child care institutions.

- \* An allocation of \$5.7 million for land acquisition for salinity control in the South-West.
- \* Substantially increased expenditure on maintenance of public assets and minor works.

### *Education*

The Government has continued its commitment to maintaining a high standard of education in Western Australia.

An amount of \$480.7 million is allocated in the Estimates to the Education Department for 1981/82. This amount is clear evidence of the priority which the Government places on the education of our younger citizens to meet the challenges of the future.

The significance of the effort made by the Government for education can be measured by the fact that in an area which represents 23.2% of total budget outlays, expenditure is planned to increase this year by 12.4% when the overall increase in revenue is only 11.4%.

The cost of automatic annual salary increases on top of the full effect of last year's award increases and new appointments have added \$25.5 million to last year's costs before taking into account likely wage movements in the current year.

The Minister for Education, in conjunction with the Cabinet Expenditure Review Committee, has thoroughly examined all aspects of expenditure on education. As a result of these investigations, the Government has adopted a series of measures which will achieve significant savings during the year.

Some of the more important economies to be introduced include:—

- \* The text-book subsidy which is at present paid to parents of all secondary students regardless of their means will cease in 1982. However, an amount of \$200 000 has been allocated to extend the present scheme of assistance to needy families.
- \* Where appropriate, the level of non-teaching support staff will be reduced to comply with standard provisions. This will be accomplished largely through wastage and transfer or through the effluxion of time.
- \* The in-term swimming classes for primary children will continue but economies will be effected by changing the method of payment to a common flat rate and by reducing the length of the program.

- \* Funding of the driver-education program in schools will be terminated. Alternative programs are being developed.

- \* The Claremont Technical College, which currently provides mainly Art Courses, is to be closed and the students and permanent staff relocated at other colleges within the Technical Education system where similar courses are conducted.

- \* The Budget will require the Education Department to exercise tight control over staffing levels; to pay close attention to expenditure on non-salary items such as electricity, travel, telephone, stocks and stationery, and to curtail one-day relief for primary teachers.

These economies will have minimal effect on the quality of work in schools and technical colleges. They are spread across many aspects of departmental expenditure and, with efficient management and a co-operative attitude by all concerned, all significant features of the education system will be maintained.

Opposition members interjected.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Some of the measures have already been implemented to reduce their impact in the second half of the financial year. I am hopeful, given the savings that have already been effected and subject to the outcome of the teachers' salary claim, that the Budget provision will enable schools and colleges to be staffed in 1982 largely on the same basis as has applied in recent years and that retrenchments of staff can be avoided.

Despite the financial constraints, the Government has provided within the Budget scope for growth and for some new developments.

Provision has been made for the appointment of an additional 152 teachers and 81 non-teaching staff to schools, advisory services and special programs. The new positions, together with vacancies created by resignations and retirements, will assist in providing job opportunities for graduate teachers in 1982.

Of these additional positions, ten have been provided to extend the education program for gifted and talented children.

During 1980/81 significant advances were achieved in the field of special education. Four new schools—two in the metropolitan area and two in the country—were opened. In addition, a large number of children with quite severe

handicaps were integrated into regular schools where they were supported by visiting teachers.

A major development was the recent opening of the West Perth Special School where almost sixty handicapped children are being given the opportunity to attend school. In setting up this school, Western Australia leads Australia in providing education for all children irrespective of their handicaps.

In 1981/82 these positive developments will be continued. Included in the new staff numbers are an additional thirty-six teachers and twenty teachers-aides for special education. This very significant increase will provide for two new schools to be opened. It will also allow services to be provided in areas of the State where there is rapid population growth.

Some handicapped Western Australian children do not yet have the opportunity of being educated by trained teachers although they are receiving training in day activity schools. A number of these children will be given the opportunity of entering the State educational system as a result of the new initiatives.

Improvements in the provision of remedial education, of education for the emotionally disturbed and a start on provision for those with severe communication problems will also be made in 1981/82.

It is appropriate in this International Year of the Disabled Person to be able to announce programs which will allow our children who suffer from educational handicaps to have the benefit of an appropriate education of high quality.

Mr Grayden: Hear, hear!

Sir CHARLES COURT: In 1981/82 the Government will continue the development and growth of technical and further education. Funds will be provided to meet operating costs associated with building developments at Rockingham and Thornlie Technical Colleges. An expansion of technical and further education courses will occur in other regional centres, including Collie and Esperance.

The Budget provides for the appointment of an additional forty-eight teachers and thirty support staff in the Technical Education Division to cope with this expansion.

The proposed allocations to the Hedland and Karratha Colleges of Technical and Further Education are \$887 000 and \$891 000 respectively.

Provision has been made for the appointment of an additional eighteen teachers and thirteen support staff to cater for the proposed new trades

program and to meet projected increases in enrolments for existing courses.

The courses to commence at the beginning of the 1982 school year include apprenticeship training in the automotive, electrical and metal trades as well as other full and part-time vocational courses.

It is anticipated that the department will move to new premises in East Perth in April 1982. The consolidation of the various branches of the department under one roof is expected to result in increased administrative efficiency.

### *Hospitals and Health Services*

Gross expenditure this year on Hospital and Allied Services is estimated at \$460.9 million, an increase of \$52 million or 12.7% over 1980/81.

Gross revenue in 1981/82 is expected to rise from \$68.6 million to \$116.3 million, an increase of \$47.7 million. Of this figure, \$44.8 million is due to the introduction of new charges for public hospital services from the 1st September 1981.

The new arrangements provide for continued free treatment in public hospitals for pensioners and patients classified as disadvantaged.

The completion of major hospital projects will add substantially to recurrent costs in 1981/82.

The projects include the Prodim and Ward Block at Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre, the South Terrace additions at Fremantle Hospital, the Home of Peace Ward Block at Subiaco and the Day Ward at the Bentley Hospital. An additional \$6.1 million has been provided in the Budget for the commissioning of these facilities and it is estimated that an additional \$12.7 million will be required to meet the full year cost in 1982/83.

As I commented earlier, no provision has been made in the Commonwealth Health Grant this year or as proposed for 1982/83 to meet any part of the cost of the new facilities.

The proposed allocation for Public Health has been increased by \$5 million to \$51.6 million.

An additional \$269 000 has been provided for the Home Care Services Program. The Government recognises the importance of providing services designed to assist aged persons to remain in their own homes.

A significant increase in home care services is to be implemented during 1981/82 and the two financial years following. Some \$230 000 has been set aside in the 1981/82 Hospital and Allied Services budget for the employment of additional housekeepers and aides.

A further \$39 000 has been allocated to the Public Health Department to allow the employment of a physiotherapist to co-ordinate keep fit groups, a nurse for day care activities and a promotions officer for aged persons support schemes. Additional physiotherapy and chiropody treatment will also be provided.

These workers will all develop programs and services designed to improve and maintain the health standard of aged people in our community.

Mental Health Services is to be provided with an additional \$5.8 million this financial year.

The proposed increase will enable the opening of Stage II of the Bennett Brook Complex at Eden Hill and also the Devonleigh Hostel.

With the transfer of intellectually handicapped patients from Swanbourne Hospital to the above units, staffing is being kept under continuous review to ensure optimum levels are maintained.

#### *Agriculture*

The Budget provides for expenditure on agriculture to increase by 13% to \$37.6 million in 1981/82.

The department has reviewed its activities and has reduced or eliminated a number that are less important in today's circumstances. The savings resulting from these decisions, and the additional funds proposed for the department, will enable the Government to maintain the high quality of support to our very important agricultural and pastoral industries.

A major increase in the work associated with soil conservation and salinity is envisaged during the year. The programs will include regional studies on salinity, development of stable systems of continuous cropping in the wheatbelt, use of crops and pastures to lower water tables and methods of farming soils prone to wind erosion.

Last year a program was commenced to reduce the production of green apples following disastrous results of sales to Europe and to replace them with red varieties which are more suited to the Asian market.

The State and Commonwealth have now agreed to a jointly-funded tree pull scheme to reduce the overall volume of apples produced.

An amount of \$827 000 is allocated in the Estimates to meet the cost of an accelerated tree pull scheme and other schemes to assist apple growers.

Full operations will commence this year at the Animal Breeding and Research Institute at Katanning. The Institute will provide a focal point for the improvement of stock breeding in

Western Australia. It will perform a pioneer role in the genetic development of animals, conduct applied research programs and work closely with breeders to improve livestock strains.

Mustering of cattle on the Fox and Ord River Stations will be continued to prevent degradation and to facilitate regeneration in these areas. The mustering will also contribute to the eradication of tuberculosis.

Monitoring of all pastoral areas is being maintained as a follow-up to a previous survey of vegetation and range conditions with a view of being able to advise pastoralists on appropriate management practices.

An amount of \$232 000 is also included in the allocation to continue work on beef, sheep and pig carcase classification. The provision of these funds by the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation and the Commonwealth Government reflects the leading role taken by Western Australia in this program.

The Government has maintained its support for plant breeding research. Although it can take up to ten years to develop new cereal strains, past investment in the program will return dividends in 1982 when five new wheats, one new barley, a new oat and two new lupins should be available to growers.

The new barley, named Stirling, promises to be a prime quality malting variety which could replace existing varieties throughout the State.

Western Australian scientific and farming expertise is currently being employed in Iraq in a large scale experimental and farming development. Officers of the Department of Agriculture are supervising and co-ordinating the Iraq financed \$7.4 million project.

#### *Police and Road Traffic Authority*

A total allocation of \$90.8 million is proposed for the Police Department and the Road Traffic Authority in 1981/82, an increase of 12.4%.

The Government recognises the need for continued augmentation of police strength to combat increased crime and to maintain a high level of traffic law enforcement. At the same time we have had to find ways of meeting these needs in the face of greatly increased costs and an acute shortage of funds.

Funds have been allocated in the Budget to allow an increase of sixty in overall Police establishment but we have concluded that further steps are necessary to enable the Commissioner to make maximum use of all available resources.

Accordingly the Government proposes to negotiate and then introduce legislation to amalgamate the Police and the Road Traffic Authority into one force. The combined police strength thus made available will permit more flexibility and better deployment of the force.

No financial savings are sought from this move although some savings in administrative support staff could result. The aim is to make possible the optimum use of available police numbers and an effective enhancement of the overall strength of the force as a result.

Mr Bryce: That proved to be an expensive experiment.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Discussions have been held with representatives of Country Local Authorities and they have been given an assurance that the proposed move will not result in any diminution of effort on traffic control including country road patrols or any less involvement by Local Government in the traffic enforcement role and licensing functions.

I propose further talks with Local Government on this matter as a further step in the negotiations already commenced. Local Government will want to know in precise terms how we propose to handle the matter and what legislation is anticipated so that it can make its input.

A review will be made to assess the practical effects of the change in time for a determination of the requirements of the combined force before next year's Budget is formulated.

#### *Corrections*

The cost to maintain prisons and to provide adequate security for the general public continues to rise annually. The expenditure proposed for the Department of Corrections this year is \$33.2 million, an increase of nearly \$5 million or 17.6% more than last year.

The staff increases in the department have been held at a lower level this year as a result of the findings of a Staffing Review Committee appointed by the Chief Secretary. Nevertheless the staff establishment will be increased by 113, the majority of whom are required to open the new Medium Security Prison at Canning Vale.

It is estimated that the staffing and other operating costs of the Medium Security Prison to 30th June 1982 will be \$1 755 000.

The full year cost of operating the Canning Vale Remand Centre and the Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison in Boulder also impacts on this year's Budget. It is planned to provide additional

facilities at the Boulder Prison at an estimated cost of \$40 000.

Emergency and safety equipment costing \$38 000 will also be provided at Fremantle and Albany Prisons.

#### *Crown Law*

The proposed allocation for the Crown Law Department of \$16.3 million makes provision for the opening and staffing of the new District Court Building in 1982. Some of the features of the new building include a centralised assembly area for jurors; better facilities for the public, legal profession and judiciary; and improved security measures for the handling of prisoners.

A sum of \$359 000 has been provided for the Office of Titles to implement a five stage program which will result in a comprehensive automated land information system. The first stage, which will be undertaken in 1981/82, involves the computerisation of the nominal index and is designed to improve the overall efficiency of the Titles Office.

An amount of \$694 000 has been allocated to the Legal Aid Commission, an increase of 19.9% on last year. Under the current cost sharing arrangements the State is required to meet 30% of the Commission's operating expenses. In this year's program, funds have been provided for the appointment of four additional solicitors and two support staff.

#### *Community Welfare*

The proposed allocation for the Department for Community Welfare is \$33.6 million.

The Commonwealth Government has removed the six months waiting period for persons qualifying for a supporting parent pension effective from 6th November 1980. Departmental expenditure included \$2.4 million last year for this purpose but assistance by Community Welfare in this area is now mainly directed to emergency assistance for which an amount of \$825 000 has been included in the Budget.

Provision has again been made for payment of increased subsidies for children both in private and residential care, the increases being broadly in line with movements in the consumer price index. Associated support for pocket money, clothing and education has also been increased. The new scale of payments increase will be effective from 1st October 1981.

An amount of \$605 000 has been included for the maintenance and upgrading of residential reserves. Of this amount, \$100 000 has been



specifically allocated for the upgrading of reserves in the North of the State.

In the course of the year, further efforts will be made to improve general welfare services, particularly in the more remote parts of the State.

#### *Other Activities*

As details of departmental votes will be available from the responsible Minister when appropriations are being dealt with in Committee, I do not propose to speak at length on other items of proposed expenditure other than to draw attention to certain special features of the Budget.

- \* An amount of \$2.7 million has been included in the Estimates to meet an expected cash loss on the operations of the Western Australian Meat Commission. A significant reduction in throughput of Robb Jetty due to drought conditions in previous years has created severe financial difficulties for the Board.
- \* The proposed 41% increase in the allocation for the Audit Department is mainly due to the full year cost of auditors transferred from the Local Government Department during 1980/81 and the transfer of Hospital Inspectors from Hospital and Allied Services from the 1st July 1981. There will be offsetting savings in the other departments.
- \* The Government is continuing its program to expand the facilities of the State Emergency Service. Phase I of the communications upgrading program was completed in 1980/81 and it is proposed to continue this program with the commencement of Phase II in 1981/82 at a cost of \$115 000. Funds have also been provided for appointment of area co-ordinators at Albany and Geraldton.
- \* A special provision of \$289 000 has been included in the proposed allocation to the Government Employees' Housing Authority to commence a program to standardise accommodation for Government employees. As part of this program, 276 Public Works Department employees' houses will be transferred to the Authority and the increased allocation will enable work to commence on upgrading these houses this financial year.
- \* A sum of \$60 000 has been allocated as a contribution towards the cost of developing the Bridgetown Park as a tourist facility. Work to be undertaken includes construction of a jetty, canoe ramp, toilet block, playground equipment, and a parking area.
- \* The recently introduced multi-rider ticketing system will reduce operating costs of the Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust as well as provide a cheaper and faster public transport network in the metropolitan area. The acceptance by the public of the pre-paid discounted ticket concept will generate benefits not only to patrons but to the MTT by effectively reducing boarding time, volume of tickets issued and amounts of cash handled.
- \* An amount of \$24 000 has been provided in the proposed allocation to the Kings Park Board for the redevelopment of Hale Oval.
- \* Funds have been provided in the allocation for the Department of Industrial Development and Commerce for the participation by seventeen Western Australian wineries at the annual Expovin in Melbourne in 1981. Funds have also been provided to enable the department to co-ordinate the Petroleum Technology Australia Conference to be held in Perth. The conference will be attended by Australian and overseas participants and will bring together expertise in the latest technology and research in the petroleum industry.
- \* The proposed vote for the Government Stores Department includes a provision of \$343 000 as part of a three year EDP development program for the implementation of a stores management system. An important feature of the proposed system is the automation of payment procedures through the use of a creditor's invoice in lieu of Government claim forms.

- \* With the continued growth in forest industries, the increase of 13.6% in the proposed allocation for the Forests Department is essential to ensure efficient forestry management. To enable the department to cater for continued growth, provision has been made for an extra forty-five new staff positions on the basis that the costs can be met from anticipated revenue increases generated from forestry activities.
- \* An amount of \$4.1 million has been provided in the Miscellaneous Services Division of the Estimates for the water salinity program in the lower South West region where controls on the clearing of land in the catchment areas have been imposed. A further allocation of \$1.6 million is proposed in the Public Works vote for salinity control measures in the Wellington Dam Catchment Area.
- \* The limit for minor works chargeable to Consolidated Revenue Fund has been lifted from \$15 000 to \$25 000. An additional \$950 000 has been included in the Public Works allocation to meet the additional work which will be charged to the Consolidated Revenue Fund because of the change.
- \* As I mentioned earlier, the Government resisted the temptation to reduce expenditure on maintenance of buildings and on the purchase and replacement of vehicles and equipment. In fact, a provision of \$35.9 million is proposed for these purposes this year compared to actual expenditure of \$25.4 million in 1980/81.

### *Conclusion*

That, Mr Speaker, concludes my outline of the Budget for 1981/82. It has been, as I said at the outset, a most difficult Budget to construct. The action taken by the Commonwealth in cutting back sharply on payments to the States has inevitably meant increased charges to the community and a tight restraint on expenditures. Some activities have had to be cut to make room for the growth in services that is necessary if we are to go forward.

It is a tough Budget in the sense that expenditure by departments and authorities has been restricted to basic needs. But it is also a responsible Budget in which priorities have been carefully set and in which room has been found

for growth and for continued improvement in services to the community.

I now turn to the the formal purpose of the Bill and in doing so, draw Honourable Members' attention to the changed wording of the measure.

Formal Bills of this nature tend to be repeated year after year with no change in the terminology which can become increasingly outdated and obscure. Commencing with the Supply Bill, introduced earlier this session, the opportunity has been taken to rewrite the financial legislation in clearer terms as part of the ongoing review of the format and presentation of all financial measures.

Only the wording has been clarified; there has been no change to the intent and purpose of the Bill.

The Bill seeks appropriation of the sums required for the services of the current financial year as detailed in the Estimates. It also makes provision for the grant of Supply to complete requirements for 1981/82.

Included in the Expenditure Estimates of \$2 072 132 000 is an amount of \$215 152 000 permanently appropriated under Special Acts, leaving a balance of \$1 856 980 000 which is to be appropriated in a manner shown in a Schedule to the Bill.

Supply of \$900 million has already been granted under the Supply Act 1981. Hence further Supply of \$956 980 000 has been provided for in the Bill.

Provision has also been made for a further grant of Supply of \$40 million from the Public Account for Advance to Treasurer which is to supplement the sum of \$45 million already granted under the Supply Act.

In addition to authorising the provision of funds for the current year, the Bill seeks ratification of the amounts spent during 1980/81 in excess of the Estimates for that year. Details of these excesses are given in the relevant Schedule to the Bill.

Before I conclude I think it would be remiss of me if I did not refer to the work of the Treasury officers. As was foreshadowed last year their load in 1980-81 was greatly increased, and this will be so for the coming years. They had added burdens placed on them including the necessity to give evidence before the Grants Commission. I want to place on record the fact that the officers concerned performed with tremendous professional ability and skill. A host of people were involved in the research that was necessary. This was all brought together in the form of evidence given to the Grants Commission. In

addition to this work they had to follow the hearings of the commission around Australia to make sure they could have an input and be informed of the evidence being contributed by other States.

I have received nothing but praise for the quality of work done by our research people and brought together in the submissions that were made to the Grants Commission and in the responses to requests of the commission.

All this work was headed by the Under Treasurer (Mr McCarrey) whose work is well known to members. We are inclined to take these people for granted. The work they do is important. It is a never-ending grind and not as glamorous as the work done in other areas. Nevertheless, without their efforts we would be in an awful mess. I pay tribute to their vigilance and the way they husband the funds of the Government, no matter who is in Government. It is all part of their professional dedication and commitment.

It is not a bad thing if, once in a while, the House is reminded of the work these people do. They are a very dedicated lot. I sometimes marvel at the number of hours they put in and the

stamina they must have to stay with some of the very exacting problems we have, especially when we run into a series of Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings and then try to sort out the burdens imposed on us because of decisions which are made such as on 14 May, and 19 and 20 June. So, on behalf of all members, I thank Mr McCarrey, his deputy (Mr Boylen), and the many other Treasury officers for the work they have done.

I commend the Bill to honourable members and in doing so seek leave to table the Estimates for 1981-82.

The following papers were tabled—

*Consolidated Revenue Fund—Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ending 30 June, 1981 (see paper No. 510).*

*Financial Statement 1981-82 (see paper No. 511).*

*Western Australian Economy 1981-82 (see paper No. 512).*

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Brian Burke (Leader of the Opposition).

*Sitting suspended from 6.07 to 7.30 p.m.*

# FINANCIAL STATEMENT 1981-82

## INDEX TO TABLES

	Table
I. Balance Sheet	1
II. Consolidated Revenue Fund—	
Revenue and Expenditure—Estimate for 1980-81 compared with Actual for year	2
Revenue—Estimate for 1981-82 compared with Receipts in previous years	3
Receipts from Commonwealth taken to Consolidated Revenue Fund—Estimate for 1981-82 compared with Receipts in previous years	4
Expenditure—Estimate for 1981-82 compared with Expenditure in previous years	5
Expenditure, North West—Estimate for 1981-82 compared with Expenditure in previous years	6
Expenditure—Functional Analysis and cost per head of population—Estimate for 1981-82 compared with Expenditure in previous years	7
Ord River Irrigation Scheme—Income and Expenditure—Estimate for 1981-82 compared with previous years	8
III. General Loan Fund—	
Receipts and Expenditure—Estimate for 1980-81 compared with Actual for year	9
Loan Expenditure for 1980-81 and previous years	10
IV. Public Debt—	
Loan Indebtedness	11
Sinking Fund—Transactions for the Year	12
Net Public Debt per head of population	13
Contingent Liabilities	14
V. Business Undertakings and Statutory Authorities—	
Albany Port Authority	15
Bunbury Port Authority	16
Esperance Port Authority	17
Fremantle Port Authority	18
Geraldton Port Authority	19
Industrial and Commercial Employees' Housing Authority	20
Industrial Lands Development Authority	21
Main Roads Department	22
Metropolitan Region Planning Authority	23
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board	24
Perth Mint	25
Port Hedland Port Authority	26
State Energy Commission	27
State Government Insurance Office	28
State Housing Commission	29
Transport Commission	30
Western Australian Fire Brigades Board	31
VI. Statistical Section—	
Receipts from Commonwealth taken to various funds other than Consolidated Revenue Fund 1980-81	32
State Taxation and Taxation per head	33

GOVERNMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA  
TABLE 1.—BALANCE SHEET AS AT 30th JUNE, 1981

30th June, 1980 \$	Funds Employed	30th June, 1981 \$	\$
1 685 289 465	Loan Flotations .....	1 768 067 260	
324 563 705	Less Redemptions from Sinking Fund and Exchange Accretion .....	344 256 669	
1 360 725 760			1 423 810 591
329 410 000	Commonwealth Capital Grants .....		369 730 000
1 690 135 760			1 793 540 591
96 100 000	Acquisition of Public Debt by Commonwealth .....		96 100 000
1 786 235 760			1 889 640 591
34 088 629	Contribution from Interest on Short Term Investments .....		43 504 241
1 820 324 389			1 933 144 832
116 012 867	Trust Funds, Governmental .....	144 172 448	
14 891 973	Less Investments .....	16 763 593	
101 120 894			127 408 855
197 537 173	Trust Funds, Private .....	230 627 572	
183 628 278	Less Investments .....	216 799 743	
13 908 895			13 827 829
87 103 023	Suspense Accounts .....		88 187 243
14 016 590	Commonwealth Grants and Advances .....		9 941 450
46 263 515	Trading Concerns and Public Utilities' Banking Accounts .....		79 806 174
2 082 737 306			2 252 316 383
4 022 369	Consolidated Revenue Fund at Commencement of Year .....		2 563 567
2 086 759 675			2 254 879 950
	Employment of Funds		
	Works and Services—		
	Railways, Transport, Electricity, Harbours, Water Supplies, Housing, and other State Undertakings .....	2 200 744 557	
2 071 930 640	Flotation Expenses and Discounts and Exchange .....	17 883 770	
15 414 701	Consolidated Revenue Fund Deficits (Funded) .....	39 413 162	
39 413 162	Consolidated Revenue Fund Deficits (Funded from Commonwealth Capital Grants) .....	14 864 098	
14 864 098			2 272 905 587
2 141 622 601	Less Redemptions of Debt applied to depreciation of assets, etc.	344 256 669	
324 563 705			1 928 648 918
1 817 058 896	Other Assets—		
167 097 208	Short Term Investment .....		215 306 481
26 320 418	Cash at Bank .....	20 814 808	
239 285	Cash in London .....	232 945	
26 559 703			21 047 753
23 921 809	Stores Accounts .....		18 660 245
20 590 494	Advances—		
218 641	Treasurer's Advances to Departments, etc. ....	24 376 766	
	Trust Funds, Governmental (Overdrawn Accounts) .....	283 985	
	Trust Funds, Private (Overdrawn Accounts) .....	15 630	
28 706 164	Trading Concerns and Public Utilities (Overdrawn Accounts) .....	46 173 304	
1 349	Suspense (Overdrawn Accounts) .....		
2 605 411	Commonwealth Grants and Advances (Overdrawn Accounts) .....	366 868	
52 122 059			71 216 553
2 086 759 675			2 254 879 950

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

TABLE 2—REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

ESTIMATE FOR 1980-81 COMPARED WITH ACTUAL FOR YEAR

Head	Estimate	Actual	Increase	Decrease
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE—</b>				
Taxation .....	354 922 000	378 037 724	23 115 724	....
Territorial .....	109 771 000	102 098 833	....	7 672 167
Law Courts .....	11 270 000	11 198 853	....	71 147
Departmental .....	211 873 000	217 945 923	6 072 923	....
Commonwealth .....	965 482 000	954 548 475	....	10 933 525
Public Utilities .....	204 012 000	196 718 224	....	7 293 776
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b> ....	<b>1 857 330 000</b>	<b>1 860 548 032</b>	<b>3 218 032</b>	<b>....</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>				
Special Acts .....	189 969 000	190 965 671	996 671	....
Governmental—				
Parliament .....	3 163 000	3 150 697	....	12 303
Premier and Treasurer .....	191 280 000	199 239 072	7 959 072	....
Deputy Premier, Minister for Labour and Industry, Consumer Affairs, Immigration, Regional Adminis- tration and the North West, and Tourism .....	15 619 000	15 781 574	162 574	....
Minister for Agriculture .....	33 104 000	33 304 880	200 880	....
Attorney General .....	21 941 000	21 702 055	....	238 945
Minister for Works and Housing .....	59 046 000	59 720 434	674 434	....
Minister for Resources Development, Mines, and Industrial Development and Commerce .....	21 689 000	22 385 053	696 053	....
Minister for Transport .....	6 628 000	6 494 023	....	133 977
Minister for Health .....	440 553 000	446 619 344	6 066 344	....
Minister for Education and Recreation .....	436 668 000	430 989 345	....	5 678 655
Minister for Lands and Forests .....	34 562 000	34 603 060	41 060	....
Minister for Local Government and Town Planning .....	4 515 000	4 216 947	....	298 053
Chief Secretary, Minister for Police and Traffic, and Community Welfare .....	148 976 000	145 822 309	....	3 153 691
Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife, and Conservation and the Environment .....	7 749 000	7 662 526	....	86 474
Public Utilities .....	241 868 000	239 349 844	....	2 518 156
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> ....	<b>1 857 330 000</b>	<b>1 862 006 834</b>	<b>4 676 834</b>	<b>....</b>
<b>DEFICIT</b> ....	<b>....</b>	<b>1 458 802</b>	<b>....</b>	<b>1 458 802</b>

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

TABLE 3—REVENUE

ESTIMATE FOR 1981-82 COMPARED WITH RECEIPTS IN PREVIOUS YEARS

Head	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>TAXATION—</b>					
Land Tax .....	14 946 740	17 855 148	22 961 754	25 735 777	32 000 000
Stamp Duty .....	60 872 150	65 805 876	76 993 956	100 016 100	135 513 000
Probate Duty .....	14 954 925	15 193 946	13 034 817	5 409 668	2 000 000
Pay-roll Tax .....	142 127 344	152 676 587	168 042 309	197 451 604	228 100 000
Licenses .....	21 360 811	23 506 155	26 416 405	28 404 073	31 748 000
Third Party Insurance Surcharge .....	3 311 236	3 372 886	3 673 694	3 699 248	3 800 000
<b>Betting Taxes—</b>					
Totalisator Duty and Licenses .....	1 773 384	1 943 384	2 025 879	2 117 770	2 200 000
Bookmakers Betting Tax and Licenses .....	1 106 023	1 289 143	1 265 197	1 329 194	1 400 000
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax .....	10 711 231	11 369 170	12 041 021	13 805 310	14 700 000
Stamp Duty on Betting .....	88 754	83 413	74 593	68 980	78 000
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>271 252 598</b>	<b>293 095 708</b>	<b>326 529 625</b>	<b>378 037 724</b>	<b>451 539 000</b>
<b>TERRITORIAL AND DEPARTMENTAL—</b>					
Land .....	3 802 941	4 523 035	3 497 688	4 007 097	7 277 000
Mining .....	57 731 000	62 615 445	74 381 243	88 738 946	100 291 000
Timber .....	6 241 486	6 927 447	7 550 669	9 352 790	11 362 000
Law Courts .....	6 928 555	8 772 967	10 314 750	11 198 853	13 606 000
Departmental Fees, etc. ....	122 077 594	148 813 128	182 589 509	217 945 923	245 305 000
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>196 781 576</b>	<b>231 652 022</b>	<b>278 333 859</b>	<b>331 243 609</b>	<b>377 841 000</b>
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES—</b>					
Country Areas Water Supplies, Sewerage, Irrigation and Drainage .....	18 694 630	22 051 642	26 056 715	30 830 084	38 735 000
Railways .....	139 161 699	142 228 647	156 470 202	165 034 499	179 500 000
State Batteries .....	171 333	229 794	358 225	853 641	2 030 000
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>158 027 662</b>	<b>164 510 083</b>	<b>182 885 142</b>	<b>196 718 224</b>	<b>220 265 000</b>
<b>COMMONWEALTH—</b>					
Tax Sharing Entitlement .....	519 891 030	579 531 852	662 888 480	734 172 477	806 300 000
Health Grants .....	116 986 431	124 430 164	135 044 417	157 850 469	150 900 000
Interest Contribution .....	946 864	946 864	946 864	946 864	947 000
Specific Purpose Grants .....	47 318 377	49 167 559	54 562 894	61 578 665	64 340 000
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>685 142 702</b>	<b>754 076 439</b>	<b>853 442 655</b>	<b>954 548 475</b>	<b>1 022 487 000</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b> .....	<b>1 311 204 538</b>	<b>1 443 334 252</b>	<b>1 641 191 281</b>	<b>1 860 548 032</b>	<b>2 072 132 000</b>

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

TABLE 4—RECEIPTS FROM COMMONWEALTH TAKEN TO CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND (a)  
ESTIMATE FOR 1981-82 COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS

Type of Grant	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>GENERAL REVENUE GRANTS—</b>					
Financial Assistance Grant—					
Tax Sharing Entitlement	519 891 030	579 531 852	662 888 480	734 172 477	806 300 000
Health Grants—					
Community Health Program	4 530 000	4 122 346	4 860 100	5 715 435	6 400 000
Hospitals	109 547 035	117 233 693	126 536 559	148 265 500	140 100 000
School Dental Service	2 909 396	3 074 125	3 647 758	3 869 534	4 400 000
Interest Contributions	946 864	946 864	946 864	946 864	947 000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>637 824 325</b>	<b>704 908 880</b>	<b>798 879 761</b>	<b>892 969 810</b>	<b>958 147 000</b>
<b>SPECIFIC PURPOSE GRANTS—</b>					
Aboriginal Advancement Program	8 996 893	9 431 752	9 350 390	9 938 021	10 390 000
Agriculture Projects	1 576 711	1 943 917	2 443 754	2 536 591	2 745 000
Aids for Disabled People					257 000
Air Quality Monitoring Control		40 000			
Apple Export Industry		309 846	248 250	168 854	414 000
Apprenticeship Training	347 667	149 153	47 406	50 049	50 000
Assistance to Deserted Wives	2 877 888	2 371 888	3 025 930	1 886 373	
Australian Biological Resources Study				5 199	40 000
Australian Encephalitis Control		20 000	32 790	50 000	24 000
Beef Carcase Classification Trials			217 087	168 874	232 000
Blood Transfusion Services	628 627	673 843	750 777	826 300	959 000
Bushfire Publicity Program	4 881				
Capital Assistance for Leisure Facilities		17 887			
Children's Services Program	4 030 331	5 300 776	5 216 525	5 828 685	5 875 000
Coal Research Grant			7 000		
Curriculum Development Program (b)	1 983	55 575	61 554	10 500	
Education Program for Unemployed Youth	46 130	103 520	122 963	114 025	119 000
Environmental Financial Assistance			35 000		
Family Law Court	1 260 519	1 485 989	1 672 077	1 916 708	2 185 000
Family Support Scheme		200 065	359 775		
Fisheries and Wildlife Projects	67 034	55 743	68 445	128 104	123 000
Health Services Planning and Research Program	135 000	100 000	100 000	75 000	75 000
Home Care Services					684 000
International Year of the Child		2 204			
Life Be In It		10 316	43 426	57 945	
National Drug Education Program			42 333	151 245	164 000
National Employment Strategy for Aborigines		73 786	298 103	199 890	400 000
National Estate Program	60 000				
Nature Conservation Program	89 940				
Schools Commission	20 977 386	20 612 907	23 403 168	27 007 741	27 405 000
Special Assistance Program for Out-of-Trade Apprentices			9 706	10 298	15 000
Special Trade Training Program				9 448	19 000
Special Youth Employment Training Program	353 888	267 076	107 139	94 728	63 000
Sports Development Program		9 361	23 208	22 858	32 000
State Emergency Services	37 167	65 389	88 440	108 972	161 000
Technical and Further Education	3 907 332	3 988 638	4 117 947	5 243 839	6 046 000
Transition from School to Work Program			103 351	2 058 941	2 463 000
Transport Planning and Research	69 000	27 928	16 350	11 477	
Water Resources Program	1 850 000	1 850 000	2 550 000	2 898 000	3 400 000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>47 318 377</b>	<b>49 167 559</b>	<b>54 562 894</b>	<b>61 578 665</b>	<b>64 340 000</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>685 142 702</b>	<b>754 076 439</b>	<b>853 442 655</b>	<b>954 548 475</b>	<b>1 022 487 000</b>

(a) For detailed historical background of these receipts refer to Return No. 39, Financial Statement, 1975-76.

(b) Prior to 1980-81 shown as Social Education Materials Project.



## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

## TABLE 5—EXPENDITURE

ESTIMATE FOR 1981-82 COMPARED WITH EXPENDITURE IN PREVIOUS YEARS

Head	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>SPECIAL ACTS</b>	139 048 756	153 176 472	167 609 291	190 965 671	215 152 000
<b>GOVERNMENTAL—</b>					
Legislative Council	263 979	175 533	166 454	203 427	305 000
Legislative Assembly	703 036	202 073	198 160	226 732	263 000
Joint House Committee	751 321	1 517 421	1 720 357	1 963 582	2 533 000
Joint Printing Committee	309 758	313 942	370 625	432 845	485 000
Joint Library Committee	83 639	83 028	95 155	109 575	129 000
Parliamentary Commission for Administrative Investigations	115 512	133 347	175 663	214 536	236 000
Premier's Department	1 526 348	1 721 571	1 790 919	2 264 137	2 288 000
London Agency	692 108	776 575	922 969	1 067 362	1 105 000
Tokyo Agency	201 784	201 621	191 371	209 258	299 990
Public Service Board	1 946 682	2 289 992	3 008 565	3 371 896	3 636 000
Treasury	1 848 613	2 623 002	2 498 702	2 919 268	3 366 000
Government Computing Division	1 577 887	1 665 373	2 793 322	2 825 124	3 421 000
Superannuation	516 380	496 117	561 063	640 829	707 000
Government Stores	1 829 446	1 985 846	2 329 091	2 678 574	3 168 000
Government Printing Office	10 139 936	11 445 115	12 266 666	13 975 430	14 949 000
Audit	1 124 553	1 241 498	1 420 752	1 821 842	2 569 000
Taxation	4 887 256	3 026 755	3 528 188	3 851 506	3 909 000
Valuer General's Office	(a)	2 140 545	2 825 935	3 447 135	3 838 000
Miscellaneous Services	53 839 546	58 448 610	66 229 143	73 558 998	109 060 000
Deputy Premier's Office	754 387	926 062	1 181 973	1 769 236	1 840 000
Governor's Establishment	459 569	435 879	483 760	554 334	675 000
Labour and Industry	3 258 239	3 662 463	4 331 939	4 741 206	5 432 000
Industrial Commission	470 508	527 241	712 384	1 170 888	1 200 000
Public Service Arbitration	70 885	75 696	89 747	93 853	106 000
Consumer Affairs Bureau	404 081	473 377	568 695	624 462	724 000
Immigration and Ethnic Affairs	898 655	806 520	808 048	1 004 089	1 204 000
Agriculture	22 226 360	24 969 337	28 627 205	33 304 880	37 620 000
Agriculture Protection Board	4 000 000	4 091 000	5 375 000	6 223 000	6 690 000
Rural Adjustment Authority	216 491	308 348	175 376	393 313	367 000
Western Australian Meat Commission	3 732 930	2 891 430	1 142 717	637 519	2 748 000
Crown Law	9 798 738	10 793 467	12 402 990	14 224 209	16 251 000
Corporate Affairs Office	1 112 480	1 191 401	1 425 330	1 655 467	2 133 000
Office of Titles	2 815 821	2 888 218	3 317 352	3 856 572	4 599 000
Public Trust Office	1 467 591	1 569 591	1 808 620	1 965 807	2 197 000
Law Reform Commission	227 000	277 000	320 000	376 000	461 000
Legal Aid Commission	100 000	293 000	374 200	579 000	694 000
Public Works and Buildings	44 413 218	46 754 077	55 699 836	59 720 434	71 262 000
Country Water Supplies, Sewerage, Irrigation and Drainage	40 355 831	43 689 444	46 693 208	51 313 258	58 363 000
Resources Development	(b)	(b)	1 877 936	2 601 119	1 909 000
Mines	10 373 338	10 915 488	12 541 106	13 881 808	16 072 000
State Batteries	1 676 987	1 892 276	2 216 096	2 885 557	3 246 000
Solar Energy Research Institute of Western Australia	250 000	600 000	800 000	880 000	500 000
Government Employees' Housing Authority	3 064 000	3 675 000	4 455 000	4 707 000	6 286 000
Rural Housing Authority	86 421	93 517	111 000	152 000	169 000
Regional Administration and the North West	1 147 257	1 359 683	1 575 706	1 832 083	2 010 000
Tourism	3 013 894	3 313 903	3 527 740	3 991 423	4 622 000
Carried Forward	238 752 465	258 961 382	295 736 064	330 920 573	405 646 990

(a) Prior to 1978-79 included under Taxation.

(b) Prior to 1979-80 included under Industrial Development and Commerce.

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

## TABLE 5—EXPENDITURE

ESTIMATE FOR 1981-82 COMPARED WITH EXPENDITURE IN PREVIOUS YEARS *continued*

Head	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Brought Forward	238 752 465	258 961 382	295 736 064	330 920 573	405 646 990
Industrial Development and Commerce	4 360 330	5 534 899	4 725 918	5 902 126	4 237 000
Harbour and Light	5 297 975	6 176 274	6 440 280	6 494 023	7 214 000
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust	24 980 000	28 837 000	35 008 000	40 370 000	42 469 000
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission	8 130 667	8 813 174	9 422 248	9 617 167	10 128 000
Western Australian Government Railways Commission	143 444 306	151 120 754	175 075 866	185 151 029	201 824 000
Public Health	30 277 754	35 434 550	38 921 727	46 565 608	51 590 000
Hospital and Allied Services	235 505 280	259 171 606	292 732 761	340 340 126	344 601 000
Mental Health	38 923 180	43 049 290	49 423 834	56 841 257	62 646 000
Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority	1 753 732	2 072 099	2 574 504	2 872 353	2 803 000
Nurses Board of Western Australia	110 432	118 382	127 000	145 000	162 000
Education	289 824 144	325 518 414	370 773 267	427 586 838	480 662 000
Board of Secondary Education	523 500	621 000	669 408	792 000	856 000
Western Australian Post Secondary Education Commission	318 000	334 730	378 000	465 000	539 000
Academy of Performing Arts	.....	.....	.....	215 000	376 000
Hedland College	.....	.....	160 000	424 000	887 000
Karratha College	.....	.....	134 119	407 000	891 000
Aboriginal Cultural Materials Preservation Committee	153 000	191 000	221 000	252 000	320 000
Art Gallery of Western Australia	1 132 500	1 372 000	1 874 000	2 598 000	2 808 000
Library Board of Western Australia	4 078 000	4 867 000	5 734 000	6 226 000	6 925 000
Museum of Western Australia	2 486 000	2 594 000	2 892 900	3 450 000	3 778 000
Perth Theatre Trust	.....	.....	150 000	144 036	132 000
Rural Youth Movement Council	160 000	153 000	197 000	227 000	248 000
Western Australian Arts Council	1 457 000	1 559 000	1 743 000	2 032 000	2 234 000
Youth Sport and Recreation	2 353 000	2 177 000	2 877 934	3 402 507	3 711 000
Lands and Surveys	10 904 849	10 451 967	12 161 536	13 551 235	15 051 000
Bush Fires Board	723 022	699 001	836 336	918 821	1 041 000
Kings Park Board	1 018 454	1 062 355	1 012 000	1 196 678	1 218 000
Zoological Gardens Board	947 000	966 000	947 000	978 000	976 000
Forests	12 232 761	14 128 370	16 612 373	20 133 004	22 876 000
Local Government	845 820	992 437	1 234 507	1 234 557	1 103 000
Keep Australia Beautiful Council	32 700	38 657	38 000	167 000	167 000
Town Planning	2 084 473	2 211 072	2 755 390	2 982 390	3 424 000
Chief Secretary's Department	1 472 721	1 377 142	1 591 146	1 539 539	1 349 000
Registrar General's Office	500 761	570 478	624 929	701 377	843 000
Astronomical Services	286 256	329 218	336 598	378 048	442 000
Electoral	509 092	488 555	1 591 701	668 646	788 000
Licensing	308 218	358 759	406 349	449 601	515 000
Department of Corrections	14 671 789	17 439 303	21 044 126	28 219 822	33 176 000
Police	36 926 592	41 339 568	47 619 739	55 776 690	61 949 000
Road Traffic Authority	17 255 993	18 928 951	22 011 950	24 998 354	28 860 000
Community Welfare	29 980 763	31 988 003	35 192 375	33 090 232	33 577 000
Aboriginal Lands Trust	136 000	153 000	202 000	202 000	153 000
Carried Forward	1 164 858 529	1 282 199 390	1 464 210 885	1 660 626 637	1 845 195 990

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

## TABLE 5—EXPENDITURE

ESTIMATE FOR 1981-82 COMPARED WITH EXPENDITURE IN PREVIOUS YEARS—*continued*

Head	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Brought Forward	1 164 858 529	1 282 199 390	1 464 210 885	1 660 626 637	1 845 195 990
Fisheries and Wildlife	3 866 337	4 183 988	5 018 428	5 635 266	6 542 000
Conservation and Environment	1 588 916	1 638 402	1 857 889	2 027 260	2 292 000
National Parks Authority	1 516 000	1 669 000	1 990 000	2 196 000	2 270 000
Waterways Commission	326 000	467 000	504 788	556 000	680 000
Sundries	....	....	....	....	10
<b>TOTAL GOVERNMENTAL</b>	<b>1 172 155 782</b>	<b>1 290 157 780</b>	<b>1 473 581 990</b>	<b>1 671 041 163</b>	<b>1 856 980 000</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>1 311 204 538</b>	<b>1 443 334 252</b>	<b>1 641 191 281</b>	<b>1 862 006 834</b>	<b>2 072 132 000</b>
<b>DEFICIT FOR YEAR</b>	....	....	....	1 458 802	....

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

TABLE 6—EXPENDITURE, NORTH WEST

ESTIMATE FOR 1981-82 COMPARED WITH EXPENDITURE IN PREVIOUS YEARS

Head	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>DEPARTMENTAL—</b>					
Corrections .....	1 063 638	1 131 546	1 390 787	1 735 490	1 900 000
Police .....	3 008 951	3 320 984	4 544 979	5 621 943	6 094 000
Road Traffic Authority .....	612 208	920 890	1 085 966	1 219 584	1 346 000
Regional Administration and the North West .....	752 108	912 181	957 282	1 196 112	1 389 000
Agriculture .....	2 106 567	2 193 691	2 636 949	3 237 600	3 528 000
Public Works .....	3 736 985	4 610 017	4 931 550	6 264 384	8 623 000
Crown Law .....	553 441	745 206	946 328	1 097 601	1 208 000
Education—					
Department .....	11 935 624	13 918 102	18 156 327	21 281 098	24 017 000
Hedland College .....			160 000	424 000	887 000
Karratha College .....			134 119	407 000	891 000
Harbour and Light .....	2 962 877	3 532 210	3 404 774	3 155 652	3 370 000
Public Health .....	4 720 042	4 980 925	5 219 940	6 162 830	6 871 000
Hospital and Allied Services .....	19 526 727	20 676 562	22 618 595	27 252 432	28 704 000
Community Welfare .....	2 525 759	2 468 407	2 474 884	3 055 673	3 458 000
Country Water Supplies, Sewerage, Irrigation and Drainage .....	8 552 931	7 899 530	7 671 327	7 677 025	9 719 000
Other .....	1 367 969	1 601 800	1 883 252	2 673 063	3 023 000
<b>ORD RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT—</b>					
Salaries and Allowances .....	184 748	235 979	261 516	262 983	272 000
Operating Expenses .....	1 255 656	1 541 873	1 589 340	1 633 319	1 884 000
Assistance to Farmers .....	260 066	103 448	80 721	50 000	60 000
Other .....	724 671	1 203 795	1 286 965	1 114 544	1 187 000
<b>GENERAL—</b>					
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission—Loss	8 130 667	8 813 174	9 422 248	9 617 167	10 128 000
Rent Reductions North West Houses—Reimbursement to State Housing Commission .....	401 615	473 576	558 000	687 555	560 000
Other (a) .....	21 602	280 849	7 072		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>74 404 852</b>	<b>81 564 745</b>	<b>91 422 921</b>	<b>105 827 055</b>	<b>119 119 000</b>

(a) Revised figures.

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

## TABLE 7—EXPENDITURE

## FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS AND COST PER HEAD OF POPULATION\*†

Details	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>SOCIAL SERVICES</b>					
<b>EDUCATION—</b>					
Administration .....	34 685 589	40 838 197	42 167 289	49 190 071	59 958 000
Pre-School/Pre-Primary .....	12 743 837	12 105 887	15 144 257	15 888 633	17 860 000
Primary .....	111 082 372	124 835 669	131 883 067	163 836 475	184 179 000
Secondary .....	93 513 333	105 028 042	109 910 343	138 201 375	155 211 000
Technical and Further Education .....	40 298 234	45 072 384	51 201 463	59 622 062	67 941 900
Teacher Training and Special Education .....	1 539 924	1 679 819	17 776 078	2 171 874	2 493 900
Transport of Children .....	11 730 132	12 387 643	13 514 186	16 624 422	18 719 000
Assistance to Private Schools .....	11 191 068	12 569 342	13 233 023	16 510 543	18 559 900
Other .....	214 137	223 062	5 000	454 814	614 300
<b>TOTAL EDUCATION</b> .....	<b>316 998 626</b>	<b>354 740 045</b>	<b>394 834 706</b>	<b>462 500 269</b>	<b>525 537 000</b>
per capita .....	260.39	286.29	313.21	360.43	402.31
<b>CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES—</b>					
Libraries .....	4 164 559	5 078 763	5 990 054	6 465 432	7 235 000
Museums .....	2 486 025	2 594 027	3 022 083	3 457 536	3 778 000
Art Galleries .....	1 269 033	1 783 735	1 957 684	2 837 396	3 117 900
Recreation .....	4 472 550	4 619 351	5 854 324	7 116 098	7 222 300
Parks, Gardens etc. ....	5 161 887	5 533 944	5 965 131	6 764 442	7 282 900
Other .....	8 013 368	5 407 686	10 099 806	6 853 919	5 193 900
<b>TOTAL CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES</b> .....	<b>25 567 422</b>	<b>25 017 506</b>	<b>32 889 082</b>	<b>33 494 823</b>	<b>33 830 000</b>
per capita .....	21.00	20.19	26.09	26.10	25.90
<b>HEALTH—</b>					
Public Health .....	29 601 341	34 290 150	37 422 074	44 532 322	51 507 100
Hospitals .....	235 357 740	259 159 243	292 164 418	340 207 307	343 368 700
Mental Health .....	38 399 093	42 489 494	48 836 799	56 102 687	61 732 300
Health of School Children .....	6 861 698	8 066 927	9 676 945	11 434 708	12 323 300
Maternal and Infant Health .....	2 627 076	2 912 622	3 460 002	3 940 976	4 314 600
<b>TOTAL HEALTH</b> .....	<b>312 846 948</b>	<b>346 918 436</b>	<b>391 560 238</b>	<b>456 218 000</b>	<b>473 246 000</b>
per capita .....	256.98	279.98	310.61	355.53	362.28
<b>WELFARE—</b>					
Child Welfare .....	19 245 648	20 176 343	16 215 336	23 416 035	24 820 700
Relief of the Aged, Indigent and Infirm .....	5 832 160	6 523 287	17 772 529	8 130 207	9 590 700
Disaster Relief .....	2 133 967	5 831 241	7 158 395	8 584 170	3 251 100
Other .....	13 388 974	14 267 287	10 555 839	14 832 119	15 076 500
<b>TOTAL WELFARE</b> .....	<b>40 600 749</b>	<b>46 798 158</b>	<b>51 702 099</b>	<b>54 962 531</b>	<b>52 739 000</b>
per capita .....	33.35	37.77	41.01	42.83	40.37
<b>LAW, ORDER AND PUBLIC SAFETY—</b>					
Police and Road Traffic Authority .....	51 965 502	58 581 276	66 285 122	76 735 399	88 753 600
Prisons .....	17 804 278	20 902 563	24 143 954	30 501 890	35 592 800
Administration and Justice .....	15 020 466	16 324 615	18 355 727	21 579 164	25 490 000
Other .....	3 722 461	4 158 898	4 720 753	6 749 665	7 310 600
<b>TOTAL LAW, ORDER AND PUBLIC SAFETY</b> .....	<b>88 512 707</b>	<b>99 967 352</b>	<b>113 505 556</b>	<b>135 566 118</b>	<b>157 147 000</b>
per capita .....	72.71	80.68	90.04	105.65	120.30
<b>TOTAL SOCIAL SERVICES</b> .....	<b>784 526 452</b>	<b>873 441 497</b>	<b>984 491 681</b>	<b>1 142 741 741</b>	<b>1 242 499 000</b>
per capita .....	644.43	704.91	780.96	890.54	951.16

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

TABLE 7—EXPENDITURE—continued

FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS AND COST PER HEAD OF POPULATION\*†—continued

Details	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRY—</b>					
Country Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage .....	45 736 888	50 885 457	59 777 246	63 000 364	71 898 900
Agricultural, Pastoral and Dairying .....	33 651 691	36 454 472	41 016 269	45 257 102	52 630 300
Mines and Minerals .....	11 636 107	12 271 985	14 193 513	16 061 692	19 115 400
Forestry .....	12 444 231	14 454 925	16 885 332	20 293 847	23 070 600
Lands .....	11 386 381	11 440 147	12 650 677	14 056 856	15 797 700
Fisheries .....	2 753 794	2 901 911	3 497 723	4 103 560	4 951 600
Other .....	24 748 421	25 819 738	42 802 905	36 162 318	40 010 500
<b>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE</b> .....	142 357 513	154 228 635	190 823 665	198 935 739	227 475 000
per capita	116·94	124·47	151·38	155·03	174·14
<b>TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATION—</b>					
Railways .....	144 649 312	151 873 277	175 778 671	186 369 053	202 806 000
Buses and Ferries .....	25 095 388	28 995 375	35 120 044	40 439 809	42 500 000
Shipping and Harbours .....	15 275 399	16 563 572	17 543 873	18 277 175	19 726 000
Other .....	1 229 814	1 661 290	3 527 545	3 822 407	4 519 000
<b>TOTAL TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATION</b> .....	186 249 913	199 093 514	231 970 133	248 908 444	269 551 000
per capita	152·99	160·68	184·02	193·97	206·35
<b>PUBLIC DEBT CHARGES—</b>					
Interest .....	92 040 041	99 146 115	105 810 440	120 166 156	134 494 000
Sinking Fund .....	13 608 010	14 472 679	15 325 141	16 021 773	16 771 000
Loan Management .....	664 837	692 670	738 584	778 395	1 864 000
<b>TOTAL PUBLIC DEBT CHARGES</b> .....	106 312 888	114 311 464	121 874 165	136 966 324	153 129 000
per capita	87·33	92·25	96·68	106·74	117·22
<b>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES</b> .....	68 938 821	77 951 987	89 254 200	108 197 580	150 737 000
per capita	56·63	62·91	70·80	84·32	115·39
<b>LEGISLATURE</b> .....	7 815 884	9 192 132	10 669 917	11 231 156	13 978 000
per capita	6·42	7·42	8·46	8·75	10·70
<b>REGULATION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY</b> .....	11 480 427	12 115 579	8 961 165	10 123 136	11 604 000
per capita	9·43	9·78	7·11	7·89	8·88
<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b> .....	3 522 640	2 999 444	3 146 355	4 902 714	3 159 000
per capita	2·89	2·42	2·50	3·82	2·42
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b> .....	1 311 204 538	1 443 334 252	1 641 191 281	1 862 006 834	2 072 132 000
per capita	1 077·06	1 164·84	1 301·91	1 451·06	1 586·26

\* Based on estimated mean population, e.g. 1981-82, 1 306 300

† Breakdown revised 30 June 1981.

## II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

TABLE 8—ORD RIVER IRRIGATION SCHEME—INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

ESTIMATE FOR 1981-82 COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS

Head	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>ACCRUED INCOME—</b>					
Water Supplies .....	86 985	104 630	161 298	189 971	246 000
Sewerage .....	36 242	42 895	63 873	87 675	110 000
Irrigation .....	161 507	202 141	258 045	276 025	347 000
Kununurra Hostel .....	104 886	187 904	165 388	142 319	150 000
Kununurra Airport .....	34 279	34 845	78 363	79 331	100 000
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b> ....	<b>423 899</b>	<b>572 415</b>	<b>726 967</b>	<b>775 321</b>	<b>953 000</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>					
Salaries and Allowances generally .....	184 748	235 979	261 516	262 983	272 000
Administration Expenses .....	31 039	42 924	50 387	51 733	67 000
Pay-roll Tax .....	9 269	11 812	13 438	13 474	14 000
Operating Expenses—					
Irrigation .....	859 850	1 031 266	1 030 900	1 111 559	1 262 000
Water Supply .....	120 591	164 290	204 450	161 358	194 000
Sewerage .....	24 439	38 372	46 135	34 166	35 000
Hostel .....	160 547	198 144	204 059	204 749	243 000
Airport .....	90 229	109 801	103 796	121 487	150 000
Assistance to Farmers—					
Cotton Growers .....	67 086	65 431	30 324	38	....
Sorghum Growers .....	150 000	2 010	5	10	....
Crop Spraying Subsidy .....	42 980	36 007	50 392	49 952	60 000
Sugar Industry Feasibility Study .....	1 079	....	....	....	....
Commercial Scale Agricultural Experiments .....	416 249	896 000	958 447	769 596	813 000
Western Australian Agreement (Ord River Irrigation) Act, 1968—Interest .....	191 314	193 035	193 035	204 297	213 000
Kununurra Townsite Services .....	23 683	12 778	21 674	23 358	25 000
Maintenance of Amenities for Public at Dams .....	33 779	31 884	30 333	34 547	35 000
Publicity .....	18 259	15 362	19 651	17 539	20 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> ....	<b>2 425 141</b>	<b>3 085 095</b>	<b>3 218 542</b>	<b>3 060 846</b>	<b>3 403 000</b>

## III.—GENERAL LOAN FUND

TABLE 9—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE

ESTIMATE FOR 1980-81 COMPARED WITH ACTUAL FOR YEAR

Head	Estimate	Actual	Increase	Decrease
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>RECEIPTS—</b>				
Borrowings approved by Australian Loan Council ....	80 639 000	80 639 000	....	....
Commonwealth Capital Grants for General Purposes	40 320 000	40 320 000	....	....
Interest on Short Term Investments under the provision of Section 4(b) Public Monies Investment Act ....	9 416 000	9 415 612	....	388
Loan Repayments ....	13 453 507	14 171 889	718 382	....
Balance at beginning of year ....	3 265 493	3 265 493	....	....
	147 094 000	147 811 994	717 994	....
Less Balance at end of year ....	....	4 495 914	4 495 914	....
<b>TOTAL RECEIPTS</b> ....	<b>147 094 000</b>	<b>143 316 080</b>	<b>....</b>	<b>3 777 920</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>				
Agriculture ....	611 000	607 905	....	3 095
Forests ....	3 000 000	3 000 000	....	....
Industrial Development ....	70 000	67 687	....	2 313
Mines ....	128 000	49 409	....	78 591
<b>Public Works—</b>				
Engineering and Associated Works ....	19 670 000	19 257 442	....	412 558
Buildings and Associated Works ....	83 091 000	79 746 166	....	3 344 834
Technical and Further Education Colleges ..	1 194 000	1 194 000	....	....
Treasury ....	930 000	967 618	37 618	....
Business Undertakings ....	27 500 000	27 250 000	....	250 000
Housing Authorities ....	10 250 000	10 250 000	....	....
Other Authorities ....	650 000	925 853	275 853	....
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> ....	<b>147 094 000</b>	<b>143 316 080</b>	<b>....</b>	<b>3 777 920</b>



## III.—GENERAL LOAN FUND

TABLE 10—LOAN EXPENDITURE

EXPENDITURE IN 1980-81 COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS

Undertaking	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Agricultural Development .....	232 539	160 483	86 941	141 055	607 905
Industrial Development .....	384 995	195 921	149 332	147 683	67 687
Fisheries and Wildlife Development .....	69 615	.....	.....	.....	.....
Forestry Development .....	1 663 000	2 250 000	2 603 000	2 870 000	3 000 000
Mining Development .....	1 529	.....	.....	42 604	49 409
Public Works—Engineering and Associated Works—					
Ports and Jetties (a) .....	652 321	1 853 847	2 130 432	1 560 093	2 998 047
Improvements to Rivers and Fore-shores (a) .....	1 637 203	2 622 106	3 909 433	1 937 181	2 106 522
Country Areas Water Supplies, Irrigation and Drainage .....	14 632 309	13 261 923	11 168 075	10 599 773	9 946 562
Country Towns Sewerage .....	1 807 178	2 051 255	4 169 599	3 824 834	4 177 945
Kununurra Townsite Development .....	108 889	55 259	32 470	.....	28 366
Public Works—Buildings and Associated Works including Furniture and Equipment—					
Hospitals .....	17 105 411	25 220 759	43 387 394	42 940 228	29 458 001
Public Health Department .....	1 258 402	624 032	957 628	577 926	462 116
Mental Health Services .....	1 929 204	1 276 215	2 492 316	2 651 550	1 763 190
Schools .....	25 173 963	31 371 182	28 289 788	22 794 206	18 865 832
Police Department .....	1 533 762	1 600 146	3 323 492	2 243 857	1 735 430
Road Traffic Authority .....	777 673	729 436	634 353	597 902	320 861
Community Welfare Department .....	417 999	345 439	617 888	496 571	375 746
Department of Corrections .....	318 116	447 792	1 822 185	6 021 041	10 298 415
Public Buildings not otherwise provided for .....	5 307 025	9 210 388	10 396 523	15 181 098	17 660 575
Railways .....	22 041 348	14 108 726	3 723 631	3 499 976	2 900 000
Advances to Sundry Bodies .....	200 000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Government Printing Office .....	418 463	54 000	184 000	95 422	291 344
Grants for Unemployment Relief Works .....	518 874	150 000	.....	.....	.....
Rural and Industries Bank—Delegated Agencies .....	10 000	.....	.....	.....	346 000
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust .....	1 510 000	1 294 000	680 000	.....	.....
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board .....	21 200 000	32 062 000	16 752 000	24 634 000	24 350 000
State Energy Commission .....	15 460 000	6 575 000	.....	.....	.....
Western Australian Meat Commission .....	120 000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Housing Authorities .....	3 800 000	7 550 000	8 682 000	9 080 000	10 900 000
Albany Port Authority .....	.....	.....	2 618 000	56 000	.....
Bunbury Port Authority .....	1 165 000	564 000	692 000	.....	.....
Fremantle Port Authority .....	500 000	825 000	350 000	.....	.....
Geraldton Port Authority .....	1 054 000	900 000	.....	.....	.....
Industrial Lands Development Authority .....	305 000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Rural Adjustment Authority .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	275 853
	143 313 818	157 358 909	149 852 480	151 993 000	142 985 806
Add Loan Flotation Expenses and Discounts (b) .....	226 382	183 933	303 831	368 133	330 274
TOTAL EXPENDITURE .....	143 540 200	157 542 842	150 156 311	152 361 133	143 316 080

(a) Previously shown as Improvements to Harbours and Rivers to 1978-79. (b) Charged to General Loan Fund.

BY TYPE AND CURRENCY OF DEBT										Face Value	At Current Rate of Exchange \$A
Australia	....	....	....	....	....	\$Aust.	....	....	....	1 420 727 759	1 420 727 759
London	....	....	....	....	....	£Stg.	....	....	....	1 583 974	2 689 260
New York	....	....	....	....	....	\$U.S.	....	....	....	367 000	319 826
Netherlands	....	....	....	....	....	Guilders	....	....	....	225 000	73 746
<b>GROSS PUBLIC DEBT</b> ....											<b>1 423 810 591</b>

## IV.—PUBLIC DEBT

TABLE 12—SINKING FUND

TRANSACTIONS FOR THE YEAR 1980-81

	\$	\$
BALANCE BROUGHT FORWARD ....	....	1 075 038
RECEIPTS—		
Loan Liability to the Commonwealth—		
State Contribution ....	16 021 773	
Commonwealth Contribution ....	3 738 414	
Net Earnings on Investments ....	25 706	
		19 785 893
		20 860 931
PAYMENTS—		
Redemptions and Repurchases, etc., at net cost (including Exchange) ....		19 111 719
BALANCE 30th JUNE, 1981 ....		1 749 212

TABLE 13—NET PUBLIC DEBT AS AT 30th JUNE PER HEAD OF MEAN POPULATION†

Year	Debt per Head	Year	Debt per Head
	\$		\$
1927 ....	321·26	1965 ....	825·93
1930 ....	335·15	1970 ....	904·65
1935 ....	395·19	1975 ....	976·08
1940 ....	410·07	1980 ....	*1078·57
1945 ....	392·74	1981 ....	1108·21
1950 ....	392·46		
1955 ....	540·73		
1960 ....	683·31		

\* Statistical basis for determination of population changed from 1979-80.

† Prior to 1967 excludes Aborigines.

|| Preliminary figure.

## IV.—PUBLIC DEBT

TABLE 14—CONTINGENT LIABILITIES AS AT 30th JUNE, 1981

Statutory Authority	Securities Issued	Redeemed	In Circulation	Sinking Fund
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Albany Port Authority	6 940 000	270 201	6 669 799	297 868
Bunbury Port Authority	7 700 000	232 337	7 467 663	353 040
Churchlands College	60 000	20 934	39 066	....
Conservator of Forests	5 200 000	2 201 948	2 998 052	95 120
Country High Schools Hostels Authority (a)	5 880 000	1 712 699	4 167 301	306 414
Dairy Industry Authority	80 000	50 885	29 115	....
Esperance Port Authority	3 125 000	26 024	3 098 976	195 542
Fremantle Hospital (a)	5 250 000	700 271	4 549 729	....
Fremantle Port Authority	11 170 000	24 532	11 145 468	1 197 007
Geraldton Port Authority	5 200 000	233 296	4 966 704	175 412
Government Employees Housing Authority	9 350 000	806 424	8 543 576	71 336
Industrial and Commercial Employees Housing Authority	3 100 000	50 327	3 049 673	3 598
Industrial Lands Development Authority	9 975 000	734 834	9 240 166	189 809
Joondalup Development Corporation	1 800 000	....	1 800 000	....
King Edward Memorial Hospital (a)	3 300 000	439 552	2 860 448	....
Metropolitan Market Trust	345 000	243 053	101 947	....
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust	11 035 820	597 159	10 438 661	896 100
Metropolitan Region Planning Authority	16 395 000	2 080 690	14 314 310	1 896 797
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board	136 999 550	5 859 005	131 140 545	1 238 628
Murdoch University (a)	1 200 000	138 159	1 061 841	....
Perth Mint	250 000	26 162	223 838	....
Port Hedland Port Authority	3 550 000	87 384	3 462 616	142 632
Princess Margaret Hospital (a)	4 200 000	948 609	3 251 391	....
Royal Perth Hospital (a)	2 500 000	678 366	1 821 634	199 041
Rural Housing Authority	1 000 000	23 338	976 662	2 166
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital (a)	2 550 000	311 555	2 238 445	....
State Energy Commission	508 123 127	709 824	507 413 303	11 755 873
State Housing Commission	35 075 000	3 580 227	31 494 773	4 233 143
State Implement and Engineering Works	1 200 000	257 751	942 249	7 740
University of Western Australia (a)	7 818 000	236 856	7 581 144	2 870 536
Western Australian Art Gallery	3 950 000	294 467	3 655 533	52 008
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission	3 700 000	186 925	3 513 075	243 174
Western Australian Fire Brigades Board (a)	18 651 000	6 161 181	12 489 819	355 127
Western Australian Government Railways (a)	60 495 786	129 558	60 366 228	208 288
Western Australian Institute of Technology (a)	3 945 000	709 733	3 235 267	373 759
Western Australian Meat Commission	10 110 000	372 373	9 737 627	446 245
Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry Board of Management	700 000	28 134	671 866	96 546
	911 923 283	31 164 773	880 758 510	27 902 949
<b>Guarantees and Indemnities under—</b>				
Housing Loan Guarantee Act	....	....	44 217 817	....
Industry (Advances) Act	....	....	49 347 253	....
Rural Housing (Assistance) Act	....	....	1 362 042	....
Other Statutes	....	....	109 145 625	....
Sureties	....	....	8 129 936	....
<b>TOTAL</b>	....	....	1 092 961 183	....

(a) Under established funding arrangements the State meets the whole or portion of the annual commitments from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 15—ALBANY PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Wharfage, handling and haulage charges	715 258	687 746	826 446	865 855	1 272 000
Tonnage rates, mooring services, etc.	352 161	295 973	547 243	315 886	549 000
Miscellaneous services	238 655	253 459	238 929	265 910	208 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b>	<b>1 306 074</b>	<b>1 237 178</b>	<b>1 612 618</b>	<b>1 447 651</b>	<b>2 029 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Cargo handling costs, wages, etc.	152 411	180 810	152 546	199 401	246 000
Maintenance on jetties, wharves, buildings, plant and equipment	293 034	240 629	341 441	319 983	380 000
Administration costs	68 487	69 436	82 844	92 547	97 000
Tug subsidy	520	22 222	—	11 629	10 000
Depreciation	125 582	134 800	153 091	173 586	175 000
Interest on capital	609 628	774 700	1 019 155	1 127 144	1 181 000
Other	113 988	168 311	197 269	157 614	163 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>1 363 650</b>	<b>1 590 908</b>	<b>1 946 346</b>	<b>2 081 904</b>	<b>2 252 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>(57 576)</b>	<b>(353 730)</b>	<b>(333 728)</b>	<b>(634 253)</b>	<b>(223 000)</b>

TABLE 16—BUNBURY PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Wharfage, tonnage and handling charges	2 240 355	2 086 873	2 689 840	2 587 513	3 009 000
Wharfage labour recoups	86 339	48 436	53 997	68 750	82 000
Plant hire, mooring and electricity	327 302	286 196	312 215	353 848	400 000
Alumina surcharge	815 952	521 223	749 043	778 622	780 000
Other	174 108	240 905	217 660	220 531	181 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b>	<b>3 644 056</b>	<b>3 183 633</b>	<b>4 022 755</b>	<b>4 009 264</b>	<b>4 452 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Administration	161 801	181 605	223 877	242 257	324 000
General maintenance	164 917	182 064	207 010	237 162	484 000
Dredging maintenance	100 000	167 325	270 841	213 859	499 000
Cargo handling and other services	331 343	258 440	264 915	313 948	377 000
Depreciation	135 064	131 110	170 093	168 408	200 000
Interest on capital	1 571 163	1 742 497	1 988 510	2 084 902	2 154 000
Other	217 238	192 577	229 183	257 796	311 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>2 681 526</b>	<b>2 855 618</b>	<b>3 354 429</b>	<b>3 518 332</b>	<b>4 349 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>962 530</b>	<b>328 015</b>	<b>668 326</b>	<b>490 932</b>	<b>103 000</b>

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 17—ESPERANCE PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Wharfage, handling and berthage	724 047	731 160	756 377	918 673	1 113 000
Wharf labour recoups	108 628	112 742	146 249	107 801	80 000
Equipment hire, power and water sales	105 231	100 294	130 169	141 028	128 000
Pipeline service charge	84 251	82 581	78 181	84 208	78 000
Non-operating income	.....	.....	63 368	18 130	.....
Other	78 280	73 122	56 541	103 288	64 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b>	<b>1 100 437</b>	<b>1 099 899</b>	<b>1 230 885</b>	<b>1 373 128</b>	<b>1 463 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Administration	64 646	75 847	91 619	115 587	122 000
Shipping handling costs	111 643	138 524	114 205	97 346	105 000
Maintenance	114 563	173 348	214 734	259 270	274 000
Depreciation	103 636	116 257	153 701	171 153	166 000
Interest charges	532 024	556 525	569 074	594 512	653 000
Other	97 002	112 122	121 974	143 380	139 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>1 023 514</b>	<b>1 172 623</b>	<b>1 265 307</b>	<b>1 381 248</b>	<b>1 459 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>76 923</b>	<b>(72 724)</b>	<b>(34 422)</b>	<b>(8 120)</b>	<b>4 000</b>

TABLE 18—FREMANTLE PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Handling charges	10 349 443	9 167 099	10 929 398	13 571 564	13 227 000
Wharfage, storage	3 613 196	4 530 008	5 193 311	6 094 694	6 180 000
Tonnage, pilotage, mooring	2 781 032	2 970 634	3 863 879	3 702 904	4 146 000
Rents	524 884	624 533	634 946	688 244	711 000
Other	2 248 815	2 521 727	2 538 234	3 398 970	3 635 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b>	<b>19 517 370</b>	<b>19 814 001</b>	<b>23 159 768</b>	<b>27 456 376</b>	<b>27 899 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Handling of cargo	8 399 528	7 256 303	8 237 836	9 553 528	10 264 000
Maintenance of port facilities	2 233 395	2 439 923	2 682 963	3 307 194	3 838 000
Nautical expenses	1 267 804	1 338 832	1 462 021	1 768 595	1 872 000
Administration	1 331 089	1 347 040	1 473 119	1 595 573	1 676 000
Provision for dredging maintenance	50 000	50 000	100 000	150 000	100 000
Provision for accrued sick leave on retirement	40 603	109 082	128 869	368 107	230 000
Accrued long service leave	.....	.....	1 290 417	420 057	346 000
Interest	1 686 694	1 924 896	2 033 359	2 330 040	2 624 000
Depreciation	1 336 151	1 470 024	1 737 214	1 994 562	1 700 000
Statutory levy	643 591	585 521	590 709	694 793	792 000
Other	3 235 644	3 183 978	3 369 007	4 879 788	4 409 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>20 224 499</b>	<b>19 705 599</b>	<b>23 105 514</b>	<b>27 062 237</b>	<b>27 851 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS (DEFICIT)</b>	<b>(707 129)</b>	<b>108 402</b>	<b>54 254</b>	<b>394 139</b>	<b>48 000</b>

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 19—GERALDTON PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Wharfage, berthage and cargo handling .....	908 190	1 020 902	1 363 220	1 447 660	1 908 000
Harbour improvement dues .....	78 385	83 249	142 921	137 932	159 000
Wharf labour recoups .....	66 862	72 124	65 315	67 984	80 000
Plant hire, power and water sales .....	59 665	61 000	101 411	81 515	106 000
Rental and leases .....	39 223	53 006	55 293	75 149	90 000
Other .....	52 080	62 536	78 932	127 265	60 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b> .....	<b>1 204 405</b>	<b>1 352 817</b>	<b>1 807 092</b>	<b>1 937 505</b>	<b>2 403 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Administration .....	132 827	143 687	157 068	199 891	190 000
Cargo handling costs .....	146 892	155 068	179 455	162 020	127 000
Maintenance .....	170 822	207 218	217 597	553 674	485 000
Water and power .....	47 399	52 285	70 443	79 868	100 000
Depreciation .....	190 267	224 826	269 848	280 026	270 000
Interest on capital .....	852 886	1 020 372	1 082 596	1 105 518	1 182 000
Other .....	11 120	16 165	26 516	25 495	28 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b> .....	<b>1 552 213</b>	<b>1 819 621</b>	<b>2 003 523</b>	<b>2 406 492</b>	<b>2 382 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<b>(347 808)</b>	<b>(466 804)</b>	<b>(196 431)</b>	<b>(468 987)</b>	<b>21 000</b>

TABLE 20—INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL EMPLOYEES' HOUSING AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>INCOME—</b>					
Rentals .....	53 605	101 283	211 700	382 523	600 000
Fees .....	22 377	.....	.....	.....	.....
Interest .....	10 033	18 395	53 679	38 701	100 000
Contribution from State Housing Commission for administration expenses .....	.....	.....	99 006	22 454	123 000
Profit on sale of assets .....	.....	.....	.....	..	80 000
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b> .....	<b>86 015</b>	<b>119 678</b>	<b>364 385</b>	<b>443 678</b>	<b>903 000</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>					
Administration .....	24 121	40 516	62 039	76 595	100 000
Depreciation .....	10 719	32 379	48 916	77 437	100 000
Interest .....	.....	9 700	116 494	257 828	511 000
Rates .....	4 308	9 097	25 235	47 486	75 000
Lease servicing .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	107 000
Other .....	1 600	7 157	14 030	21 139	30 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> .....	<b>40 748</b>	<b>98 849</b>	<b>266 714</b>	<b>480 485</b>	<b>923 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<b>45 267</b>	<b>20 829</b>	<b>97 671</b>	<b>(36 807)</b>	<b>(20 000)</b>

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 21—INDUSTRIAL LANDS DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>INCOME—</b>					
Surplus from sale of land ....	2 344 217	581 661	1 156 811	1 911 561	1 500 000
Rental ....	90 800	154 249	152 289	1 683 837	1 678 000
Interest ....	309 297	456 898	335 921	553 635	665 000
Other ....	28 010	2 400	9 322	8 837	12 000
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b> ....	<b>2 772 324</b>	<b>1 195 208</b>	<b>1 654 343</b>	<b>4 157 870</b>	<b>3 855 000</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>					
Administration ....	65 528	75 659	100 519	122 347	150 000
Interest ....	310 084	338 701	399 352	717 072	1 097 000
Depreciation ....	1 507	1 179	2 350	2 248	2 000
Other ....	12 223	6 898	14 483	28 990	30 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> ....	<b>389 342</b>	<b>422 437</b>	<b>516 704</b>	<b>870 657</b>	<b>1 279 000</b>
Credit/(debit) adjustment from pre- vious years ....	(17 411)	8 688	(246 637)	(115 067)	(100 000)
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> ....	<b>2 365 571</b>	<b>781 459</b>	<b>891 002</b>	<b>3 172 146</b>	<b>2 476 000</b>



## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 22—MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>RECEIPTS—</b>					
Commonwealth Grants and Advances	63 263 712	65 295 605	71 034 603	78 729 290	83 895 000
Traffic Act licence fees and road maintenance contributions	46 780 910	52 698 803	43 941 222	43 009 712	46 050 000
Fuel franchise licence fees (net)	....	....	16 264 788	24 438 609	28 795 000
Consolidated Revenue Fund—Pillbara Road Program	....	....	2 000 000	2 500 000	2 500 000
Loans raised under section 9A of the Main Roads Act	800 000	1 000 000	600 000	1 800 000	1 200 000
Recoups for work performed on behalf of others	5 464 819	3 168 001	5 574 176	13 539 270	4 000 000
Transfer from Plant Suspense Reserve	1 500 000	500 000	3 230 000	4 200 000	....
Transfer from Payroll Surcharge Account	....	679 971	2 500 000	....	....
Rent received	710 805	830 391	802 629	1 023 322	1 100 000
Other	756 801	906 606	150 986	355 171	160 000
<b>TOTAL RECEIPTS</b>	<b>119 277 047</b>	<b>125 079 377</b>	<b>146 098 404</b>	<b>169 595 374</b>	<b>167 700 000</b>
<b>PAYMENTS—</b>					
Road Construction and Maintenance	96 275 221	112 353 522	125 647 930	128 478 460	135 716 000
Salaries and Incidentals (a)	10 236 583	11 065 344	14 649 979	16 658 378	22 105 000
Restoration of State assets destroyed by natural disasters	1 459 544	502 793	1 463 701	1 511 171	....
Works on behalf of other Authorities	5 062 043	3 993 158	5 324 566	14 025 734	4 000 000
Buildings	965 981	1 288 654	2 059 838	1 435 887	1 200 000
Increase in Materials on hand	509 280	672 116	1 157 798	1 071 802	500 000
Planning and research	1 228 226	1 276 951	1 281 431	1 494 235	1 400 000
Urban Public Transport Improvement Program	23 668	100 815	....	....	....
<b>Debt Charges—</b>					
<b>General Loan Fund—</b>					
Interest	281 914	300 809	319 172	336 969	354 000
Sinking fund	39 858	41 652	43 512	45 499	47 000
<b>Private Loans—</b>					
Interest	190 123	260 606	322 702	442 288	670 000
Principal repayments	39 463	75 389	116 538	132 534	200 000
Sinking fund	4 760	4 760	4 760	8 010	8 000
<b>TOTAL PAYMENTS</b>	<b>116 316 664</b>	<b>131 936 569</b>	<b>152 391 927</b>	<b>165 640 967</b>	<b>166 200 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>2 960 383</b>	<b>(6 857 192)</b>	<b>(6 293 523)</b>	<b>3 954 407</b>	<b>1 500 000</b>

(a) Excludes amounts charged to Commonwealth Funds and included under Road Construction and Maintenance.

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 23—METROPOLITAN REGION PLANNING AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>INCOME—</b>					
Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax .....	2 623 870	3 280 109	4 077 932	4 487 283	5 300 000
Provided from Consolidated Revenue Fund .....	1 988 000	2 187 000	2 406 000	2 641 000	2 905 000
Rents receivable .....	361 972	527 927	701 906	866 130	1 057 000
Interest on investments .....	257 897	247 765	284 357	385 898	330 000
Special contributions for land acquisition .....	2 610 000	2 074 133	767 108	200 000	31 000
Development and improvement plans .....	1 669 973	.....	.....	.....	.....
Property sales (net) .....	.....	765 058	404 361	97 645	1 300 000
Additions to record of property acquired in prior years .....	.....	1 445 916	58 489	12 350	.....
Other .....	9 437	17 528	16 191	16 973	24 000
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b> .....	<b>9 521 149</b>	<b>10 545 436</b>	<b>8 716 344</b>	<b>8 707 279</b>	<b>10 947 000</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>					
Property management .....	203 581	162 836	183 764	216 111	236 000
Regional open space improvements .....	62 249	82 655	404 618	161 262	230 000
Regional studies .....	193 124	117 110	47 139	151 244	473 000
Development and improvement plans .....	843 303	41 144	505	78 401	.....
Debt service costs .....	1 077 834	1 172 554	1 218 739	1 314 023	1 409 000
Properties vested as Crown Reserves .....	.....	931 144	15 906	.....	.....
Education Department site transferred to the Crown .....	.....	.....	898 882	.....	.....
Incidentals .....	158 262	182 078	275 138	241 786	680 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> .....	<b>2 538 353</b>	<b>2 689 521</b>	<b>3 044 691</b>	<b>2 162 827</b>	<b>3 028 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<b>6 982 796</b>	<b>7 855 915</b>	<b>5 671 653</b>	<b>6 544 452</b>	<b>7 919 000</b>

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 24—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE BOARD

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	£	£	£	£	£
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Rates and annual fees—					
Water Supply	20 847 105	22 787 274	26 363 069	38 130 970	46 996 000
Sewerage	23 521 396	28 521 595	34 605 882	41 472 728	50 382 000
Drainage	3 246 524	3 801 674	4 530 530	5 170 479	5 847 000
	47 615 025	55 110 543	65 499 481	84 774 177	103 225 000
Water sales	3 552 721	6 264 767	10 130 643	13 917 958	16 405 000
Building fees	464 001	415 059	490 785	632 648	603 000
Interest on deposits	1 156 866	1 580 224	2 070 489	4 729 746	5 292 000
Sundries	707 023	744 832	1 160 726	1 563 493	1 425 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b>	<b>53 495 636</b>	<b>64 115 425</b>	<b>79 352 124</b>	<b>105 618 022</b>	<b>126 950 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Operating Expenses—					
Water supply	14 331 911	17 268 597	19 762 226	23 448 456	25 757 000
Sewerage	11 244 508	14 406 729	15 388 959	17 087 636	19 994 000
Drainage	1 569 755	1 919 786	2 062 400	2 392 825	2 708 000
	27 146 174	33 595 112	37 213 585	42 928 917	48 459 000
Interest	20 733 581	24 968 650	29 272 335	35 485 151	43 548 000
Depreciation	5 380 000	7 600 000	10 120 000	16 030 000	22 020 000
Statutory levy	1 458 494	1 604 869	1 923 463	2 380 563	3 169 000
Provision for deferred maintenance	1 600 000	1 860 000	3 032 000	3 432 000	3 832 000
Provision for doubtful debts	—	—	20 000	30 000	30 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>56 318 249</b>	<b>69 628 631</b>	<b>81 581 383</b>	<b>100 286 631</b>	<b>121 058 000</b>
Credit/(debit) adjustments from previous years	(73 867)	(31 568)	184 314	116 285	—
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b>	<b>(2 896 480)</b>	<b>(5 544 774)</b>	<b>(2 044 945)</b>	<b>5 447 676</b>	<b>5 892 000</b>

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 25—PERTH MINT

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Mint charges .....	93 573	103 674	167 308	328 177	350 000
Revenue from—					
Silver .....	225 091	313 748	604 377	963 484	600 000
Coinage operations .....	581 248	881 350	754 380	1 329 269	1 600 000
Industrial gold sales .....	57 524	97 503	347 905	452 112	300 000
Revaluation of bullion .....	70 857	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other .....	154 520	229 072	536 626	657 832	500 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b> .....	<b>1 182 813</b>	<b>1 625 347</b>	<b>2 410 596</b>	<b>3 730 874</b>	<b>3 350 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Administration .....	439 171	532 624	654 365	854 333	900 000
Wages .....	556 174	645 300	711 410	890 463	1 200 000
Fuel and water .....	37 763	50 784	64 638	93 840	100 000
Stores .....	85 461	135 677	224 421	190 285	200 000
Depreciation .....	7 075	20 307	29 422	38 445	45 000
Interest on private borrowings .....	1 000	17 797	24 227	22 298	20 000
Other .....	9 882	15 616	11 489	29 386	30 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b> .....	<b>1 136 526</b>	<b>1 418 105</b>	<b>1 719 972</b>	<b>2 119 050</b>	<b>2 495 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<b>46 287</b>	<b>207 242</b>	<b>690 624</b>	<b>1 611 824</b>	<b>855 000</b>

TABLE 26—PORT HEDLAND PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Wharfage, handling and haulage .....	767 404	947 023	829 628	1 550 689	1 573 000
Pilotage .....	753 448	822 658	718 864	807 145	845 000
Tonnage rates .....	1 252 344	1 274 376	1 160 402	1 317 597	1 461 000
Ships accounts .....	202 312	252 726	294 537	317 274	378 000
Lease rentals .....	117 095	134 965	197 813	229 660	252 000
Harbour maintenance levy .....	18 789	21 943	29 797	29 248	42 000
Port improvement rates .....	5 584 791	5 923 266	5 423 277	6 811 443	5 863 000
Non-operating income .....	225 611	199 294	285 679	544 565	466 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b> .....	<b>8 921 794</b>	<b>9 576 251</b>	<b>8 939 997</b>	<b>11 607 621</b>	<b>10 880 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Salaries and wages .....	689 161	737 569	830 822	976 325	1 072 000
Maintenance .....	1 078 750	689 172	868 615	835 879	911 000
Helicopter and hydro survey/pilot boat .....	238 396	432 762	332 265	398 862	454 000
Interest .....	548 580	577 624	577 287	588 233	602 000
Depreciation .....	324 872	344 820	358 737	388 276	386 000
Dredging—provision .....	.....	300 000	315 000	640 000	480 000
Superannuation—provision .....	54 648	64 600	76 800	113 000	115 000
Other .....	470 613	503 458	571 448	609 239	821 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b> .....	<b>3 405 020</b>	<b>3 650 005</b>	<b>3 930 974</b>	<b>4 549 814</b>	<b>4 841 000</b>
<b>Loan Repayment Reserve Appropriation</b> .....	<b>5 584 791</b>	<b>5 923 266</b>	<b>5 423 277</b>	<b>6 811 443</b>	<b>5 863 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<b>(68 017)</b>	<b>2 980</b>	<b>(414 254)</b>	<b>246 364</b>	<b>176 000</b>

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 27—STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
REVENUE ACCOUNT					
EARNINGS—					
Sales—					
Electricity .....	179 445 347	205 633 031	232 974 522	281 092 607	346 084 000
Gas .....	10 192 705	13 589 302	15 303 294	21 021 342	27 757 000
Miscellaneous .....	2 290 955	3 434 736	3 993 667	5 569 308	8 382 000
TOTAL EARNINGS .....	191 929 007	222 657 069	252 271 483	307 683 257	382 223 000
EXPENSES—					
Electricity—					
Generation .....	103 341 512 }	122 752 262	121 227 955	150 266 139	172 117 000
Electricity purchases .....			4 167 151	6 052 022	8 405 000
Transmission and distribution .....			26 113 611	31 583 699	36 289 000
Less Departmental usage .....			(400 916)	(510 302)	(663 000)
Gas—					
Gas purchases .....	4 906 459 }	5 532 665	3 406 582	3 744 144	4 598 000
Supply and distribution .....			7 195 096	7 953 183	9 962 000
Less Departmental usage .....			(20 804)	(24 791)	(27 000)
Administration—					
Salaries and wages: Administration .....	33 233 227 }	32 597 767	10 903 842	13 049 233	16 155 000
Labour related expenses: Commission .....			14 123 664	16 299 162	20 321 000
Other administration costs .....			9 627 637	12 836 297	13 694 000
Financial Overheads—					
Interest .....	25 305 172	32 415 313	30 076 312	38 817 549	55 174 000
Depreciation .....	19 613 853	22 007 588	24 849 170	27 331 553	31 722 000
Statutory levy .....	4 383 811	5 606 429	6 522 150	7 369 716	9 061 000
Leases—Country Undertakings .....	.....	.....	1 349 428	2 113 217	3 895 000
TOTAL EXPENSES .....	190 784 034	220 912 024	259 140 878	316 880 821	380 703 000
SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) .....	1 144 973	1 745 045	(6 869 395)	(9 197 564)	1 520 000

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 28—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>					
<b>EARNINGS—</b>					
Premiums (less reinsurance) ....	54 756 914	51 176 434	49 336 297	54 559 528	57 650 000
Investment earnings (less adminis- tration and expenses) ....	4 214 388	5 766 131	7 283 504	8 634 468	9 500 000
Dividend—M.V.I.T. ....	412 056	....	....	292 238	....
Local Authority Pools income/(loss)	81 110	(28 342)	12 018	9 281	....
Other ....	69 426	424 664	124 570	157 626	160 000
<b>TOTAL EARNINGS</b> ....	<b>59 533 894</b>	<b>57 338 887</b>	<b>56 756 389</b>	<b>63 653 141</b>	<b>67 310 000</b>
<b>EXPENSES—</b>					
Claims (net) ....	35 853 720	35 065 474	36 004 127	40 995 524	50 360 000
Commission and brokerage ....	1 028 076	971 532	998 569	1 146 476	1 250 000
Fire Brigade charges ....	142 349	178 608	233 267	236 635	280 000
Administration and management ....	3 908 682	4 473 504	5 160 810	5 898 118	6 500 000
Bad debts ....	....	10 817	18 024	11 157	12 000
Provisions for—					
Unearned premiums ....	2 752 200	1 994 000	1 849 300	(1 200 500)	800 000
Unadjusted claims ....	15 205 000	(43 500)	(1 842 000)	12 531 000	6 000 000
Superannuation and long service leave ....	140 000	4 319 224	685 344	361 186	1 100 000
Bad debts ....	....	....	280 000	....	....
Taxation ....	....	2 374 822	5 712 354	253 827	429 000
Miscellaneous ....	82 149	92 827	95 922	6 110	76 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b> ....	<b>59 112 176</b>	<b>49 435 308</b>	<b>49 195 717</b>	<b>60 239 533</b>	<b>66 807 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> ....	<b>421 718</b>	<b>7 903 579</b>	<b>7 560 672</b>	<b>3 413 608</b>	<b>503 000</b>

## NOTE:

This statement does not include transactions in respect of the following:—

- (a) Gross transactions in relation to Local Authority Pools.
- (b) Government Workers' Compensation Fund.
- (c) Government Fire, Marine and General Insurance Fund.

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 29—STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>INCOME—</b>					
Net rents receivable .....	25 172 296	28 684 692	29 888 760	34 585 306	38 729 000
Interest earned .....	13 224 332	11 775 187	11 962 374	12 562 172	12 300 000
Profit on sale of assets .....	9 351 868	8 286 215	17 387 173 (a)	9 146 325	10 847 000
Fees .....	2 043 932	1 642 623	728 464	719 021	800 000
Commission .....	88 300	89 966	10 380	10 278	12 000
Construction contingencies .....	82 609	86 853	46 936	38 100	50 000
Other .....	65 107	9 133	33 410	52 553	50 000
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b> .....	<b>50 028 444</b>	<b>50 574 669</b>	<b>60 057 497</b>	<b>57 113 755</b>	<b>62 788 000</b>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>					
Administration .....	7 964 954	7 544 526	8 882 046	9 261 572	11 737 000
Interest on capital .....	20 138 237	18 291 850	19 811 736	20 945 410	21 807 000
Depreciation .....	5 394 305	6 237 275	7 173 758	7 194 956	7 451 000
Maintenance .....	11 308 744	8 834 033	10 624 298	11 636 528	13 527 000
Rates .....	4 500 408	5 377 341	6 176 570	7 608 041	8 980 000
Insurance claims paid .....	259 617	366 282	473 849	407 749	554 000
Doubtful debts .....	256 697	276 991	314 767	332 110	350 000
Death benefit scheme .....	28 400	14 800	11 400	16 000	15 000
Improvements .....	.....	.....	446 666	849 943	2 783 000
Grants and subsidies .....	46 131	45 304	310 996	471 233	1 245 000
Fire Brigade levy .....	.....	.....	.....	258 308	252 000
Lease rentals .....	.....	.....	.....	65 223	221 000
Other .....	75 213	66 820	26 939	58 125	60 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> .....	<b>49 972 706</b>	<b>47 055 222</b>	<b>54 253 025</b>	<b>59 105 198</b>	<b>68 982 000</b>
Adjustment from previous years .....	1 740 956	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<b>1 796 694</b>	<b>3 519 447</b>	<b>5 804 472</b>	<b>(1 991 443)</b>	<b>(6 194 000)</b>

(a) Includes amounts totalling \$1 558 811 derived from transactions completed in previous years.

## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 30—TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>RECEIPTS—</b>					
Licence and Permit Fees (Net)—					
Omnibus .....	49 039	54 717	62 685	81 945	85 000
Commercial goods vehicles .....	1 982 823	1 984 361	2 108 090	2 458 841	2 652 000
Aircraft .....	287 199	319 845	373 330	446 607	484 000
Shipping .....	15	19	103	10	....
Recoups .....	16 231	13 117	20 212	719	....
Farmers' contributions towards cost of cartage .....	3 339 931	3 296 770	4 545 370	3 790 371	6 816 000
Government Assisted Transport Services—					
Seasonal services .....	574 673	664 010	652 492	375 909	723 000
Other services .....	454 389	559 741	709 138	734 087	785 000
Other .....	58 498	68 123	53 036	100 920	101 000
<b>TOTAL RECEIPTS</b> .....	<b>6 762 798</b>	<b>6 960 703</b>	<b>8 524 456</b>	<b>7 989 409</b>	<b>11 646 000</b>
<b>PAYMENTS—</b>					
Administration .....	1 666 955	1 797 741	1 618 660	1 901 779	2 139 000
Office accommodation, equipment and motor vehicle costs .....	122 961	156 487	154 783	142 904	144 000
Transport subsidies—					
Aircraft services .....	257 865	171 643	453 518	455 196	499 000
Aircraft reserves grants .....	2 117	....	22 000	17 500	....
Omnibus services .....	39 853	10 258	58 335	56 955	54 000
Commercial goods vehicles .....	152 616	130 192	200 368	360 351	336 000
Government assisted transport services—					
Seasonal services .....	4 085 845	3 833 328	5 045 172	4 414 241	7 539 000
Other services .....	454 389	559 741	709 138	734 087	785 000
Transport Commission reserve account for long service leave, administration and property development .....	107 747	126 894	73 455	226 268	62 000
Other .....	45 993	46 967	58 337	47 867	88 000
<b>TOTAL PAYMENTS</b> .....	<b>6 936 341</b>	<b>6 833 251</b>	<b>8 393 766</b>	<b>8 357 148</b>	<b>11 646 000</b>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<b>(173 543)</b>	<b>127 452</b>	<b>130 690</b>	<b>(367 739)</b>	<b>....</b>



## V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

TABLE 31—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN FIRE BRIGADES BOARD

Details	1977-78 Actual	1978-79 Actual	1979-80 Actual	1980-81 Actual	1981-82 Estimate
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>INCOME—</b>					
Balance brought forward .....	431 145	624 630	280 794	1 173 204	50 000
Statutory Contributions—					
Insurance Companies .....	12 173 141	13 801 027	15 651 904	14 486 895	16 892 000
Local Authorities .....	2 028 857	2 300 171	2 608 651	2 414 483	2 815 000
State Government .....	2 028 857	2 300 171	2 608 651	3 868 418	4 205 000
	<u>16 662 000</u>	<u>19 025 999</u>	<u>21 150 000</u>	<u>21 943 000</u>	<u>23 962 000</u>
Fire prevention maintenance charges	747 835	961 959	1 006 698	1 015 445	1 072 000
Section 46B transfers .....	379 605	5 540	8 622		
Other .....	127 392	129 857	416 605	824 028	669 000
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b> .....	<u>17 916 832</u>	<u>20 123 355</u>	<u>22 581 925</u>	<u>23 782 473</u>	<u>25 703 000</u>
<b>EXPENDITURE—</b>					
Salaries, wages, allowances and payroll overheads .....	13 115 190	14 961 766	16 044 277	17 882 128	19 688 000
Debt service costs .....	1 401 847	1 662 574	1 713 687	1 624 704	1 768 000
Maintenance of properties .....	348 742	417 900	654 144	733 714	765 000
Purchase, installation and maintenance of plant and equipment .....	741 829	836 760	1 075 817	1 644 065	1 561 000
Communications .....	152 364	237 174	245 998	187 282	241 000
Insurances (other than workers compensation) .....	311 967	324 428	259 506	321 107	373 000
Depreciation .....	936 000	971 000	945 000	755 700	786 000
Volunteer Fire Brigades—honoraria, travelling expenses, etc.	105 109	134 007	152 449	156 562	182 000
Other .....	179 154	296 952	317 843	426 912	339 000
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> .....	<u>17 292 202</u>	<u>19 842 561</u>	<u>21 408 721</u>	<u>23 732 174</u>	<u>25 703 000</u>
<b>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</b> .....	<u>624 630</u>	<u>280 794</u>	<u>1 173 204</u>	<u>50 299</u>	<u>...</u>

TABLE 32—RECEIPTS FROM COMMONWEALTH TAKEN TO VARIOUS FUNDS OTHER THAN CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND 1980-81

Details	Amount
	\$
<b>LAW, ORDER AND PUBLIC SAFETY—</b>	
Legal Aid .....	3 289 200
National Safety Council .....	24 750
State Emergency Service .....	34 440
Western Australian Fire Brigades Board .....	185 682
<b>EDUCATION—</b>	
Primary and Secondary—Government Schools— Schools Commission Program—	
Capital Purposes (Schools Assistance) Act 1979 .....	6 139 200
Capital Purposes (Schools Assistance) Act 1980 .....	5 014 000
Primary and Secondary—Non-Government Schools— Schools Commission Program—	
Capital Purposes .....	2 926 129
Recurrent Purposes .....	24 088 590
Technical— Technical and Further Education—	
Capital Purposes .....	9 148 346
Non-Government Adult Education .....	46 000
Non-Government Business Colleges .....	453 918
Other—	
Education Research and Development Committee .....	98 692
Multi-cultural Education .....	10 000
Services and Development Program—Education Centres .....	209 464
Special Projects (Innovations Program) .....	217 440
Tertiary—	
Colleges of Advanced Education—	
Affiliated Residential Colleges .....	57 769
Colleges of Advanced Education .....	23 620 625
Western Australian Institute of Technology .....	39 330 375
Universities—	
Murdoch University .....	15 235 348
University of Western Australia .....	46 822 656
University Residential Colleges .....	264 083
<b>CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES—</b>	
Garden Island—Public Access .....	15 601
National Estate .....	330 000
<b>HEALTH—</b>	
Community Health Program .....	237 055
Health Education Campaigns .....	22 525
Pharmaceutical Benefits .....	967 985
Seaport Waste Disposal .....	191 300
Carried Forward .....	178 981 173



## VI.—STATISTICAL SECTION

TABLE 33.—TOTAL NET COLLECTIONS OF STATE TAXATION FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30th JUNE 1981—  
TAKEN TO THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND, TRUST ACCOUNTS, AND SPECIAL ACCOUNTS

Details	Paid to Consolidated Revenue Fund	Paid to Trust or Special Accounts	Total	Taxation per Head of population (a)
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Probate and Succession Duties .....	5 227 614	.....	5 227 614	4
Land Tax .....	25 363 249	.....	25 363 249	20
Third Party Insurance Surcharge .....	3 699 248	.....	3 699 248	3
Payroll Tax .....	197 312 319	.....	197 312 319	154
Other Stamp Duties—				
Conveyances and Transfers .....	44 646 278	.....	44 646 278	35
Insurance Policies .....	13 006 270	.....	13 006 270	10
Cheques, Orders, Procurations, etc. ....	7 201 007	.....	7 201 007	6
Motor Vehicle Licenses .....	7 068 667	.....	7 068 667	5
Mortgages .....	6 294 475	.....	6 294 475	5
Credit Facilities (including Hire Purchase Agreements) .....	16 282 755	.....	16 282 755	13
Other .....	5 311 052	.....	5 311 052	4
Tobacco Licenses .....	10 190 554	.....	10 190 554	8
Liquor Licenses .....	17 951 918	.....	17 951 918	14
Racing—				
Betting Tax—Totalisator Agency Board .....	13 805 310	.....	13 805 310	11
Totalisator Duty and Licenses .....	2 117 725	.....	2 117 725	1
Bookmakers' Betting Tax and Licenses .....	1 328 074	.....	1 328 074	1
Stamp Duty on Betting .....	68 640	.....	68 640	.....
Motor Taxation .....	3 072 473	70 089 237	73 161 710	57
Other Vehicle Taxation .....	46 110	446 067	492 177	.....
Shipping Fees and Permits .....	.....	10	10	.....
Fruit Fly Eradication Registration Fees .....	.....	188	188	.....
Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax .....	.....	4 479 618	4 479 618	4
Licenses not elsewhere included—				
Companies Business Names, etc. ....	4 392 578	.....	4 392 578	3
Boat Registrations .....	506 983	.....	506 983	2
Explosives and Flammable Liquids .....	226 779	.....	226 779	
Factories and Shops .....	622 602	.....	622 602	
Firearms .....	607 231	.....	607 231	
Fisheries .....	301 324	.....	301 324	
Hire Purchase Act .....	107 536	.....	107 536	
Land Agents and Salesmen .....	135 543	.....	135 543	
Motor Vehicle Dealers Act .....	79 162	.....	79 162	
Other .....	264 924	.....	264 924	.....
TOTAL .....	387 238 400	75 015 120	462 253 520	360

(a) Based on estimated mean population for year 1980-81—1 283 200.

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

### BILLS (2): RETURNED

1. Architects Amendment Bill.
2. Abattoirs Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

### SMALL CLAIMS TRIBUNALS AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

**MR YOUNG** (Scarborough—Minister for Health) [7.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Act has been in operation for several years. During that time amendments have been made to overcome practical and procedural difficulties that have become apparent. Further difficulties have been drawn to attention which necessitate the amendments in the Bill now before members. The proposed amendments are therefore to formalise procedures adopted by the Small Claims Tribunal, to clarify certain matters, and to assist in administrative functions.

The majority of amendments to various definitions of the Act relate purely to matters requiring greater clarity. The term "consumer" has suffered certain anomalous situations, where for instance a claimant had, after retiring from his occupation, purchased a fishing boat and intended in the future to carry on business as a professional fisherman. In this case the claimant was a consumer when in fact he intended to become a trader. The proposed amendment will alleviate this present anomaly.

The inclusion of the term "fixed amount" is to simplify references in the Act. It does not change the jurisdictional limit placed on the tribunal.

The inclusion of the definition of "services" is consequential to the 1980 amendment to the Consumer Affairs Act which permitted the bureau to investigate and deal with insurance matters, other than workers' compensation insurance and third party motor vehicle insurance effected under the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act. The Bureau of Consumer Affairs cannot always solve these matters by agreement and under the existing provisions of the Small Claims Tribunals Act the tribunal does not have jurisdiction over matters arising out of contracts of insurance. The amendment will overcome this difficulty.

The definition of "small claim" is to be amended to provide, firstly, that the return of goods can be a small claim; and, secondly, in relation to tenancy bond matters, that the tribunal may deal with matters in excess of the actual bond, but not exceeding the jurisdictional limit.

The first amendment referred to is as a result of an appeal to the Supreme Court against a decision by a former referee. In the second case matters relating to non-return by landlords of bond money to tenants come before the tribunal. In many cases the landlord claims damages and arrears of rent in excess of the bond. Because the tribunal is limited to the amount of the bond, the landlord has gone to the Local Court to obtain the excess. This involves the tenant in additional costs. Additionally this procedure is seen as being unnecessary when the matter already has been before the tribunal.

Because the definition was becoming unwieldy the opportunity has been taken to rewrite it. This has the added advantages of making the definition easier to read and also of including the current jurisdictional limit of \$1 000, so that the Act can be interpreted in this respect without reference to the regulations.

There are a great number of occasions when a person comes to the counter of the Small Claims Tribunal wishing to enforce an order of the tribunal which has already been made. Among other things, this involves the swearing of an affidavit stating that all, none, or part of the amount has been paid.

The difficulty of swearing arises because justices of the peace are not always available. There are also cases where a person wishes to file an affidavit of evidence for the tribunal to consider. This necessitates also the availability of a justice of the peace to take the affidavit.

As part of the Government's commitment to rationalise and reduce public inconvenience where possible, it has decided to amend the Act to permit the registrar and other responsible persons to witness affidavits required by the Act.

There is difficulty in respect to the power of the tribunal to order replacement of defective goods. The Act currently provides that the tribunal may make an order that requires a party to the proceeding—other than the claimant—to perform work to rectify a defect in goods and services. Generally speaking there is no difficulty with performing work to rectify services, but on the wording of the current provision there can be in relation to goods. The party concerned is required to do work only to rectify.

Under existing legislation the tribunal has power to order the return of goods even where the property therein has passed, and, in addition, to order the repayment of the purchase price.

There are cases, however, where money payment, etc., does not compensate the claimant. The proposed amendment will empower the tribunal in clearer words to make an order requiring a party to replace goods in the proper circumstances.

An order made by a tribunal which exceeds the jurisdiction makes the whole of it of no effect. Such an order is considered to be a nullity and, while it is not free from doubt, there can be a rehearing. The Government is concerned that this adds expense and inconvenience to the parties and the tribunal.

For this reason it is proposed to provide that an order either for the payment of money or for the performance of work which exceeds the jurisdiction is of no effect only as to the excess and is valid effective up to the amount of the jurisdiction.

Section 23(1) of the present Act is cumbersome and unworkable in practice. On the wording of the current section, an order must first be made and then the proceeding has to be adjourned to a specific date or indefinitely, and, at the same time, leave is then granted to renew the reference. As stated, this is a cumbersome procedure and if followed would result in so many adjournments that the tribunal would never catch up.

The proposed amendments relating to contempt provisions are considered necessary so as to provide that the tribunal itself may deal with an offender who may be summarily convicted by the tribunal.

The current section relating to contempt has shortcomings. If an offending party is excluded from the tribunal it would be difficult to come to a decision in his absence and if a decision is arrived at in the absence of the party it may amount to a breach of natural justice.

The method of procedure to convict a person is not set out nor is the offence said to be punishable summarily, nor in what court the proceedings are to be taken.

It is considered that any such extended power would not be abused, especially as the referees must be qualified legal practitioners and past history has shown no abuse of such power.

Other minor amendments have been included to update title references.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Parker.

## BILLS (2): MESSAGES

### *Appropriations*

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Appropriation (Consolidated Revenue Fund) Bill.
2. Workers' Compensation and Assistance Bill.

## AGRICULTURE AND RELATED RESOURCES PROTECTION AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [8.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Under the Act a rate is levied on land held under pastoral lease. The rate is based on the amount of rent charged for the lease at 30 June 1976, which is the day before the Act came into force, or in the case of leases granted since that date, on the first rent charged.

Anomalies have occurred, particularly in the Kimberley where in 1979 there was a review of the rents charged for pastoral leases. This resulted in a considerable rise in the rents of a number of properties. For rating purposes this has made no difference to landholders who have not altered the terms of their leases in any way, because if the leases were granted before 30 June 1976, they still continue to pay rates based on the rent charged at that date. The pastoralists who have been affected are those who have altered their leases, and particularly when they have extended their properties by incorporating land adjacent to theirs. This practice of amalgamation is encouraged by the Pastoral Board to improve viability of pastoral leases.

When such an amalgamation is made a new lease document is issued by the Lands and Surveys Department, and because of the wording of the Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act, the rate is charged on the basis of rent imposed for this new lease. In the case of the Kimberley this is the 1979 rent, and an instance has occurred where a lessee extended his boundaries by taking in a relatively small portion of additional land, but the issue of the new lease at the new rent meant that his rate payments have increased more than three-fold. His neighbours, whose leases are unchanged, still have to pay only at the old level.

Clauses 3(a) and 3(b) of the Bill are designed to correct such anomalies.

Clause 3(c) is purely a re-enactment of an existing section of the Act to conform with the amendments proposed in this Bill, and amendments which have been made previously to the Land Act.

Clause 3(d) relates to other anomalies which were found to occur when the sizes of pastoral holdings were reduced, or a lessee lost use of part of his land. This has happened when portion of a holding has been resumed or surrendered, or when the owner has been required by the Minister for Lands to reduce the stock numbers on his lease. In such cases the actual rent charged for the lease by the Lands and Surveys Department was reduced, but for the purpose of the pastoral rate it remained frozen at the 1976 level, which meant the owner was still being rated on land he could not use.

The Bill proposes that when a leaseholder has lost part of his land, or the use of part of it, and his rent has been reduced by the Minister for Lands, I be empowered to similarly reduce the rent value for rating purposes. I would stress that any figure I may determine applies for the purposes of the rate only where loss of use of land has occurred. It will not apply to any variation made by the Minister for Lands in his periodic review of rents charged on all pastoral leases, in the terms of section 98DA of the Land Act.

This legislation does not affect the obligation of landholders to pay rates which were assessed prior to 1 July, 1981. The power given to me to determine a lower rent dates from that date, so it will enable me to correct any anomalies which I find to have occurred in the current rating year.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Evans.

## ACTS AMENDMENT (MINING) BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 22 September.

**MR GRILL** (Yilgarn-Dundas) [8.08 p.m.]: The mining laws of this State are in confusion—in fact, they are in utter confusion. The measure before the House is designed to amend the Mining Act 1978. The Mining Bill of 1978 was assented to on 8 December of that year. However, three or four sections only of that Act have been proclaimed and, at this time, the remainder of the Act remains unproclaimed.

At present the mining laws of the State are governed by the provisions of the old 1904 Act, including the regulations made under that Act

which has been amended once already this year, and I do not think the Government can rule out the possibility of further amendments before the 1978 Act comes into operation.

We have before us a Bill which proposes major amendments to the Bill passed in 1978, and which at that time we were told was the last word in mining legislation.

**Mr Coyne**: Minor amendments.

**Mr GRILL**: Did the honourable member say "minor amendments"?

**Mr Coyne**: Yes.

**Mr GRILL**: Some of the amendments in the Bill before us are major amendments.

**Mr Coyne**: Which ones?

**Mr GRILL**: We have before us amendments to legislation which we were told was the last word in mining law. Yet three sections only of that legislation have come into operation. As well as that, two sets of draft regulations have been prepared, but as far as we know, no regulations have been agreed upon as yet. The Act remains substantially unproclaimed and inoperative.

To add to the confusion, the major Government party at its annual conference this year passed a motion condemning the 1978 Act and calling for its repeal. The conference based its condemnation on the fact that the Act strikes at the very basis of Liberal Party philosophy.

The Premier reacted by saying, "We will give the Act a try for a year. We will see how it goes for 12 months, and if it does not work, we will repeal it or amend it". Even the Government is not certain as to the sort of laws which should be governing mining in this State.

There is confusion in the ranks of the major Government party about the 1978 Act, and the other major party in the State—the Australian Labor Party—has indicated to the public that if it becomes the Government in 1983 it will repeal the 1978 Act and revert to the 1904 Act with amendments.

**Mr Davies**: And the people of Kalgoorlie endorsed that.

**Mr GRILL**: They endorsed it absolutely.

**Mr Sodeman**: How does it affect you?

**Mr Coyne**: You have learnt a lot about mining in a short time!

**Mr GRILL**: The Mining Act affects all of us.

**Mr Coyne**: Yes, the Labor Government introduced it.

**Mr GRILL**: The 1978 Act was introduced by the Liberal Government.

Mr Coyne: You are responsible for the legislation of 1972; you ratted on your Minister.

Mr GRILL: So we have the situation where the Liberal Party is not certain what it will do with the Act. Its lay wing wants the Act withdrawn completely.

Sir Charles Court: We know exactly what to do.

Mr GRILL: The Premier is giving it a year's try.

Sir Charles Court: Where did you get this "one year's try" from?

Mr GRILL: The Premier told his own party that the Act was to have one year's probation.

Sir Charles Court: No, I said it would be kept under review. If we find it has anomalies in it, the anomalies will be corrected in consultation with the industry.

Mr GRILL: The Premier mentioned a period of 12 months during which the legislation would be given a try.

Sir Charles Court: A year or two.

Mr Pearce: You are admitting it now.

Sir Charles Court: That has been inherent in all the Government's legislation.

Mr GRILL: The Premier is confused in his own mind as to what he said on that occasion.

Sir Charles Court: Certainly not.

Mr GRILL: How are the people of the State to understand if the Premier does not know?

Sir Charles Court: You had better go back and do a bit more homework; do a bit more claim trading.

Mr Barnett: You are retiring in 1981.

Several members interjected.

Mr GRILL: Let me reassure the Government at this stage; the Opposition does not intend to oppose this Bill. However, we do intend to move some amendments to it.

Let me make one point crystal clear. The Act, and the Bill before us, do nothing for the mining industry. They do nothing for the mining companies; and they do even less for the prospectors.

Mr Coyne: Absolute nonsense!

Mr GRILL: It is absolutely true.

Mr Coyne: It will revolutionise mining in this State.

Mr GRILL: Apart from correcting a few anomalies in the 1978 Act, the Bill detracts from the position of mining companies and prospectors in some very serious ways. It bends over

backwards to accommodate the pastoralists, firstly—

Mr Sodeman: They do not agree with that.

Mr GRILL: —and, secondly, it bends over backwards to accommodate the farmers. If the member for Pilbara does not agree with that, he has not read the Bill.

Mr Sodeman: I am saying the pastoralists do not agree with that.

Mr GRILL: Any fair-minded person would have to agree that this Bill bends over backwards to accommodate two entrenched sections of the community which have been aligned traditionally with Government parties—two sections of the community which have always been more than well catered for by the coalition.

This Bill is abhorrent to the people of the eastern goldfields—absolutely abhorrent. One has to look only—

Mr Coyne: You mean abhorrent to the Mayor of Kalgoorlie?

Mr GRILL: —at the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of Saturday, 10 October to see the following—

#### FINLAYSON TALKS OF BLOODSHED OVER ACT

The State Government's rejection of the latest submission on the new Mining Act had received an angry reaction from the Goldfields ward of the Country Shire Councils' Association and would eventually lead to bloodshed, the association's chairman, Mr Ray Finlayson, said yesterday.

Mr Coyne: He would love that to happen.

Mr GRILL: He was commenting about the rejection by the Government of a submission by a number of country shire councils, including Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie, Laverton, Menzies, Yilgarn, Dundas, Esperance, and Leonora. He was speaking on behalf of every shire in the eastern goldfields, with the exception of one.

Mr P. V. Jones: Which was the submission he was referring to?

Mr GRILL: That was the submission placed before the Minister for Mines by the goldfields ward of the Country Shire Councils' Association.

Mr P. V. Jones: Can you tell me when? I read that, and I am having a little difficulty in identifying what submission he was talking about.

Mr GRILL: For the edification of the Minister, I indicate this is the submission of 13 August 1981.



Mr Wilson: He is a bit behind in his correspondence.

Mr GRILL: The Government would like the people to think that the Mayor of Kalgoorlie is an isolated voice in respect of this Act. It would like the people to think that he is a voice in the wilderness. However, that is not the case. The true situation is that the Bill and the Act are abhorrent to most people in the goldfields.

Mr Coyne: When you say "most people in the goldfields", what do you mean?

Mr Wilson: Everyone but you.

Mr GRILL: Sometimes the member for Murchison-Eyre goes to the area. He might know some of the people involved.

Mr Coyne: Only 4 per cent of the people in Kalgoorlie objected to it—to one specific area of it. Doug Dawes said the other day that 95 per cent of them think the Bill is first class. All they are trying to do is get the 5 per cent improved. The 5 per cent refers to exploration.

Mr GRILL: That is a very subjective view. Let me quote the objective test. That was the last by-election in Kalgoorlie, when the present member was elected. By and large, that was regarded by the Labor Party as a referendum on the Mining Act. The Labor Party stated categorically that the by-election was a referendum on the Mining Act. At that by-election, not only did the Labor Party win the seat and retain its traditional vote, but it increased its traditional vote by 6 per cent. That was the objective test, and it cannot be refuted.

Mr Sodeman: How much coverage did the local newspaper give the Liberal Party during that election?

Mr Wilson: As much as it deserved.

Mr Pearce: More than it deserved—it was mentioned, for a start.

Mr Coyne: There was a big sympathy campaign.

Mr GRILL: It is surprising to hear that comment from the Liberal Party benches. I will break down and cry in a minute!

Mr P. V. Jones: Are we talking about this Bill before the House now?

Mr GRILL: We are talking about the Act.

Mr P. V. Jones: The parent Act?

Mr GRILL: Yes, the parent Act.

Mr Davies: And what the public thinks of it.

Mr GRILL: I referred this Bill to the Prospectors Association, as I normally do. The association reacted by saying simply, "We don't

want to know what's in it. As far as we are concerned, we aren't going to operate under the new Act. We're not going to have a bar of it". I do not claim that is an intelligent stance to take. I am not saying that it is a correct stance to take. However, I am saying that that stance is being taken. That is how the prospectors in the eastern goldfields feel about the Act.

Members on the Government side can think what they like, and they can take advice from individuals like Doug Dawes, the Liberal Party candidate who was beaten thoroughly in two successive elections in Kalgoorlie because he did not know how to read the thoughts and the aspirations of the people in the electorate.

Mr Clarko: How many votes would you get in Nedlands?

Mr GRILL: The fact is that the people in the goldfields do not want a bar of the 1978 Mining Act.

In offering no opposition to this Bill today, we do not detract one bit from the stance that we have taken in relation to the Mining Act. When we come into power, we will withdraw that Act holus-bolus.

I turn now to the Bill before us. In his second reading speech, the Minister indicated the four main areas in which the parent Act was to be amended. The first was to transfer oil shale exploration from the Petroleum Act to the Mining Act. The second was to amend the private landholding provisions to give farmers the right to veto mining on private land—fairly strong words, but they are the words used, not just by me, but by the Minister in a recent Press release in the southern part of this State, if he was reported correctly.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not what the second reading speech said.

Mr GRILL: No. They are the Minister's words in a country newspaper.

Mr P. V. Jones: No, that is what somebody reported me as saying.

Mr GRILL: I think that person was correct.

Mr Old: How would you know? Did you see the Press release?

Mr GRILL: If the words ascribed to the Minister were an accurate reflection of what he said, what he was saying was true; and he knows it is true.

Mr Old: Well said!

Mr GRILL: Thirdly, the Bill will give wide-ranging powers to the mining warden to grant compensation to holders of pastoral leases where

they have suffered not only damage to the improvements on their property, but also substantial loss of earnings. That is a vexed question, and I will deal with it shortly.

Mr Sodeman: You are not saying that is improper?

Mr GRILL: No.

Mr Sodeman: It has been a gray area for a long time.

Mr GRILL: Fourthly and lastly, the Bill makes a host of minor amendments to tidy up errors in the parent Act—errors in drafting and errors of omission—and to take account of new interpretations of the Act in line with recent decisions of courts, and with reinterpretations by the Crown Law Department.

In respect of the first of those four major objectives, at present oil shale exploration is administered under the Petroleum Act. However, the exploration and mining techniques for coal and oil shale are very similar. I am told by the Minister—and I understand it is correct—that it is difficult or impossible to differentiate between coal and shale. Conflicts have arisen when different companies have been prospecting for coal and shale on the same ground, under the Mining Act and the Petroleum Act respectively.

The Opposition agrees that the amendments in respect of oil shale are proper amendments; and we support them. In further amplification of that stance, we indicate that in most States of the Commonwealth oil shale and coal are treated in the same way, and normally under the same Act.

The next area is the private landholder provisions. Those are much more vexing issues. The change in the provisions relating to mining on private land means that private land cannot be taken possession of by a miner without the consent of the owner. That means, really, that the owner of private land can now veto mining upon that land if that mining is down to 30 metres. The landholder can preclude access by miners to his land when the mining is deeper than 30 metres.

The change in philosophy by the Government in respect of this section of the Act, in my view and in the view of the Opposition as a whole, is a complete sellout of the Government's previously expressed philosophy on this matter. The fair and equitable arbitration provisions which were provided under the 1978 Act are to be repealed and replaced by provisions which give farmers and private landholders the right of veto over mining upon their land. What is more, the farmers will be given the right to sell the minerals on that land to the highest bidder.

Always it has been the philosophy of successive Governments of this State since 1904 that the owners of private land, or the owners of any land except land taken possession of under the Mining Act, do not obtain the mineral rights to that land.

Under this amendment to the private landholders' provision, owners of private land now have the *de facto* right to sell the minerals in that land as they like. That is a departure from the express philosophy of successive Governments of this State. Under the Bill "private land" is defined in a very wide manner. If we look at clause 9(3) we see that private land includes land under cultivation and that includes—

- (a) land being used for the purpose of cropping or pasturing;
- (b) land, whether cleared or uncleared, used for the grazing of stock in the ordinary course of management of the land of the owner of which the land so used forms the whole or any part;

That is a very wide definition of "private land" and it could be said that it takes in all pastoral land held under freehold title, whether cleared or uncleared. It is a very wide definition and it probably exceeds the definition which applied under the 1904 Act.

The sell-out by the Government—it can be called only a "sell-out"—was forced on it by the Primary Industry Association of WA and its lobby. That demonstrates a real weakness in this Government.

As I said before, the Government has bent over backwards to accommodate the Primary Industry Association of WA lobby. It has done that against its will, but nonetheless it has done it, and it has demonstrated a real weakness in this Government when it comes to dealing with vested interests. The Government is unable to deal effectively with those vested interests when they are of importance to the electoral success of the coalition parties.

Unfortunately—and here is the rub for the Labor Party—the new provisions under this Bill are very similar to those contained in the 1904 Act. Consequently we are somewhat embarrassed by the fact that we are committed to support the 1904 Act and, as such, are committed to support similar provisions which give owners of private land a veto over the mining of minerals on those lands and the right to sell the minerals to the highest bidder.

We do not oppose the provisions relating to private landholding, but we feel it incumbent upon us to indicate that both sides of the House in many respects are acting against their own philosophies and in fact what we are doing is

giving the minerals in private land to the private landowners to do with as they wish.

Mr Sodeman: That is inconsistent with the ALP's stated policy as regards freehold land, if you advocate such a proposition in that regard.

Mr GRILL: If I advocate what?

Mr Sodeman: If people have freehold land they should be able to do with it as they wish, particularly in respect of minerals.

Mr GRILL: I do not believe that is our philosophy, but we will deal with that shortly, because we intend to move some amendments to the Bill.

The third major area of amendment in the Bill relates to compensation to pastoral leaseholders. The Bill grants very wide powers to pastoral leaseholders which will be exercised ultimately by the warden of the Supreme Court who will grant compensation to pastoral leaseholders not only where improvements upon a pastoral property have been effected, but also where substantial loss of earnings has flowed from damage to improvements.

Two comments may be made in respect of those amendments to the Act. The first comment is that the Government has again bent over backwards to accommodate vested interests.

Mr Coyne: You are totally wrong there.

Mr GRILL: The Government has bent over backwards to accommodate pastoralists in respect of compensation.

Mr Sodeman: You are saying their claim is not valid and they should not be accommodated.

Mr GRILL: There should be some accommodation, but the Government has bent over backwards to accommodate a traditional vested interest which is associated closely with the Liberal Party.

The second comment which could be made about these provisions is that they will open up a treasure chest for lawyers. There is no question about that.

Mr Coyne: You have already opened it yourself.

Mr GRILL: There are those in our community who would like to see more straightforward laws and laws which are less open to different interpretations and less likely to lead to litigation. This legislation will open a whole new Pandora's box of legal interpretation.

Mr Coyne: How will that happen?

Mr GRILL: It is relatively simple to look at improvements and to decide whether they have been damaged. It is much more difficult to look at

those improvements, decide they have been damaged, and then arrive at a consequential loss which has flowed from that damage by way of loss of earnings. The words "substantial loss of earnings" appear in the Bill.

Mr Sodeman: Does not that happen with workers' compensation?

Mr GRILL: I ask members: What is substantial? What is substantial to one person may be quite insubstantial to another. The word "substantial" is subjective.

Mr Coyne: A 1 000-strong community on your property represents a substantial loss of earnings. It puts the whole operation beyond control and they should be compensated on that basis.

Mr GRILL: Indeed, having 1 000 people on one's property would result in some damage; but having one person on one's property may or may not result in damage.

Mr Coyne: There are 2 000 people on Laverton Downs. There is no way you can carry on an operation on that basis.

Mr Pearce: How many people do you have on your roll—about 1 000?

Mr GRILL: In any event, I ask the Minister in his reply to define the meaning of "substantial loss of earnings". I ask the Minister to indicate that this provision will not open a Pandora's box of litigation. The Minister knows this clause will open the door to all sorts of litigation. That cannot be denied by the Government, because it is obvious. The clause will open the way to all sorts of litigation.

I am not here to say the pastoralists should not be compensated properly. All I am saying is this provision is vague and it does not indicate on what grounds or under what criteria compensation should be awarded. The provision merely says quite blandly and openly that compensation will be awarded when there has been substantial loss of earnings. It could not be wider than that, it could not be vaguer than that, and it leaves the whole matter open to interpretation.

Every pastoralist and every miner will interpret the provision in a different way. In the past we have seen conflict between the mining company on the one hand and the pastoralist on the other hand; we see such conflict presently and it will exist in the future. If, as appears to be the case, the Government is making a legitimate effort in this provision to lessen such conflict, we will go along with it; but the provision appears to be too wide and too vague.

Within six months or a year of the proclamation of this legislation, the Government

will bring it back to define this clause, because it will open up a Pandora's box of legal interpretation.

We are not saying the Government is not making a legitimate attempt to ease the conflict to which I have referred, and we will not offer any opposition to this provision if that is the case, but let us not put our heads in the sand and say this particular provision will not cause trouble. Of course it will. All sorts of situations will arise as a result of this provision and it cannot be said blandly that this clause will work. We will see whether it works and it is my feeling that, in 12 months' time, the Government will be back here amending this provision in an endeavour to make it clearer.

The Government has indicated it will make a whole host of amendments to the Act to allow for better transition of the 1978 legislation. That is not true. The Government is making a number of small amendments to the Act—some of them are rather important—because errors were made in the 1978 legislation. We saw errors of omission, errors of interpretation, and errors in drafting, and they are being cleared up now. Let us be frank about the fact that errors were made in the 1978 legislation, and those errors are being rectified now.

In his second reading speech the Minister listed a number of amendments this legislation seeks to make. They read as follows—

These amendments include provisions—

to ensure that all land the subject of an agreement with the State will be protected in the transmission of the new Act;

That matter was omitted in the previous legislation and it laid open to attack every major agreement signed by this Government in respect of mining development in this State. Every major mining development was open to attack because of an omission made in the drafting of the 1978 legislation and that is why this amendment has been brought forward today. It is not before us to enable better transition provisions, but rather it has been found necessary because of an error which the Government made. The Government should stand up and say it made an error in this regard. To continue—

to provide a procedure for dealing with applications for mining tenements over land which has been exempted from the operations of the Act;

That particular amendment has come about because of a recent decision of the Supreme Court. It has nothing to do with transition. It has

come about because of a new legal interpretation. To continue—

to allow the Minister a discretionary power to exempt holders of exploration licences for iron ore from having to relinquish areas after the end of the third and fourth years of the term of licence;

That amendment is necessary because of another error of omission. Let me indicate also that, during the Committee stages, we shall ask the Minister to consider expanding this amendment so that his discretion can be exercised with respect to other minerals when it is thought necessary. I realise the department tells the Minister it will happen in respect of only iron ore, but our advice is it could happen in respect of other minerals and, if the Minister is to have these powers, they should be as wide as possible and they should be exercised in a responsible and flexible manner. To continue—

to allow for reinstatement in certain cases of prospecting licences and miscellaneous licences which have been forfeited;

That amendment is necessary because of another obvious error of omission and it should be accepted as such by the Government. To continue—

to include exploration licences in the provisions for forfeiture for non-payment of rent;

So they should be included and so they should have been under the 1978 Act. To continue—

to relate exemption of expenditure conditions to sums of money, rather than to periods of time;

That is the proper logic to use and that is the way it should have been under the 1978 legislation. It is a further error which is being remedied. To continue—

to clarify that section 112, which allows the Crown to remove rock, stone, clay, sand, or gravel from prospecting licences and exploration licences for use for any public purpose, does not apply where such licences are on private land;

That amendment comes about because of a new interpretation of that section by the Crown Law Department. The 1978 Act is to be amended to provide for priorities for applicants for mining tenements according to the time and date of lodgment. That is the situation that applies under the old 1904 Mining Act and is a situation which

should have applied under the 1978 Act when that measure was first assented to.

In respect of the transition provisions, all the provisions set out in schedule 11 are to be withdrawn or repealed and rewritten, and quite properly so. But whilst criticising the Government for not frankly saying that these amendments are due to errors or omissions and errors of drafting, I do thank the Minister for making available to us the services of the under secretary to explain to us some of the amendments that are being made. That was of great assistance to me and my colleagues in coming to some decision about these provisions. We feel that all the amendments I have just mentioned are good and proper and we have no opposition to them.

There is an area in respect of the 1978 Act and the Bill before us where the Opposition sincerely feels that the Government could give some further consideration in relation to the special situation of Aborigines living on Aboriginal reserves and Aboriginal groups living on pastoral leases which have been set aside, not so much for pastoral purposes, but in reality, for groups of Aborigines to live. We put the case that Aborigines on Aboriginal reserves constituting a sizeable community of something at least in excess of 50, and Aborigines of similar groups living on those special pastoral leases referred to above should be afforded the same protection that owners of freehold land are given in respect of the minerals on those lands by the amendment to the private landholder provisions in this particular Bill.

Mr Stephens: What are the differences between these amendments and what exists in the 1904 Act?

Mr GRILL: As I understand it, the provisions are fairly similar.

Mr Stephens: So you object to the provisions that exist and are operating now in relation to mining of private land?

Mr GRILL: No. What I have said is this—

Mr Stephens: Why do you object to our retaining those provisions?

Mr GRILL: What I say is that we do not object to it, but that when we pass this Bill, in fact members on that side of the House and on this side of the House will be breaching the express policy of successive Governments which have said that minerals do not go with private land. In a *de facto* sense, by granting the holder of private land a veto over the mining of that land the provision is giving him the right to sell those minerals to the highest bidder. We will not oppose those provisions, but we should not fool ourselves about what we are doing. We are giving him the

right to sell those minerals which are on his land—there are no two ways about it.

The Aborigines, however, represent a genuine and separate case and separate and sincere consideration should be given to their plight. Real compromises should be made for them and some way should be found around the ongoing social tragedy which applies to groups of Aborigines living on pastoral and Aboriginal reserves. The amendments which we will put forward later will be in the spirit of compromise in the hope that both sides of the House can see their way clear to do something for Aborigines in this special case.

In concluding, I will just sum up by saying that the Opposition states quite categorically: This Bill and the parent Act do absolutely nothing for the miner; the Government has bent over backwards to accommodate vested interests that have been close to them over the years—namely, the primary industry lobby and the pastoralists—and it has done nothing for the people for whom the Act was promulgated.

A lot of mud is thrown at miners. I was recently at a seminar when Mr Parry, one of the directors of Western Mining Corporation, correctly pointed out to the people assembled that the great destroyers of the Australian environment have not been the miners. In fact, in his words, if all the mining operations in Western Australia were put together in one space they would not take up an area as large as the metropolitan area of Perth. I think that would be right.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is right.

Mr GRILL: It has been the increase in the size of towns—

Mr P. V. Jones: Mt. Newman could fit into Kings Park.

Mr GRILL: —that has been the great destroyer of our environment. The second great destroyer has been the farmer who has destroyed great tracts of land for one reason or another, many of them good reasons. Nonetheless, the great environment destroyers in this country have been the farmers and it is this particular Bill that caters so much for those farming and pastoral interests and so little, in our opinion, for the genuine prospector and small mining company.

Mr McPharlin: The land has not been destroyed.

Mr GRILL: Much of it has been destroyed by erosion and in other ways. There is real resentment and belligerence in the eastern goldfields in respect of this particular Act. Right or wrong, the people on the eastern goldfields

believe that they have been hard done by with the 1978 Mining Act and have no sympathy for its objectives and no interest in this particular group of amendments to it. That feeling of resentment is only exacerbated by this Bill which they see as catering for vested interests close to the Government.

**MR I. F. TAYLOR (Kalgoorlie)** [8.55 p.m.]: I speak in support of the remarks made by my colleague, the member for Yilgarn-Dundas and the Opposition shadow Minister for Mines. This Bill is not one to which we object as a whole. The 1978 Act itself is, of course, one that the Opposition objects to very strongly. The Government knows the Kalgoorlie by-election was one in which the 1978 Mining Act was one of the key issues. In fact, the Opposition called for the people of Kalgoorlie to make the by-election a referendum on the 1978 Mining Act. We are all aware of the actual results of that by-election. I am quite certain that the 1978 Mining Act and the people's attitude in the Kalgoorlie area to that Act was reflected by the 6½ per cent swing to the Labor Party.

Not only are people in Kalgoorlie concerned about the 1978 Mining Act, but of course prospecting organisations and prospectors throughout the State have expressed very great anger to the Government about its contents. Local government bodies have referred submissions to the Government on the 1978 Act. In fact, the member for Yilgarn-Dundas already has mentioned to the Minister for Mines the submission made by the Goldfields ward of the Country Shire Councils' Association. In fact, at the annual general meeting of the Country Shire Councils' Association of 3 August this year it was resolved that it should put a submission along those lines to the Minister for Mines and that it fully supported the growing protest from local authorities to the terms of the new Act. Represented at that meeting of the Country Shire Councils' Association was the City of Bunbury, the Towns of Kalgoorlie, Narrogin, Albany, Northam, Geraldton, and the Shires of Mandurah, Collic, Boulder, Merredin, Busselton, and Albany—a wide range of local councils throughout Western Australia. One of the principal objections to the Act is the wide power conferred on the Minister over and above that already contained in the existing Act.

Mr P. V. Jones: Your colleague was just saying he wants to extend the Minister's powers.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Only in one small area. The Minister's powers were referred to in a speech by Mr Brodie-Hall in 1973 when he said—

One of the most unsatisfactory operations of mining legislation is the amount of discretion given to the Minister.

He went on to say—

If the Government has formulated a policy on exploration and mining it should be embodied in the legislation and few discretionary powers should be necessary.

Recently in this House I put to the Minister for Mines a matter concerning a Mr Darrell Crouch, a prospector in the Leonora area. Mr Crouch had been deprived of a goldmining lease as a result of the Minister's decision to use his discretion to overturn the decision of the Warden's Court.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not right. He had not been deprived. It had not been granted. You are wrong to say that.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I have today spoken to people in the Bond Corporation Pty Ltd and Amalgamated Industries Ltd and have been very pleased to learn that Amalgamated Industries is now prepared to return that goldmining lease to Mr Crouch subject to a few legalities being cleared up. It is very gratifying to know that some corporations such as the Bond Corporation are aware of difficulties that may be faced by prospectors as a result of decisions made by the Minister.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not what I was told today.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: In fact, Mr Crouch has told me that despite the Minister's assurances, he is yet to be contacted by the Mines Department on this issue. That was some three weeks ago.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not what the Bond Corporation told me today. It is not the Bond Corporation anyway.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is Amalgamated Industries which is a subsidiary of the Bond Corporation.

Mr P. V. Jones: It is not able to give the goldmining lease to Mr Crouch.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It is not able to give it to him, but it is able to sell it to him for 10c or \$1, but there are a few legalities attached to it. It is possible for the corporation, and it intends, to return the goldmining lease to Mr Crouch, and I think that is an admirable decision on its part.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not my understanding.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: That was my understanding as at 12.00 midday today.

There are some matters in the Bill that the Opposition is concerned about. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas has already mentioned the

provisions in relation to the compensation to pastoral leaseholders which in fact open a Pandora's box and perhaps they open a treasure chest, so far as lawyers throughout Western Australia are concerned.

It will be very difficult actually to come to some agreement between the mining companies and the leaseholders as to what in fact a specific "loss of earnings" means. I cannot understand how the mining companies and the pastoral leaseholders would ever come to an agreement unless the sums involved from the mining companies in terms of payment to the leaseholders are very substantial indeed.

We also raise the question of compensation for substantial loss of earnings in regard to the clearing bans in catchment areas in the south-west of the State. I understand that no compensation was paid for loss of earnings for the farmers concerned.

My remarks are brief; in fact, I just wanted to ensure that our objections and the objections of the people of Kalgoorlie to the 1978 Mining Act are recorded. I wanted to ensure also that Amalgamated Industries Ltd. is given some recognition for the way it handled the situation it faced because of the actions of Mr Crouch and the Mines Department. I support the Bill.

**MR COWAN** (Merredin) [9.01 p.m.]: This Bill is welcomed by members of the National Party. You will recall, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Nanovich), that when a debate took place in 1978 we were the only conservative party which opposed the Bill.

Mr Bryce: Bush socialists!

**Mr COWAN:** That might be the opinion of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. However, we had two valid reasons for opposing the legislation. Firstly, we believed that property owners would not have the same rights that they had under the 1904 Act. Secondly, we were led to believe that the prospectors would suffer very greatly under its provisions. We are not too sure about the provisions in regard to prospectors under the Bill before us now. However, we believe the Bill will not alter the situation as far as prospectors are concerned.

The legislation however will make a substantial difference to the rights and privileges enjoyed by property owners—whether the property is freehold, leasehold, or conditional purchase. The amendments are in line with the argument we have put forward since 1978.

I accept that the principle behind mining and mineral exploration in Western Australia, and indeed in Australia, has been always that

minerals are the property of the Crown. There has been conflict when a farmer wishes to make a living from agriculture using the surface of the land, and a mining company or a prospector wishes to exploit the minerals under the surface of the land. It was in regard to this conflict that most of the argument arose.

There must be some recognition of the rights of a person who has freehold title or some other title to land which he uses for agricultural purposes, if minerals are discovered on it. I accept also that it is possible for a property owner to be able to sell, not the minerals, but certainly the property, to a mining company or a prospector at a highly inflated price.

I think the member for Yilgarn-Dundas will accept that currently when mining companies purchase agricultural land, the purchase price is roughly double the assessed value of the property. That is an accepted practice in mining circles. It has been followed for years, and I suggest it will continue.

Even though a farmer has the right to determine whether or not a company will mine on his property, he really does not have title over the minerals. He can deny access to the minerals unless a particular price is paid for his property or a satisfactory agreement has been reached. In my opinion that has been a fair and reasonable compensation to a person deprived of his livelihood. I do not think the member for Yilgarn-Dundas would find many mining companies which would object to the 1904 provisions in relation to mining on private land. My interpretation of the provisions in the Bill before us is that it will merely restore to the private landholder the rights he had under the 1904 Act.

**Mr Grill:** That is right.

**Mr COWAN:** For that reason we welcome the Bill; we believe it is a step in the right direction.

As I stated before, we are less familiar with the effect of the 1978 Act upon prospectors. I am well aware that prospectors believe it will be more difficult for them to earn their living through prospecting under that Act, although their position will be determined more by the regulations to be prescribed under that Act than by the Act itself.

In general the clauses of the Bill before us which deal specifically with private landowners are welcomed by us; we have been arguing for these provisions since 1978.

I welcome also the decision to offer some form of compensation to pastoral lessees. I do not think it will be difficult for parties to reach some understanding or agreement in connection with

compensation, particularly as the compensation must relate to a loss of income. It would be quite simple to ascertain the precise loss of income which a pastoralist will suffer from a mining activity or a mining venture on his pastoral property.

I believe a mineral explorer and a pastoralist will be able to readily agree to a compensation figure.

We have no argument with the provisions which are to correct anomalies in the 1978 Act, and we have no argument with the definition of the words "oil shale". So we support the Bill before the House. As I stated, in 1978 we were the only conservative party to oppose the mining legislation. The Bill before us will satisfy some of our objections, and we welcome it.

**MR SODEMAN** (Pilbara) [9.09 p.m.]: I had not intended to speak on this Bill, but the remarks of members opposite have prompted me to do so. My comments will be relatively brief and they will relate to compensation to pastoral leaseholders.

I took exception to the remarks of the member for Yilgarn-Dundas who said that the Government is bending over backwards to accommodate vested interests. I inform him that some pastoralists support the Labor Party, although for the life of me I cannot understand why.

The honourable member contradicted himself later in his speech when he acknowledged that our efforts in this instance were legitimate. I cannot reconcile his two statements. However, his earlier remark is rather untrue and shallow.

In the past I made representations, not only to the present Minister for Mines, but also to his predecessor on this matter. In recent years the situation as far as the pastoral industry is concerned has changed dramatically. Mining developments have intruded into traditional pastoral areas; and the trend is continuing. This is progress—in fact it is what the current-day Pilbara is all about—but we would be remiss as a Government if we did not pay proper accord to the problems suffered by pastoral people in these developing areas.

Pastoralists have suffered because of large towns being developed right on the boundaries of their properties. They are having to cope with dramatically changed economic circumstances. Indeed, after the bad seasons we have suffered over the past few years, we could almost say the pastoral industry is no longer viable. Many of the people who have been in the industry for years and who do not want to leave the land have

been—to coin a phrase—living off the smell of an oil rag for a long time.

I want to thank the Government and the Minister for Mines for bringing this legislation to the Parliament, and particularly I am happy about clauses 27 and 28 which appear on pages 18 to 20.

I agree there will be some problem with the definitions. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas who has some legal experience I am told, should be aware that the Bill makes adequate provision to overcome the problem—when a definition is queried, the matter can be adjudicated. I really do not believe that the legislation will be the bonanza for solicitors that he perhaps hopes it might be.

In the past there has been no way to compensate pastoralists for damage to roads, pasture, and water holes—important factors in the operation of a pastoral lease. Although these provisions will go a long way towards overcoming the problem of compensation, we cannot legislate to offset the effects of illegal shooting on pastoral property or leaving gates open so that stock can wander onto the roads and perhaps be killed. It is very frustrating for a pastoralist, after spending days mustering his stock, to find that an irresponsible person has left a gate open and the stock have strayed.

We realise that when large communities develop in such areas, the people naturally want access to the coast, and the only way to reach it may be through pastoral properties. Unfortunately many of these people are inconsiderate and abuse the privilege afforded to them.

In concluding I would like to say that this measure is long overdue. It is one I and my colleagues who represent country areas—

**Mr Grill:** How would you define "substantial loss of earnings"?

**Mr SODEMAN:** —have been requesting for some considerable time.

**Mr Grill:** You can't.

**Mr SODEMAN:** We support strongly not only the clauses to which I have referred, but also the whole Bill.

**MR COYNE** (Murchison-Eyre) [9.15 p.m.]: Having had a fairly long association with this legislation, I would like to refute some of the comments made by certain members on the other side of the House.

The first mining legislation with which I was concerned was the measure introduced in 1972 by the then Labor Minister for Mines (Mr Don May). He faced problems similar to those we are



facing—he was unable to get his message across. He was rather frustrated, and in a Press cutting I have here which is dated 26 May 1972, the heading is, "May says critics lack knowledge of Bill". The article states—

The Minister for Mines, Mr May, said today that many people criticising the new Mining Bill did not really know what it contained.

That is the Bill his Government introduced.

Mr Grill: This is ancient history, like you.

Mr COYNE: The same situation applies today. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas, and the member for Kalgoorlie said the reason the Kalgoorlie by-election was won with such a handsome majority was due to reaction to the mining legislation. That is quite wrong. In actual fact, there was a strong sympathy vote on behalf of the Evans family.

Mr Grill: You are entirely wrong.

Mr COYNE: Anybody who is a candidate for the party of a member who dies in office receives a strong sympathy vote. It was evident to the people who canvassed in the Kalgoorlie by-election, long before the election results were announced, that we were going to lose by a big majority.

Mr Clarko: Have they not won the seat for the whole 90 years it has been contested?

Mr COYNE: I do not think they can claim credit for that.

The then Minister for Mines (Mr May) said that people did not understand his Bill. However, we are dealing basically with the same Bill today, apart from a few tidying-up provisions relating to shale, and the like. Yet we see members opposite carrying on about it.

As members would know, the great debates of 1978 were fairly acrimonious affairs. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas said tonight that he was the lead speaker for the Opposition on that occasion. Actually, the lead speaker for the Opposition was the member for South Perth! All the member for Yilgarn-Dundas did was to support what the member for South Perth said.

The lead speaker for the Opposition in fact was the then member for Kalgoorlie (Mr Tom Evans); his contribution was a most worthy one. However, he dropped out of the debate and left a vacuum which was taken up by the member for South Perth. Even the then member for Swan's contribution eclipsed that of the member for Yilgarn-Dundas. So, his statement that he was the lead speaker for the Opposition was quite wrong.

Mr Grill: You are completely wrong about that. Why do you wish to bring up this personal abuse at this stage of the debate?

Mr COYNE: I am trying to refute the things the member for Yilgarn-Dundas said about why the Government lost the by-election in Kalgoorlie.

Mr Grill: Has something stung you recently?

Mr COYNE: A lot has stung me about the member for Yilgarn-Dundas; he will probably hear about it one of these days.

A virulent campaign was organised in Kalgoorlie in opposition to the new Mining Act. It really sickened me because of what the Government did after the 1978 debate. In fact, I introduced deputation after deputation to the Mines Department, all of which were received and the matters debated. I would listen to the submissions made by prospectors and take them along to the Mines Department. However, they could not convince me. I was not in there to jeopardise the seat of Murchison-Eyre; however, there was no way I could accept their arguments.

When Doug Daws said to me in Kalgoorlie the other day that as far as he was concerned, 95 per cent of the Mining Act 1978 was okay and that only 5 per cent of the Act needed changing, I said, "That is music to my ears, because that is what I have been saying ever since the legislation was passed".

To justify what we were saying, we asked the then under secretary (Bernie Rogers) and some of his principal registrars to go into the electorate to allay the fears of prospectors. These people did not understand the language of legislation, so we intended to put the matter in simple terms and relate the 1904 Act to the 1978 Act. However, they would not turn up.

In an article headed "Misgivings over visit to explain new Mining Act" the following statement appeared—

Misgivings were expressed today over a planned visit to the Goldfields by government officials to explain the controversial new Mining Act.

We wanted to hold a discussion group, not in an official capacity, but in an informal manner so that prospectors could have their questions answered. However, they were advised not to come near us because we would only pollute their minds. They were told, "The 1904 Act is good, and the present Bill is bad". We are finding out by a process of elimination that all the submissions were carefully considered. Eventually, the legislation reached the stage where people believed 95 per cent of it was okay

and that only 5 per cent needed some change. The people who believed that 5 per cent needed changing were those who were opposed to the provision which prevented them from exploring areas willy-nilly. They did not want to be tied to a programme, with expenditure conditions.

Throughout my electorate, there are huge areas of land under claim. At present, there are 30 000 unprocessed applications. That in itself indicates there is something wrong with the 1904 Act. In 1970, there were something like 40 000 unprocessed applications.

Mr Grill: This Bill will retain the 1904 Act's provisions in respect of transition matters. That contradicts your argument.

Mr COYNE: It allows them to flow on. Anybody holding a tenement under the present provisions will be guaranteed the tenement under those provisions for an extended period under the new legislation. Those are some of the reasons that these amendments are necessary.

I wish to deal with the area with which I am most conversant; namely, how the Bill will affect pastoral leases. There are a number of stations in Murchison-Eyre, particularly in the north-east goldfields sector: for example, there are Mt. Keith, Yeelirrie, Leinster Downs, Tarmoola, and Weebo. Mt. Keith Station is a rather small property which has a mining operation right in the middle of it. It eventually deteriorated to such an extent that it was sold for a mere \$20 000 to Metalex Mining Co.

A lot of commotion has been aroused about the damage which mining operations can cause to pastoral properties. One of the most convincing arguments in this respect is in respect of the situation at Tarmoola Station. Tarmoola is a long, narrow property running in a north-south configuration. In the middle of the property, a nickel-copper-silver deposit was located in an area known as Teutonic Bore, adjacent to the original Teutonic Bore goldmine. That situation effectively demonstrated to me the enormous damage mining operations can cause to pastoral leases.

I took my friend, the member for Karrinyup, along with me to interview the lessee of that station (Mr Jim Nicholas). We spent the night discussing the matter with him; we drank a bottle of whisky and had a great time. We viewed the site the next day and I returned and wrote a long and impassioned letter to the Minister. Mr Nicholas was grateful for our assistance on his behalf. I had better not tell members how much he paid for the station, but we were hoping we

could get him reimbursed for his original purchase price.

Letters flew back and forth between Mr Nicholas and I and I seemed to be making headway. Suddenly, I received a call from Mr Nicholas, who said, "Do not go any further with that matter. We have had a generous offer from the company". It turned out he received about four times as much as he paid for the lease, and was delighted. It showed there was a willingness on the part of mining companies to compensate lessees. I understand Jim Nicholas received about \$200 000 for his property. This situation is further evidenced by the fact that a mining company purchased Weebo Station for some \$400 000. This indicates mining companies are very much aware of what mining operations can do to pastoral leases.

Leinster, which is the host town for the Agnew Mining Company, has a population of about 1 600. Members can just imagine the situation on weekends, with people running around on these station tracks. There is no way a person can operate a pastoral lease on that basis. Eventually, the lease must be bought out at the market price. In most cases, there is no problem; mining companies recognise the situation and make a reasonable offer. That is a classic example—

Mr Grill: I do not think they are the cases which will cause the trouble. There is no problem with big mining companies; they have a lot of cash. It is where you get small operators coming in.

Mr Sodeman: If they are aware of the provision they will be more careful.

Mr COYNE: There will be an opportunity to deal with this matter in greater depth when the regulations are tabled; I understand there will be a motion for disallowance. We will be able to discuss the total scene on that occasion.

I am very happy with the way consideration has been given to all the submissions that have been made and with the way the regulations have been explained to the public. I believe the mining industry in this State will be in a tremendous position to go forward into the 1980s and 1990s and derive the greatest benefit from the industry. I look forward to the opportunity to debate these amendments in greater depth at some other time.

**MR BRIDGE** (Kimberley) [9.28 p.m.]: Like the member for Pilbara, I am prompted to rise as a result of points put forward in this debate. In my case, I rise as a result of comments made by the member for Pilbara and, to a lesser extent, by the member for Murchison-Eyre.

It seems appropriate that the Opposition's position be made clear. The member for Pilbara suggested we had reservations about the compensation measures contained in the Bill. That is not our position at all. In fact, we support those measures. Quite clearly, there has been a real need for the Government to examine the question of proper compensation for pastoral leases affected by mining operations. I wish to make it clear there is no opposition on the part of the Labor Party to the measures contained in the Bill which provide for compensation. We made it clear we supported the Bill in general terms, but felt certain comments needed to be made tonight.

We need to consider the question of compensation a little closer. The situation is not quite clear as to what is meant when we talk about "substantial losses" being incurred by pastoralists. It is important that the Minister spells out clearly what is meant by this term. There are times when compensation can be arrived at quite easily, but there are times when it is quite difficult to do so.

A couple of years ago a pastoralist in the Kimberley suffered losses because of activities by a mining company. He had 600 head of cattle being held in a paddock pending the arrival of a road train to take them to the meatworks. The mining company's activity caused fences to be knocked down and gates to be left open, and so the cattle escaped. How could that pastoralist establish "substantial losses"? It is very difficult and this is an area which needs to be clearly defined.

On some properties stock horses have been allowed to escape from paddocks with the result that extra time has been taken up to muster them. This has meant perhaps an extra week's wages being incurred by the station owner. The Minister should define how that sort of situation could be related to "substantial losses" to the satisfaction of all.

There are a number of areas where pastoralists are entitled to compensation, but the compensation is not necessarily easily definable, so the Minister must explain what is meant by compensation for "substantial losses". The Opposition supports the measure and asks the Minister to answer the queries raised with respect to substantial losses and compensation.

**MR P. V. JONES** (Narrogin—Minister for Mines) [9.33 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the Bill. Much of what has been said has reflected the personal views of those members who contributed, and the number of new arguments introduced was not great.

The member for Yilgarn-Dundas referred to the background of the original legislation and in particular to the time that has elapsed since it was introduced. I do not know how many times it has been said, but it seems we have to say again that when the Bill was passed a commitment was very clearly made in 1978 that the Act would not be proclaimed until such time as the draft regulations were not only prepared, but also had been submitted for public comment and circulated to members of the industry, all the submissions assessed, and the resulting changes again discussed with concerned bodies. All that has been done. I find it passing strange for the Government to be criticised for not proclaiming the Act because it has given an opportunity to industry, the general public, and all those who might so wish to have a say in drafting the regulations.

Mr Grill: It was nearly three years ago.

**MR P. V. JONES:** The draft regulations were circulated for public comment with responses to be back originally by 30 March 1980. I extended that time because approaches had been made by the mining industry, leaseholders, and prospectors asking for more time. Was it wrong of me to give them additional time? Was it wrong of me to go to Kalgoorlie to discuss the matter with these people?

I am trying to make it clear that when the Bill is proclaimed on 1 January next year it will be proclaimed with the regulations which have been drafted as a result of consultations with industry, all in a manner that probably has not been undertaken before. It has been done in this way because the Government has recognised it is necessary to make sure that industry groups—the chamber, the leaseholders and prospectors, and the mining clerks—had an opportunity to make submissions, for their submissions to be received and considered, and for discussions to take place with me or officers of the department.

The member for Yilgarn-Dundas has received from me a copy of the proposed changes. I hope he would be among the first to acknowledge that, in many instances, they reflect the wishes of industry.

Mr Grill: My point was that the people are confused.

**MR P. V. JONES:** So far as members' comments are concerned regarding the legislation before us tonight, a great deal of time was spent referring to the 1978 Act. I do not propose to do that except to make one comment. Reference was made to the fact that the Kalgoorlie by-election

was turned into a referendum on the 1978 Mining Act.

Mr Coyne: Nonsense!

Mr P. V. JONES: There are more people in this State interested in the mining industry than those people in the Kalgoorlie electorate. As the member for Murchison-Eyre has said tonight, 95 per cent of the legislation is acceptable and it is only the other 5 per cent on which comment has been made. The point I want to make is that there is not one industry group which has said to me that it does not want the 1978 Act. They all have said they might like certain changes made, and their submissions have reflected that, but the major comment, with just one exception, has been that they are in favour of the 1978 Act. There is one group which is not altogether happy, but I have discussed with these people the draft regulations and the changes made on two occasions in some depth. I am sure that the benefits to be gained by the changes made will inevitably be accepted and welcomed because of the help they will give to the industry.

I want now to deal with comments made about the Bill before us. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas identified the four major divisions involved and there is no need for me to comment on each of them in great detail. The question of oil shale is one that was not present in 1978. The difficulty we are now experiencing was not present at that time. Both my second reading speech and the member's comments indicate that this is a new mineral in the sense that it is handled, not only legislatively and administratively in the Mining Act, but also in a practical sense in mining, in a way similar to that in respect of coal. Consequently it can be treated in a practical way in the Act.

The question of private landholder provisions received some attention. It was suggested that this represented a major about-face by the Government. I do not think that is so at all. If members look back at the comments made since the 1978 Bill passed through the House and since the concern has been expressed by the Primary Industry Association and others, they will find that at no time did I put forward any case other than it was always the intention of the Government that the genuine landholder would have his rights and wishes respected. It was clearly pointed out that if it were found that the provisions in the 1978 Bill did not do that, we would consider those matters. The opportunity has been taken to do that now.

All we are doing is putting into the Act the proposals which were being put into the

regulations originally. They were draft regulations, which I discussed with the Primary Industry Association, which provided an opportunity for a private landholder to object, and so on. Admittedly it did not have the same strength as will the placing of the provision in the legislation.

Mr Cowan: That is a little weak.

Mr P. V. JONES: We are now putting that provision into the Act.

Mr Cowan: You have contradicted what was in the parent Act.

Mr P. V. JONES: A check of *Hansard* will reveal that it does not record where the member for Merredin objected in 1978 to the private landholder provisions. Indeed, the only one of his colleagues who has written to me and fervently asked for some change to be made or for some explanation has been the member for Mt. Marshall.

Mr Cowan: How many members of our party do you want to write to you?

Mr P. V. JONES: The member for Merredin claims he has been pushing for the change, but not once did he approach me.

Mr Cowan: We opposed the Bill.

Mr P. V. JONES: The role of the Primary Industry Association has been mentioned. I point out that it is still involved in this matter. I am now having to pay some attention to the activities of the former legal adviser who in private practice is writing compensation agreements and promoting them with farmers in a form which is being questioned. I find some of the comments he made at the time to be quite scurrilous. He certainly did not help in getting to the nub of the argument. We were able to do so only when he took no part in the deliberations and we were able to quietly get down to discussing what it was all about.

The question of pastoralists receiving compensation was raised—not so much the principle of it, but the way in which it has been introduced and the reason behind it. As the members for Pilbara and Kimberley have said, compensation for pastoral activity losses is an entirely different matter from the example suggested by the member for Kalgoorlie when he spoke about compensation in agricultural areas.

Pastoral pursuits are not farming pursuits; pastoral activities do not include the growing of crops in the same way as a farmer conducts his operations. The private landholder in agricultural areas is able to prevent mining exploration whereas a pastoralist cannot. Mining exploration

now is carried out by mechanical means. As the member for Yilgarn-Dundas would be well aware, mining exploration is now undertaken with backhoes, tractors, and front end loaders, and the damage caused to pastoral properties is in some cases quite significant, although I accept it is not significant in all cases. For example, at Meekatharra I had a meeting with a pastoralist who told me that one of his men had an accident while riding his motorcycle; he had driven straight into a costain, at considerable damage to not only himself, but also his vehicle.

Mr Grill: Don't you think the clause is terribly vague?

Mr P. V. JONES: I will come to that point. I think we agree that the two situations to which I have referred are different. The right of entry and entitlement to conduct mineral exploration is different in regard to private landholdings from those relating to pastoral holdings. Now we will provide the opportunity to pastoralists to be recompensed in circumstances where they would not have been previously. As I am sure the member for Yilgarn-Dundas is aware, the member for Murchison-Eyre has indicated that nine times out of 10, if not 99 out of 100, problems do not occur. Indeed, in my discussions with pastoralists and the industry generally I have ascertained that usually both parties are accommodated quite satisfactorily. These remarks relate to most pastoralists and mining companies; only a few people do not stick to the rules or do the right thing.

In relation to compensation it would appear that danger exists in not reading the amending legislation into the parent Act because the amending legislation falls into two categories. At page 19 of the Bill it can be seen that proposed new subsection (7)(c) states—

subject to section 125, any damage to improvements on that land caused by the holder and for any loss—

- (i) suffered by the pastoral lessee; and
- (ii) resulting from that damage;

For the moment I will not go on to proposed new subsection (7)(d). Elsewhere in the clause reference is made to the Warden's Court and the manner in which it determines certain things—the technical aspects. I take it the member for Yilgarn-Dundas has no other questions in relation to proposed new subsection (7)(c).

Mr Grill: No.

Mr P. V. JONES: Proposed new subsection (7)(d) states—

notwithstanding anything in section 125, any substantial loss of earnings—

- (i) suffered by the pastoral lessee; and
- (ii) resulting or arising from mining by the holder.

For two reasons I agreed to the form of this amendment. The first related to the degree of difficulty in identifying and setting out every single instance which may occur. I am sure the member will agree it is virtually impossible to legislate for every possible kind of accident or disruption that may contribute to a loss of earnings.

Mr Grill: But you seem to have gone to the other extreme.

Mr P. V. JONES: I have not finished my comment. The second reason relates to the necessity to provide for more than just a finite determination that can be made under proposed new subsection (7)(c) in the light of some examples given to me by pastoralists, examples which I discussed not only with individual pastoralists, but also with the Pastoralists and Graziers Association. I will refer to two that were given to me.

The first relates to a loss of earnings incurred by a station owner after a fire had been caused by an employee of a mining company. If it was possible to determine how many cattle had died and how many kilometres of fencing had been destroyed, a certain finite valuation of the damage could have been estimated, and in this instance the income earning capacity of the property was immeasurably impaired for one season.

The next example—this is a factual example—relates to cattle which had been mustered, brought in, but stampeded in error by an employee of a mining company. This meant that a mob of cattle were unfit for market for that season which caused considerable financial hardship for the station owner. This occurred in the eastern goldfields.

How can we in legislative terms be finite in regard to such things? Certainly we could not cover all circumstances. The matter was discussed and canvassed at some length in an endeavour to provide an opportunity for compensation to pastoralists who incur a loss of earnings because of various circumstances which may arise, of which I have given two examples.

The situation is not so much an open-door one, but it is very hard to determine in finite terms—we must have flexible terms. The word "substantial" means that some assessment must be made. In the two examples to which I have

referred an assessment was made. In the case of the fire causing damage the company agreed to the assessment of loss, and in the case of the cattle being stampeded I understand a settlement still is being negotiated. At least, it was being negotiated at the time I discussed this matter with the pastoralists.

I accept that in isolated circumstances litigation will result from one side not accepting an assessment of a loss of earnings, and legislation is provided to deal with such situations. The least we can do is to ensure no-one will be disadvantaged.

Mr Grill: The example relating to the fire is a case of tortious negligence which could be handled under common law in any event.

Mr P. V. JONES: Does the member agree that the negligence would contribute to a substantial loss of earnings?

Mr Grill: When you talk about that you get into a very vexed area of the law.

Mr P. V. JONES: I do not disagree with that.

Mr Grill: It is very vexed indeed. What I am saying is that in that case the particular pastoralist had a remedy under common law, if he could prove negligence; but under this bland section you have now, compensation is payable under all sorts of conditions, whether there is negligence or not, and you have excluded section 125.

Mr P. V. JONES: I am concerned that the member does not want to provide assistance to the pastoral industry.

Mr Grill: I am not saying that, but there are no guidelines.

Mr P. V. JONES: If the member believes it is possible to legislate for every single circumstance rather than provide provisions for a set of circumstances in which compensation can be assessed, then he is a better man than I.

Mr Grill: Go on with it if you like, but I guarantee we will be back in six months with further amending legislation.

Mr P. V. JONES: I believe the member is mistaken; I have more faith in the common sense of mining companies and pastoralists. I accept that we cannot stop people embarking on litigation. It is what helps to keep the member in business.

I wanted to make only one other point and that refers to the comments made in relation to transitional provisions. The member for Yilgarn-Dundas mentioned quite rightly that in one or two instances errors or oversights have occurred. He was quite right in saying that an oversight

occurred in regard to a prospecting licence—it was an omission. It is important that we cover that omission so that unnecessary hardship does not face a prospector.

His comment concerning the Land Act was not correct when he referred to rights in regard to a temporary reserve. A temporary reserve is not a tenement. The amendment will clarify the situation so that no-one will be disadvantaged.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr Clarko) in the Chair; Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8 put and passed.

Clause 9: Section 29 repealed and substituted—

Mr COWAN: This clause deals with the reversion to that which existed under the 1904 Act and which will be written into the 1978 parent Act. It can be said fairly that this clause and the one which follows it relate to the section of the Act dealing with mining on private property. Mr Chairman, I ask you to give me some licence to refer to both clauses now and again. This will alleviate the necessity for me to call your attention to clause 10 when it is put.

In my mind no question exists that the credit for the success of having this clause included is due mainly to the PIA and its legal officer (Mr Pat Gethin). I do not accept the Minister's statement that there has been no change in the position of the Government—every member would be fully aware that several policy statements have been made in relation to the aspect of mining on private land. Perhaps the first statement was made by the present Minister's predecessor when he held the portfolio. There is no question that the Government has had a change of attitude and a change of heart in regard to this legislation. To my way of thinking that change in no way affects the concept that minerals are the property of the Crown. What it does is protect people who make their livelihood from the use of the surface of the land. Most mining companies will admit quite readily that never has there been any great opposition to mining exploration, and never any great conflict between property owners and mining companies when mining companies have wished to exploit the minerals under the surface of the land.

In the 1904 Act—and in this Bill—a private landholder had the right of veto. The right of veto

by the 1978 Act was removed, but by this legislation it will be restored. It took far too long for this Government to accept that the right of veto should not have been removed, and it took far too long for this Government to introduce the amendment before us.

To me it seems strangely coincidental that the introduction of these amendments took place immediately after the State conference of the Liberal Party which condemned the Mining Act, particularly for its not retaining the right of veto. In addition the National Party made a statement that it would introduce amendments to that section of the Act. I am quite sure that move would have proved to be some embarrassment to members on this side of the Committee who hold seats in rural areas. We absolutely deny the suggestion by the Minister that we did not make any representation to the Government in regard to having this section of the Act amended.

Mr GRILL: I wish to move the following amendments—

Page 7, line 4—

Insert after the words "be granted in respect of:" the following paragraph—

"(a) Private land"

Page 7, line 22—

Add after paragraph (f) the following—

"(b) Or reserve land defined under subsection (2)(c) hereof";

Page 7, line 25—

Add after the words "lowest part of the surface of that private land" the words "or reserve land".

The CHAIRMAN: The member may move one amendment, then speak to it. Each amendment must be moved separately.

Mr P. V. Jones: In other words, you wish to create two new paragraphs (a) and (b).

Mr GRILL: I move an amendment—

Page 7, line 4—Delete the words "private land"

The intention is to create two definitions—private land and reserve land—as defined in subsection (2)(c) and bring in a new subsection (2)(c) which defines reserve land. The gist of this amendment is to afford Aborigines, who are in a very special position, some protection under this legislation. The protection we would like to afford to them is the same protection which is afforded to private landowners.

We are not putting forward the case that all Aborigines and Aboriginal groups should be

placed in this situation, but we believe it is incumbent upon the Government to appreciate and acknowledge the fact that there are Aboriginal communities living on reserves and pastoral leases. Not all, but some, use these reserves and leases as a place to live, in the same way we use our homes, dwellings, towns, or cities. They do not use the pastoral leases primarily to raise cattle or sheep; they use them as places to live.

In the past there has been a great deal of conflict where there have been sizable or large communities living on reserves or pastoral leases. Noonkanbah is a classic example where there has been conflict between the explorer or company and the community. These conflicts have led to hostility, misunderstanding, and bitterness. We feel that this amendment would be a compromise and that people in special positions should be catered for in this legislation.

The purpose of the amendment is to extend the protection offered to the owners or the occupiers of private land to areas which have been set apart for the occupation of Aboriginal communities. That would include reserve land and a limited number of pastoral leases which have been granted primarily for the occupation of Aboriginal communities; two examples are Noonkanbah and Dunbar River.

We would like to extend the definition to include land reserves under the Land Act and the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act, but only those reserves specifically utilised as the home of Aboriginal communities. This would extend protection to pastoral leases also, but only those pastoral leases which are being utilised as a home for Aboriginal communities.

I think it would be appropriate to read the proposed definition of "reserve land" so that members can understand our intention. The amendment we will move will be to add subsection 2(c) as follows—

For the purpose of this Section "reserve land" shall mean land which is reserved under the Land Act 1933 or the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act of 1972 for the use and benefit of Aborigines and which reserve is in current use as the principal place of residence of an Aboriginal community of more than 50 members and shall include land leased under the Land Act 1933 for pastoral purposes to the Aboriginal Lands Trust or to a community of Aborigines incorporated under the laws of Western Australia or the Commonwealth of Australia which is in current use as the principal place of residence

of an Aboriginal community of more than 50 members.

So, protection would be afforded to Aboriginal groups in excess of 50. The group would need to be an incorporated body or to hold land under the Land Act, for pastoral purposes, or hold land under the Aboriginal Lands Trust. It would represent communities of a sizable nature and which are places of abode.

This amendment is put forward as some sort of a compromise which we feel is one way around an ongoing social tragedy which seems to accompany many of these communities which are decimated by mining activity and other activity in the community. This compromise is directed only at land which is set aside either for the use of Aborigines or for pastoral leases used by Aborigines as a principal place of abode.

Mr Cowan: Are you talking about the entire pastoral lease?

Mr GRILL: We are talking about the entire pastoral lease where the other criteria are met. Yes, we are talking about the entire pastoral lease.

No doubt, members of the Government will say that by doing this we are excluding sizable pieces of land from the operation of the Act. I remind members that with the private landholding provisions in this legislation we have already extended to farmers—who probably hold one-quarter of the land of this State—that privilege, and we now wish to extend the same privilege to Aboriginal communities. However, that privilege will be extended to a much smaller group of people and a much smaller area as well. Therefore, we would be extending such a privilege to a small part of the Aboriginal community, a privilege which the member for Merredin said should so rightly be enjoyed by the farmers of this State.

My argument is that although this would apply to the whole of the pastoral lease, it does not represent a very large area of land if we compare it with the area of land which will be excluded from the normal provisions of this Act. It is fairly miniscule. I suppose the Government will argue there will be some loss because some land will be split from the normal provisions of the Act. However, I ask Government members: What is the cost to the general community of the social disintegration of some Aboriginal group or community? What is the social and physical cost? I think the cost is high and for those reasons we feel that the cost of this proposition is proportionately small. It is a small price to pay in the circumstances.

This proposition would afford some dignity to the Aboriginal people. They would have a right of veto over mining on their land, the same right a farmer would have over his land. They would have a correspondingly similar authority to sell off the right to mine minerals on their land at no greater or lesser extent than a farmer.

Mr P. V. Jones: Would you want non-Aboriginal pastoralists to have this, too?

Mr GRILL: I am saying that there are certain groups of Aborigines which are in a special category. They live as communities on pastoral leases and reserves in a way very different from that of white people.

Mr Coyne: Can you name one community?

Mr GRILL: I have named a couple. The Noonkanbah community is one.

Mr Brian Burke: How far down south do you want us to come?

Mr GRILL: I know the member for Murchison-Eyre would like me to name Cundeelee.

Mr BRIDGE: I support the amendment moved by the member for Yilgarn-Dundas. It seeks to provide some measure of uniformity, which is essential if we are to look at long-term planning and the sorts of exploration activities to be allowed on pastoral properties occupied by Aborigines. It goes without saying we support the measures contained in the Bill which relate to the interests of the farmer; they are appropriate, and not in dispute. We also support the matter of compensation to the pastoral industry.

I point out to members that although when selling pastoral leases to groups of Aborigines the Government lays down the condition that the properties acquired shall be used for pastoral pursuits, it must also be acknowledged there is a very great social factor which prompted those negotiations. The Government would be well aware of this situation at the time negotiations were under way.

For example, in the case of the Noonkanbah Station purchase, a pressing social problem existed at Fitzroy Crossing. Every member would know what happened at Fitzroy Crossing, leading up to the purchase of Noonkanbah Station. Therefore, I do not think it can be argued that Noonkanbah Station was purchased primarily for pastoral pursuits. Prior to its purchase, the station was not operated as a pastoral property. It had been allowed to deteriorate to the stage where practically no bores were operating and fences were in disrepair. The purchase of Noonkanbah Station satisfied a clear social need.



Mr Sodeman: That was not the governing factor. The purchase was allowed on the basis that a certain condition was satisfied.

Mr BRIDGE: But it was a major factor.

Mr Sodeman: Yes, but the NAC representative in our area has stated that the stations are not to be overpopulated, but must be run economically and as viably as possible. They must keep the number of people down to a manageable level.

Mr BRIDGE: I take the point; there are Aborigines who say that, and I do not say they are wrong. However, any action to reduce the numbers invariably would result in people drifting back to the fringes of towns where they originally experienced social problems. There are about 100 people at Noonkanbah and, I suppose, it could be said the station is capable of looking after about 12 of those people. The net result of such a policy would be the relocation of the remainder at Fitzroy Crossing, where the original social problems would occur all over again.

Mr Sodeman: What you are saying is right, but they should be classified as reserves as opposed to pastoral properties, and pastoral properties should not be given any special considerations other than the provisions already in the Bill.

Mr BRIDGE: As the member for Yilgarn-Dundas said, where a property is deemed to be operating in such a capacity, there is no dispute that the property should be seen as a pastoral lease, and should be accorded the protections provided for in the legislation. That is why our amendment provides for a figure of 50 or more people residing on a property.

Mr Sodeman: Then you merely need to create a reserve and that reserve, under this Government's present policy, would be protected from mining activity.

Mr BRIDGE: That is supposed to be the situation, but it has not been evident in the past.

Mr Sodeman: That related to pastoral leases, not reserves.

Mr BRIDGE: It is only a couple of years since the Oombulgurri people at Forrest River Reserve opposed the entry of a mining company, yet exploration activities were allowed to proceed by way of a ministerial decision.

The amendment seeks to provide some measure of uniformity whereby not only farmers, but also groups of 50 or more Aborigines occupying a pastoral lease, will be protected. We believe the amendment is a workable proposition which will not unnecessarily inhibit exploration. As a matter of fact, probably it will improve the situation because until we arrive at a uniform land policy

there always will be conflict in this area. Our amendment will ensure there is a genuine and proper regard for farmers and groups of Aborigines holding pastoral leases. It is a worthwhile step which should be considered in the interests of protecting those people, and of the development of this State.

Recently, it was announced that the Aboriginal Development Commission was to purchase a property near Cundeelee. I suggest to the member for Murchison-Eyre that whilst the property may have been considered a pastoral property in the past, there is no way it can be considered as such today. The Government realised that, in allowing the sale to proceed, knowing the sale would relieve a serious social problem which existed at Cundeelee Mission.

I commend our amendment to the Committee.

Mr P. V. JONES: I am surprised this amendment has come forward in the way it has. We are dealing with a piece of legislation which addresses the mining industry and the administration of that industry. Notwithstanding the genuine needs and social requirements of Aboriginal communities, this is not the Statute which addresses that factor.

Mr Evans: Do you agree with the principle?

Mr P. V. JONES: Wait until I have finished. It was suggested Aboriginal communities settled on pastoral properties should be given the same rights private landholders will have on areas defined as "private land". I do not know whether the member for Yilgarn-Dundas referred to the definition of "private land" which appears at page 7 of the parent Act. If he does, he will agree he is making it very difficult.

The point missed by the member for Yilgarn-Dundas—the member for Kimberley referred to it—was that a prevailing Statute caters for this area. Where Aboriginal communities are established in situations for much the same purposes to which the member for Yilgarn-Dundas has referred in his definition, the Minister for Mines cannot grant a tenement—

Mr Evans: It did not do much good at Noonkanbah.

Mr P. V. JONES: That is not the same case; there are two different situations. As I said, the Minister cannot grant a tenement unless the Minister for Community Welfare in the first instance has given a permit to enter. If the Minister for Community Welfare issues that permit, he is still able to determine conditions under which the exploration company can enter that area and undertake its operations. Without that permit, the Minister for Mines cannot grant

the tenement. In other words, protection already is afforded.

Mr Cowan: You are talking about reserves now?

Mr P. V. JONES: Yes; I said there were two situations. For example, at Yandeyarra restrictions have been placed on companies wishing to undertake exploration in the area.

The position at Noonkanbah has been mentioned; that is the other side of the issue, where we are talking about a pastoral lease. The amendment seeks to bring about two different kinds of situations prevailing on pastoral leases, and that simply is not on. As far as the Mining Act and the Land Act are concerned, the administration of pastoral leases shall be constant; the same rules, circumstances, and conditions will apply to lessees, irrespective of whom, what group, or what company they happen to be; they must abide by the terms and conditions of the lease.

Mr Bridge: So, you will have no regard whatsoever of the social needs of thousands of people, as opposed to an individual occupier of a pastoral lease? We have no argument with you about the family situation, but some of these properties are occupied by hundreds of people.

Mr P. V. JONES: I know that, and I accept it. What I am saying is that this is not the statute under which that social aspect should be raised. I admit the problems are very real and pressing. However, they are taken care of in the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act or whatever other piece of legislation has been utilised for that purpose, and these groups will have to fit in with the legislation, as they do now in the case of Aboriginal reserves where permits to enter are granted.

The Minister for Community Welfare also has power to set conditions under which permits will be granted, apart from those in respect of reserves. The Minister did so in relation to Noonkanbah. He provided a set of conditions with which the company had to comply—such things as no alcohol, no firearms, and a whole range of other issues with which I do not need to deal now.

Provisions allow special conditions to be set for permits to enter. They prohibit the Minister for Mines from granting tenements where reserves are concerned. An instance of that is Yandeyarra, of which the member for Kimberley would be well aware. There has been pressure in relation to that for a long time, but the permit will not be granted.

The merit of the amendment is not questioned by me. I am suggesting, however, that this is not

the Statute in which it should be done. This Statute administers the mining industry; and that industry will fit in with other Statutes in relation to reserves. It would have to do so, for example, if the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act was amended.

Reference has been made to section 31. If that needs to be amended, the industry will fit in with that. The substance of this amendment is two sets of conditions related to pastoral leases.

Mr GRILL: It is pleasing that the Minister has conceded the merit of the moral argument. It is refreshingly surprising to hear him conceding that legislation of this sort should be enacted.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not what I said. I said if it is done elsewhere, this is not the Statute to do it. I accept there is a problem in the terms suggested by the member for Kimberley. There are communities of people wanting to live on pastoral properties. I am not questioning that.

Mr GRILL: They need to be catered for in this way.

Mr P. V. Jones: Not under this Statute.

Mr GRILL: I understand that the Minister conceded some part of the moral case, but he is saying that this is not the appropriate legislation to amend. I submit it is appropriate. Let me make an analogy. We have catered for the interests of the farmers in respect of the use of their land; *vis-a-vis* mining, under the appropriate Act, the Mining Act. We have catered for the pastoralists in respect of the use of their land, *vis-a-vis* mining, under the appropriate Act, the Mining Act. When we are dealing with the land used by the Aborigines, *vis-a-vis* mining, it should be dealt with under the same Act—the Mining Act. It is the appropriate Act to amend.

All sorts of legislation infringe on or affect the life of the Aborigines. Likewise, all sorts of legislation infringe upon the life and the method of living of the pastoralists and the farmers. However, when it comes down to the land on which they are living, or from which they are earning their living, when it is affected by mining the appropriate Act to amend is the Mining Act. In every respect, this amendment is being made to the appropriate Act.

The Minister had a point when he said that the definition of "private land" in section 8 of the parent Act would probably preclude the amendment that we are making. However, that is not fatal. Having read the definition of "private land" in the parent Act, I find it includes a lease, but it does not include a lease for pastoral or timber purposes. All that needs to be done is to

delete the word "pastoral" and the objection vanishes.

The moral argument is undeniable. We are acting in an even-handed way in the interests of the farmers and pastoralists. We realise they have special problems, and they should be dealt with in a special way.

No-one could argue that Aboriginal communities do not have very special problems and do not warrant special cases. They should be dealt with in a special way. As the member for Kimberley has said, we are asking for uniformity and even-handedness in the appropriate Act. We say that the Mining Act is the appropriate Act. We need recognition of the plight of the Aborigines.

The member for Kimberley suggested that by allowing an amendment of this sort, the Parliament is allowing land to be opened up rather than closed to exploration by mining companies. Land will be opened up, because Aborigines will be allowed to negotiate with dignity, justice, and equity. While they hold the whip hand over the mining companies, like the holders of private land, that is fair and proper.

The Minister put forward an argument which, at face value, seems to hold some water. He claimed that we are looking at two situations—reserves on the one hand, and pastoral leases on the other. That is true. Then he went on to say that our argument did not really apply to the reserves because special provisions apply to reserves before mining can take place on them.

We concede that point, but that does not preclude us from arguing that under the appropriate Act—the Mining Act—Aborigines should have some sort of overriding provision the same as the safeguards given to farmers and pastoralists in the rest of the State. Notwithstanding the other protection they may have in respect of the reserves, they should be given overriding protection under the Mining Act. As the member for Kimberley pointed out, the protections granted under other Acts are not adequate at times.

We are asking for a more general form of protection, one that is meted out in an even-handed way to a very special group in our community.

I commend the amendment to the Chamber.

Mr COWAN: I am inclined to agree with the member for Yilgarn-Dundas that if we are to cater for private landowners and pastoralists under this Act, we should be able to cater for the Aboriginal people living in special communities. I accept there may be an advantage in granting to

an Aboriginal community, living on a reserve set aside for that purpose, some right to determine what happens in respect of that land. I am not familiar with the powers given to the Minister for Community Welfare in relation to the granting of a permit to enter; but I see no reason for not granting power to the Aborigines who live on reserves. There is nothing wrong with that.

However, I object to the idea of throwing an entire pastoral lease, on which an Aboriginal community is living, into the category of reserve land.

Mr Bridge: Keep it in perspective, nonetheless. We will be looking at a very few properties in this State.

Mr COWAN: I am sure of that. However, the Opposition is drawing a distinction between those pastoral leases and other pastoral leases. There is no distinction between private land and private land; but in this case it is asking for a distinction between different pastoral leases on the basis of ownership. I cannot accept that.

Perhaps the definition of "reserve land" should cater for a specific area in which a community lives, rather than the entire pastoral lease. The question deserves to be examined further.

I have no objection to Aborigines being able to declare a reserve as something in which they have powers over the mining and exploration companies, as do other landholders. However, I take objection to the entire pastoral lease that has been given to an Aboriginal community being declared reserve land.

The Opposition should have kept its definition confined to the area of land on which the residential place of the community is situated.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes 17

Mr Barnett	Mr Hodge
Mr Bridge	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr Parker
Mr Brian Burke	Mr Pearce
Mr Terry Burke	Mr A. D. Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr Wilson
Mr Evans	Mr Bateman
Mr Grill	

(Teller)

## Noes 23

Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr Rushton
Mr Coyne	Mr Sibson
Mrs Craig	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Trethowan
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Watt
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Williams
Mr Laurance	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

## Pairs

## Noes

Ayes	
Mr Jamieson	Dr Dadour
Mr Tonkin	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Bertram	Mr Crane
Mr McIver	Mr O'Connor
Mr Harman	Mr Blaikie

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr GRILL: I move an amendment—

Page 10, line 9—Add after the word “fenced” the following new subsection to stand as subsection (8)—

(8) Nothing in this Section of this Act shall in any way affect the operation of Section 31 of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act nor any Section of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972-80.

Section 31 of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act requires a permit before entry onto reserve land. Since both the Mining Act 1978 and amendments postdate the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act, it might be said that any holder of a mining tenement is not bound by section 31 of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority Act and there is some legal authority for that.

I understand the situation has been drawn to the attention of the Government and it may have some opinion itself that in fact section 31, which is there to safeguard the interests of Aborigines, is in fact postdated by this particular piece of legislation and is, therefore, of no effect whatsoever.

I have moved this amendment so that whether our legal interpretation is right or wrong, or whether the Government's interpretation is right or wrong, there should be no doubt about the matter. The Minister has conceded already in the speeches he has made that that sort of protection should and is accorded to Aborigines and we say it should not be removed either directly or indirectly by stealth or otherwise.

We say that, to put the matter beyond doubt, this small postscript to clause 9 would be a valid and proper amendment to the Act and we commend it to the Committee.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

## Ayes 17

Mr Barnett	Mr Hodge
Mr Bridge	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bryce	Mr Parker
Mr Brian Burke	Mr Pearce
Mr Terry Burke	Mr A. D. Taylor
Mr Carr	Mr I. F. Taylor
Mr Davies	Mr Wilson
Mr Evans	Mr Bateman
Mr Grill	

(Teller)

## Noes 23

Sir Charles Court	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr Rushton
Mr Coyne	Mr Sibson
Mrs Craig	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Trethowan
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Watt
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Williams
Mr Laurance	Mr Young
Mr Mensaros	Mr Shalders
Mr Nanovich	

(Teller)

## Pairs

## Noes

Ayes	
Mr Jamieson	Dr Dadour
Mr Tonkin	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Bertram	Mr Crane
Mr McIver	Mr O'Connor
Mr Harman	Mr Blaikie

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 19 put and passed.

Clause 20: Section 65 amended—

Mr GRILL: As I indicated earlier we would like to present an argument—not an amendment—to the Minister that perhaps ironically his discretion should be extended in respect of clause 20(b). In other words, section 65 of the Act should be amended to allow the Minister to exercise his discretion in respect of exploration licences, not only as they relate to iron ore, but also as they relate to other minerals.

The department has indicated iron ore falls into a special category and it has been the case in the past that, where temporary reserves have been granted for iron ore, companies having proved up their deposits, carried out their exploration, and being unable to find a market, have not been forced to drop off part of the “TR” as they would normally have to do.

The amendment contained in this legislation places a discretion in the hands of the Minister to enable him to exclude the operation of the drop-off provisions in respect of exploration licences in the third and fourth years. We merely put the simple argument that, although this situation obviously applies to iron ore, there may well be other cases where it applies. In fact our expert

advice is to the effect this could well be the case with other minerals and, as long as discretion is exercised in the proper way—namely, where a proper exploration programme has taken place, where some ore body has been delineated, and where the Minister is satisfied markers do not exist—this particular discretion on the part of the Minister should be exercised in regard to other minerals as well.

Mr P. V. JONES: We have discussed this matter with the honourable member. It is not considered necessary to change the provision. I appreciate the comments made by the member, but if he looks at the earlier parts of the provision which precede the amendment contained in the Bill, he will find discretionary power is provided to the Minister to prevent any loss by the holder of a permit relative to iron ore. The loss refers to a situation in which the holder of a permit had to forfeit the area at the end of a certain period of time. I am sure the member is aware of what I am referring to.

Mr Grill: Yes, I am.

Mr P. V. JONES: I can see the point made by the member that circumstances could arise and the exercise of the Minister's discretion could be dealt with in other ways. It is not considered necessary to specify minerals other than iron ore in this case. Here we specify one particular instance and other aspects are taken care of.

There is no need for an amendment to be made in this regard.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 21 to 34 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Clauses 35 and 36 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Mines), and transmitted to the Council.

### **METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Mensaros (Minister for Water Resources), and transmitted to the Council.

*House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### LAND: RURAL

#### *Trees*

2087. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the Government's policy with respect to the provision of incentives to farmers for the growing and retention of trees on their farms?
- (2) What incentives, including financial, are offered to land-holders for such purposes?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) The Government is anxious to encourage farmers to grow or retain trees on their properties in as many ways as possible within current financial constraints.
- (2) Free trees are to be made available through the Public Works Department for approved farm replanting schemes in areas subject to catchment clearing controls. The Forests Department provides a comprehensive tree planting advisory service, and provides farmers with suitable trees for planting elsewhere at cost of production. A major seminar on "Trees in the Rural Landscape" is to be held from 19 to 21 October to help in development of further policies and provide further encouragement for tree planting.

### TRANSPORT: ROAD

#### *Small Goods*

2110. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Government entered, or is about to enter, a joint venture to handle small goods freight?
- (2) With which firms have negotiations for such a venture been undertaken?
- (3) How will the joint venture operate for country towns?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) A number of alternatives have been evaluated by Westrail concerning the haulage of "smalls" and parcels

freight in order to make these types of traffic profitable.

In the course of its studies Westrail has had assistance from freight forwarding companies.

A joint venture between Westrail and a private company is one of the alternatives being considered but no decision has yet been made. If such an option were to be adopted freight forwarding companies would be given the opportunity to make an offer for a joint venture.

- (3) Through local agents.

### NOXIOUS WEED

#### *Caltrop*

2111. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Adverting to his reply to question 2074 of 1981 relating to the plant caltrop, will he table a copy of the technical evidence which indicated that the plant caltrop was insignificant as a pest of agriculture, to a level which justified its removal from the declared noxious weeds list?

Mr OLD replied:

Yes. Report is hereby tabled.

*The paper was tabled (see paper No. 509).*

### FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

#### *Charges: Rebates*

2112. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Bearing in mind that the State Energy Commission action group submitted its proposal for a rebate system to the Minister for Fuel and Energy in May 1980, can he give the reasons for the time required in making available the report on the State Energy Commission action group proposal for rebated electricity and gas charges?
- (2) (a) On what date was the State Energy Commission action group advised that the report had been completed;
- (b) when were they provided with a copy of the report?

- (3) Is it a fact that the report was issued to a number of welfare organisations who supported the State Energy Commission action group's proposal by way of signed letters which were attached to the proposal and that these reports were sent by way of courier service?
- (4) Is it a fact that other welfare organisations were not issued copies of the report or advised that the report was available?
- (5) (a) By what criteria did he select the organisations to whom copies of the report were issued; and  
(b) which organisations received copies via—  
(i) mail;  
(ii) courier service;  
(iii) other means?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) A proposal by the SEC action group for rebated electricity and gas charges was submitted to me in August 1980, not May 1980 as suggested.  
I assume the member is referring to a proposal which raised issues that were farreaching and required extensive research and consideration. It must be appreciated that Commonwealth Government responsibilities, as well as State Government operations, were involved.  
It was essential that all aspects were fully evaluated and issues of importance were not overlooked because of a premature response.
- (2) (a) and (b) I am advised that advice was directly given on 10 September 1981 and, at the same time, they received the letter advising them of the Government's decision.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) and (5) Copies of the report, together with a covering letter, were sent to each identified organisation which had been a party to the original submission. A copy was also forwarded to the office of the Leader of the Opposition.

#### HOSPITALS

##### *Cost per Bed*

2113. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the cost per bed per day at—  
(a) Royal Perth Hospital;  
(b) Royal Perth Hospital annex, Shenton Park;

- (c) Royal Perth Hospital annex, Mt. Lawley;
- (d) Princess Margaret Hospital;
- (e) Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital;
- (f) King Edward Memorial Hospital;
- (g) Fremantle Hospital;
- (h) Osborne Park Hospital;
- (i) Swan Districts Hospital;
- (j) Armadale Hospital;
- (k) Kelmscott Hospital?

- (2) What is the staffing ratio per bed at these hospitals?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) The costs per bed per day for 1980-81 are—  
(a) \$261.31;  
(b) \$201.70;  
(c) not available;  
(d) \$382.76;  
(e) \$265.41;  
(f) \$225.87;  
(g) \$275.79;  
(h) \$124.48;  
(i) \$130.13;  
(j) \$112.37;  
(k) see (j) — Armadale - Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital.  
All costs include expenditure associated with outpatient treatment. No separate accounts are maintained in respect of outpatient services.
- (2) The staffing ratios per bed based on staff numbers employed as at 30 June, 1981 are—  
(a) 4.72  
(b) 2.55 } 3.75  
(c) 0.52  
(d) 4.79;  
(e) 4.13;  
(f) 2.78;  
(g) 3.94;  
(h) 1.58;  
(i) 1.84;  
(j) 1.63;  
(k) see (j) — Armadale - Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital.  
All ratios include staff associated with outpatient treatment.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE

*Family Advisory Committee*

2114. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Who are the members of the advisory committee established to help develop a family policy for Western Australia?
- (2) How many times has the committee met?
- (3) What recommendations or reports have been made?
- (4) What action has been taken as a result?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Sir Lawrence Jackson (Chairman)  
Dr Judith Henzel—Child Health Services  
Dr Warren Loudon—Education Department  
Mr David Greenhill—Department for Community Welfare  
His Honour Judge Ferrier—Family Law Court  
Mrs Pat Smeeton—private member  
Mrs Sally Pownall—private member  
Mrs Anne Griffiths—private member  
Mr Robert Isaacs—private member  
Mr Jeff Hopp—private member.
- (2) 10 times.
- (3) Advice has been received on the subject of adoption—access to information. The committee is currently working on five projects as follows—
  - (a) Community support for the aged;
  - (b) the family in remote areas;
  - (c) crisis care in WA;
  - (d) the development of a framework to permit the existence of a healthy family;
  - (e) child day care.
- (4) The advice on adoption will be used along with other information obtained on the subject in due course. Other reports will be considered.

## CULTURAL AFFAIRS: FILMS

*Projection Operators*

2115. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

Will he table the regulations made pursuant to the Electricity Act which deal with the licensing of cinematograph operators?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The relevant regulations were tabled in the House in 1947, at the time they were promulgated, and were reprinted in 1968. The reprinted regulations are in a separate binding and I am advised a copy may be obtained through the Clerk of Papers at Parliament House.

As advised in reply to question 2094 of Thursday, 1 October, action is in hand to repeal the regulations concerning cinematograph operators.

EDUCATION: TECHNICAL  
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT*Office Accommodation*

2116. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What office accommodation is occupied by the Technical Education Directorate at 184 St. George's Terrace, Perth?
- (2) What is the cost of such tenancy?
- (3) What is the proposed duration of such tenancy?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Ground floor, floors 6, 8, 9, 10, and part of floors 5 and 7.
- (2) \$133 421 p.a.
- (3) Part February 1982, part June 1983, part continuing indefinitely.

## HEALTH: CLUBS

*Life Membership*

2117. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Adverting to my question 2093 of 1981 relating to "life membership" of a health club, how many complaints relating to Ian Goodwin's Health Club "life membership" have been received by the Consumer Affairs Bureau?
- (2) What assistance has been given to those complainants?



Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) 21.
- (2) Complainants have been advised to lodge any claims at the Small Claims Tribunal and to claim jointly against current proprietors, Mr and Mrs Duncan, and the previous owner, Blackstone Holdings Pty. Limited.

#### EDUCATION: NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

*Ananda Marga*

2118. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it fact, as reported in the *The Australian Financial Review* of 29 September that Federal and State Government grants are being paid to an Ananda Marga school in Western Australia?
- (2) To which school are the grants being paid?
- (3) How long have the grants been paid?
- (4) Does the Government have any suspicion that the school is operated for any other than educational purposes?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) *Per capita* grants are paid to the Sunrise School which had been known as the Ananda Marga School.
- (3) Since it was declared an efficient school in 1976.
- (4) No.

#### STATE FORESTS: PRODUCTS

*Complex at Bunbury:  
Proposal*

2119. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Is it a fact that there is a current proposal to build a multi-million dollar complex to treat forest products near Bunbury?
- (2) What is the exact location of the proposed mill site?
- (3) How many people will be employed at the site?
- (4) When is it proposed to commence development of this complex?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (4) The WA Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd. has advised me that proposals are being considered. I have been informed by the company that it has acquired land 22 kilometres south-east of Bunbury for possible use as a plant site. Studies regarding possible uses of the site are being undertaken.

#### STATE FORESTS: PRODUCTS

*Complex at Bunbury:  
Site*

2120. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Is it a fact that a multi-million dollar complex to treat forest products is mooted for a site near Bunbury?
- (2) Will it cover existing State forest?
- (3) What is the area of land acquired by WA Chip & Pulp Co. Pty. Ltd.?
- (4) Was that land purchased from the State Government?
- (5) If so, for how much?
- (6) Where will the timber for the mill come from?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) Proposals are under consideration.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not known.
- (4) No.
- (5) See (4).
- (6) From various localities mainly in State forest depending on the range of industries finally developed.

#### STATE FORESTS: PRODUCTS

*Complex at Bunbury:  
ERMP*

2121. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is it a fact that a multi-million dollar complex to treat forest products is mooted for a site near Bunbury?
- (2) Will there be an environmental review and management programme for this proposal?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) I understand that some very preliminary discussions have been held.

- (2) When and if a proposal is put to the Government, it will be referred to the EPA for advice.
- (3) Answered by (2).

### MINING: COAL

#### *Esperance*

2122. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Can the Minister provide me with a map showing the precise location of the recently discovered Esperance brown coal deposit showing details of the size of the area and amount of brown coal proven so far?
- (2) Does this discovery impinge on any national park in the area?
- (3) If so, which national park and to what extent?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Plan showing tenements upon which a discovery of brown coal has been made is tabled. Company statements have indicated a quantity approaching one billion tonnes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).

*The paper was tabled (see paper No. 508).*

### FEDERAL BUDGET

#### *Funding: Cutbacks*

2123. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of recent cuts in the Federal Budget in air pollution funding, soil conservation funding and no increases being made for water conservation methods?
- (2) What action does the State Government intend to take as a result of this course of action by the Federal Government?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) Such funds are not provided to the Department of Conservation and Environment to administer and it is suggested the member inquire of the relevant Ministers; namely, Health Agriculture, and Public Works respectively.

### FEDERAL BUDGET: LAND

#### *Purchase: Grants*

2124. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the recent Federal budget shows State grants for the purchase of land has been wound down to an amount of next to nothing?
- (2) Will the State Government make immediate overtures to the Federal Government for more money to be provided for the purchase of land for reserves throughout Western Australia?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) The recent Federal Budget contained numerous areas of constraint which have resulted in the State having to readjust its areas of Budget expenditure. Allocation of money for the purchase of lands for reserves in Western Australia is but one of these areas and will receive the same scrutiny as others.

### EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

#### *Rockingham*

2125. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Transport:

Further to his answers to me of my question 1915 of 1981 relating to Warnbro students, travelling time, what bus can be taken by Warnbro students to ensure they arrive at school in time for classes; providing the bus number, the time of departure from Warnbro, and the time of arrival at the school?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Route 125 bus departs Warnbro at 0730 hours connecting at the Rockingham transfer station with the route 123 bus to Safety Bay at 0755 hours. This bus normally arrives near the school at 0802 hours.

The member should be aware that particulars of bus timetables are readily available from the MTT's information offices.

# TRAFFIC: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

## *Cross Street-Wharf Street Intersection*

2126. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) As there are now over 300 children crossing daily at the intersection of Wharf and Cross Streets, Queens Park, to attend the Queens Park primary school, will he have immediately installed a crosswalk attendant at this intersection?
- (2) As there are "no walk" signs or "children crossing" signs at this intersection, will he also have arrangements made to have these signs erected forthwith?
- (3) As Wharf Street is used as a bypass road for many heavy vehicles servicing the Kewdale industrial complex, together with the intensive build up of all other types of vehicular traffic during the times the children are attending their school, will he treat both these problems as extremely urgent?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Investigation will be carried out and a decision made resultant on surveys conducted.
- (2) Erection of signs will be dependent on the result of investigations as in question (1).
- (3) The matter will be dealt with as soon as practicable—I expect the first steps will be taken within two weeks.
- (4) Not applicable.

# LAND: RESUMPTIONS

## *Orders*

2127. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) As there have been many people financially affected by land resumptions where the land has been gazetted for certain purposes and not required to be used for many years with the owners still in possession, is there a statutory limit of time such land can be held without the actual payment for such resumptions either by local councils or by Government instrumentalities?
- (2) If "Yes", what is the period of time?

- (3) In view of the financial loss such actions have caused to ordinary home owners brought about by the fact that no one will purchase land which is under threat of resumption, will she have the matter fully examined, with a view to enabling those properties so affected, to be resumed immediately in order that financial settlement can be arranged without delay?

- (4) If not, why not?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) The procedures for making and settling claims for compensation for resumption of property are set out in the Public Works Act. Times are set down. Upon resumption, land vests in the statutory body involved and there is no statutory limit in the sense of the question.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) and (4) If the question relates to town planning schemes, it would be beyond the resources available to examine all town planning schemes in the way suggested. In the case of local authority schemes, the initiative rests with the landowner to claim compensation for injurious affection and each scheme must set out the period within which compensation can be claimed, being not less than six months. Compensation procedures in respect of the metropolitan region scheme vary and an explanatory pamphlet is available at the office of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. If the member has some specific proposals in mind, I will try and assist in providing further information.

# COURT: LICENSING

## *Hotels*

2128. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) For the past two years is the Licensing Court satisfied that all hotels have been taking bookings for all available accommodation?
- (2) If not, without identifying the hotels, what are the particulars of the failure to do so?
- (3) Are all hotels supplying table service for meals in their dining rooms during the full hours as prescribed?

- (4) If not, what number of hotels were deficient in the metropolitan area and the country respectively in the matter of providing—
  - (a) lunch and/or dinner served at tables in dining rooms; and
  - (b) serving such meals during the hours specified in the Liquor Act?
- (5) Without necessarily identifying individual hotels, what are the particulars of such breaches?
- (6) What action, if any, has been taken—
  - (a) against offenders; and
  - (b) to ensure future compliance?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No complaint has been received by the Licensing Court in respect of hotels failing to take bookings for available accommodation. On this basis the court is reasonably satisfied that a serious problem does not exist.
- (2) Answered by (1) above.
- (3) From time to time complaints are received from members of the public that hotels are not supplying table service as required. When this occurs, an explanation is sought from the licensee and he is advised that a substantiated breach may result in the suspension of his licence. In all cases this action appears to be effective and the required service is provided.
- (4) (a) and (b) Statistics on these matters are not maintained in the office of the Licensing Court. The staff is fully occupied with its statutory duties and the clerical labour necessary to maintain lists of complaints is not available. It would be necessary to search the individual files pertaining to each hotel licence of the 380 in force as at 30 June 1981 to obtain the information.
- (5) and (6) Answered by (3) above.

## LIQUOR

### Taverns

2129. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) In respect of taverns, in how many instances has it been reported in the past 12 months that light meals have not been available at all times?
- (2) In how many cases has action been taken where breaches have occurred?

- (3) What was the nature of that action?
- (4) Does the liquor and gaming branch of the Police Department make checks as to the provision of light meals?
- (5) If so, with what results as to number of premises failing to meet requirements, the number of breaches detected, and the action taken subsequently?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Four.
- (2) Four.
- (3) Three cases dealt with by the Licensing Court, one by police prosecution. Of those dealt with by the Licensing Court, one resulted in no breach of the Licensing Act, and, in the other two cases, warnings were issued.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Answered by (1) to (3).

2130. *This question was postponed.*

## EDUCATION: GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

### *Migrants: English Classes*

2131. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Further to question 2073 of 1981 concerning on-the-job adult English classes, can he advise which Government department in Western Australia has expressed interest in a course entitled "Courses in Industry"?
- (2) How does the course relate to the development of on-the-job adult English classes?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Metropolitan Water Board  
Hospital and Allied Services  
Telecom  
Australia Post.
- (2) They are synonymous.

## LAND

### *Reserve: Animal*

2132. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Further to my question 2059 of 1981 relevant to Crown land reserves, and to which he replied that his department

had not set aside any area of Crown land in Nambung Road, Badgingarra as an animal reserve, will the Minister justify his department's letters to people holding leases of Crown land in this area stating that "action is now proceeding for the purpose of this area and the surrounding Crown land as a reserve for the purposes of flora and fauna"?

- (2) What action is anticipated against those holders of Crown land leases, bearing in mind the cost for fencing and stock purposes outlaid by the farmers in this area?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) The Department of Conservation and Environment has suggested a reservation of vacant Crown land north of Nambung Road for the purpose of Conservation of Flora and Fauna. The proposal has been referred to the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife and to other departments.

The area concerned, which is on the north side of Nambung Road, is not leased currently for grazing and any fencing undertaken by a lessee of Crown land is on the south side of the road and is therefore unaffected.

Any applications for the land under consideration for a reserve on the north side of the road have been consistently refused.

#### WATER RESOURCES: CATCHMENT AREAS

##### *Declaration*

2133. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Under the Country Areas Water Supply Act, is consideration being given to declaring any or all of the Blackwood, Frankland and Deep Rivers as catchment areas?
- (2) If "Yes", when will a decision be announced?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

#### WATER RESOURCES: EFFLUENT

##### *Mullaloo*

2134. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Is it fact that the Metropolitan Water Board is installing a bypass valve which will discharge untreated effluent to the outfall at Mullaloo, at the moment, if there is a breakdown of generators or blockage?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The arrangement being installed in connection with the enlargement of the Beenyup treatment plant is a necessary precaution to ensure that, should an industrial dispute or power failure prevent the secondary treatment plant from operating, then the primary treated effluent can be diverted to the outfall.

#### HOUSING: FLATS

##### *Wandana*

2135. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing.

- (1) Is he aware that State Housing Commission tenants on the ninth floor of block A in Wandana Flats have to dispose of their rubbish by taking it into a lift down to a communal rubbish disposal bin?
- (2) Is he also aware that tenants in blocks B and C have to drag their rubbish down steps to get it to the communal rubbish disposal bin?
- (3) Is he also aware of the particular difficulties for the large number of aged and disabled people in these flats due to this method of rubbish disposal?
- (4) Has any consideration been given to extending the furnace chimney and fitting it with a cowl in order to enable the reopening of the rubbish chutes as a means of easing the rubbish disposal problems for aged and disabled tenants?
- (5) If "No" to (4), what other measures are being considered as a means of easing these problems?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) and (2) Tenants in Wandana Flats, if they are complying with the directions given, should be using kitchen tidy bins in their units. They would then only have a small parcel to be taken to the disposal bin, as required.
- (3) There are no particular difficulties for aged persons in this method of rubbish disposal. Any disabled persons having difficulty can approach the resident manager for assistance.
- (4) and (5) No. Both furnace and rubbish chutes have been matters of considerable tenant dissatisfaction in the past and the present method is generally well accepted by tenants.

#### HOUSING: FLATS

##### *Wandana*

2136. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is he aware of access problems for aged and disabled tenants in Wandana Flats posed by steps at the Thomas Street and Barker Road entrances and off the courtyard?
- (2) Has consideration been given to providing better access at these entrances?
- (3) If "No", will he have the need for better access at these entrances further investigated?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) If any tenant has difficulty he/she should approach the resident manager at Wandana.

#### HOUSING: RENTAL

##### *Emergent and Wait-turn*

2137. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many families are listed wait turn for State Housing Commission rental accommodation in the metropolitan area—
  - (a) south of the river; and
  - (b) north of the river;
 in the following categories—
  - (i) two-bedroomed apartment;
  - (ii) two-bedroomed duplex;
  - (iii) two-bedroomed single detached house?

- (2) How many families are listed emergent for State Housing Commission rental accommodation in the metropolitan area—

- (a) south of the river; and
- (b) north of the river;

in the following categories—

- (i) two-bedroomed apartment;
- (ii) two-bedroomed duplex;
- (iii) two-bedroomed single detached house?

- (3) How many families are listed wait turn for State Housing Commission rental accommodation in the metropolitan area—

- (a) south of the river; and
- (b) north of the river;

for four-bedroomed accommodation?

- (4) How many families are listed emergent for State Housing Commission accommodation—

- (a) south of the river; and
- (b) north of the river;

for four-bedroomed accommodation?

- (5) How many State Housing Commission rental units of the following categories were constructed in the metropolitan area in the past financial year—

- (a) two-bedroomed apartments;
- (b) two-bedroomed duplexes;
- (c) two-bedroomed houses?

- (6) How many four-bedroomed State Housing Commission rental houses were constructed in the metropolitan area in the past financial year?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (6) As the information will take time to collate, the member will be advised by letter.

#### HOUSING: RENTAL

##### *Emergent*

2138. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Can he confirm that the State Housing Commission is referring Aboriginal families listed for emergent

accommodation assistance to the Aboriginal Housing Board, knowing that the Aboriginal Housing Board has no housing available for allocation to emergency cases?

- (2) On what basis are Aboriginal families referred to the Aboriginal Housing Board for assistance?
- (3) On what basis is Commonwealth-State grant housing allocated?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) Aboriginal applicants assessed as suitable for Aboriginal grant housing are referred to the Aboriginal Housing Board for assistance according to the availability of accommodation.
- (2) and (3) Applicants who satisfy the criteria set down for Commonwealth-State rental accommodation are listed accordingly. Those applicants who do not meet this criteria are referred to the Aboriginal Housing Board for consideration of their listing for housing under the Aboriginal housing scheme.

### HOUSING: ABORIGINES

#### *Accommodation Available*

2139. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the current total stock of Commonwealth-State Aboriginal grant housing in the metropolitan area?
- (2) How many of these houses are in the following categories—
- (a) two-bedroomed;
- (b) three-bedroomed;
- (c) four-bedroomed;
- (d) five-bedroomed?
- (3) How many families are currently listed for wait turn and emergent assistance in each of these categories?
- (4) How many Commonwealth-State Aboriginal grant houses were constructed in the past financial year in each category in—
- (a) the metropolitan area;
- (b) non-metropolitan areas?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (3) Some of the information has been provided in question 2140. The other will take some time to collate and the member will be advised by letter.

(4) Category	(a) Metro-politan	(b) Non Metro-politan
Two-bedroomed	6	4
Three-bedroomed	23	69
Four-bedroomed	3	26
Five-bedroomed	3	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>99</b>

### HOUSING: ABORIGINES

#### *Aboriginal Housing Board: Allocation*

2140. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the total stock of housing available for allocation by the Aboriginal Housing Board in the metropolitan area in the following categories—
- (a) two-bedroomed apartments;
- (b) two-bedroomed duplexes;
- (c) two-bedroomed houses;
- (d) three-bedroomed apartments;
- (e) three-bedroomed town houses;
- (f) three-bedroomed duplexes;
- (g) three-bedroomed houses;
- (h) four-bedroomed houses;
- (i) five-bedroomed houses?

- (2) How many vacancies currently exist in each of these categories?
- (3) How many units of accommodation are currently under offer in each of these categories?
- (4) How many units of accommodation are currently under maintenance in each of these categories?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (4) As at 30 September 1981 the position was as follows—

Category	(1) Stock Available	(2) Vacancies	(3) Under Offer	(4) Under Maintenance
(a) 2BR apartments	-	-	-	-
(b) 2BR duplexes	8	-	-	-
(c) 2BR homes	34	-	-	-
(d) 3BR apartments	-	-	-	-
(e) 3BR town houses	-	-	-	-
(f) 3BR duplexes	2	-	-	-
(g) 3BR houses	359	7	1	6
(h) 4BR houses	65	3	-	3
(i) 5BR houses	13	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>

## HOUSING: ABORIGINES

*Aboriginal Housing Board;  
Emergent and Wait-turn*

2141. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister  
Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many families are currently listed for accommodation assistance in the metropolitan area on a wait turn basis with the Aboriginal Housing Board for—
  - (a) two-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (b) three-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (c) four-bedroomed accommodation?
- (2) How many families are currently listed for accommodation assistance in the metropolitan area on an emergent basis with the Aboriginal Housing Board for—
  - (a) two-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (b) three-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (c) four-bedroomed accommodation?
- (3) How many families are currently listed for transfer in the metropolitan area on a wait turn basis with the Aboriginal Housing Board to—
  - (a) three-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (b) four-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (c) five-bedroomed accommodation?
- (4) How many families are currently listed for transfer in the metropolitan area on emergent basis with the Aboriginal Housing Board to—
  - (a) three-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (b) four-bedroomed accommodation;
  - (c) five-bedroomed accommodation?
- (5) What is the approximate waiting time for families listed for accommodation assistance and transfer as detailed in (1) to (4) above, before allocation may be expected?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (5) As the information will take time to collate, the member will be advised by letter.

## HOUSING: TOWNHOUSES

*Koondoola*

2142. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister  
Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What decision has been made by the State Housing Commission in response

to my representations of 22 July 1981 for improved provision for tenant parking and individual letter boxes for townhouse units at 11 Nankivell Way, Koondoola?

- (2) If no decision has been made after nearly three months have elapsed, when will I be advised of improvement plans to ease the long-felt problems of the tenants concerned?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) and (2) I am advised that you wrote to the general manager of the commission on these, and other matters on 22 July and that consideration of the various matters involved liaison and decision by outside bodies.

The general manager advises me that he will reply to that letter within a week.

## HOUSING: RENTAL

*Emergent*

2143. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister  
Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Further to his answer to question 2108 of 1981, can he say whether he has yet received the advice of the Chairman of the Aboriginal Housing Board and the State Housing Commission regarding accommodation for the Hansen families?
- (2) If "Yes", what provision is to be made for these families?
- (3) If "No", will he agree to expedite the process in view of the fact that one of these families has now for several weeks been taking up more than half the space available in a womens refuge in conditions which are only meant to cope with temporary emergency situations?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) I have requested the chairman of both boards to arrange a meeting of interested groups as soon as practicable, to see whether a solution to this family's problems can be found within the welfare field.



## HOUSING: ABORIGINES

*Aboriginal Housing Board:  
Mr L. Coomer*

2144. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Why did the State Housing Commission refuse to agree to a proposal by welfare workers for Mr L. Coomer, who is a widower with five children urgently in need of accommodation, to move into a three-bedroomed Commonwealth-State Aboriginal grant house in Salmar Way, Balga, which is presently occupied by a widow anxious to obtain smaller accommodation for herself and her dependent grandchild?
- (2) Is he aware that the present tenant in the Balga house is fully in agreement with such an exchange of accommodation to make way for the larger family unit?
- (3) Is he also aware of the serious medical problems affecting the youngest Coomer child, requiring ongoing treatment at Princess Margaret Hospital?
- (4) Is he aware of the need for the family to be housed in the Balga-Girrawheen area to allow another child to continue to attend a special class in that vicinity and so that they can be close to female relatives for family support?
- (5) If "Yes" to (2) to (4) above, why has this family been cast into a virtual limbo by being referred for assistance to the Aboriginal Housing Board, when it is likely that this will entail an extremely long delay in proper accommodation being made available?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (5) The State Housing Commission has a long-standing policy of not divulging personal details of its clients to the public.

The questions asked by the member will be examined and the answers will be supplied by letter.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE

*Homeless Youths*

2145. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Has he received recommendations from the advisory committee he established in

association with the youth services support scheme for the allocation of funds to projects catering for homeless young people?

- (2) If "Yes", has he gone against the committee's recommendation in the way in which he has chosen to allocate these funds?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), in what way has he departed from the committee's recommendations?
- (4) On what grounds and on whose advice has he gone against these recommendations?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Yes. Recommendations have been made to me from an advisory committee established by my predecessor.
- (2) to (4) Advisory committees exist to tender advice. That advice is received, and decisions are made having regard to the advice received and other considerations which ought appropriately be considered by the Minister responsible for making decisions.

I will not disclose details of the advice tendered.

Allocation of funds requires the final approval of the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security. Recommendations have been made to him by me.

## HEALTH

*Hove Day Centre*

2146. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Can he confirm that the 20 children and young people at Hove Day Centre are to be sent to other centres in 1982?

- (2) If "Yes" to (1)—

- (a) Is Hove Day Centre to be converted into an entertainment centre for older intellectually handicapped people;

- (b) What alternative arrangements will be made for the children and young people now attending Hove Day Centre;

- (c) What consultation will there be with parents about these alternative arrangements and when will parents be given definite information about arrangements for 1982?
- (3) If "No" to (1), what changes, if any, are to be made to Hove Day Centre in 1982?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) No decision has been made to move any clients presently attending Hove Day Centre.
- (2) (a) to (c) Not applicable.
- (3) There are no plans for any changes at the Hove Day Centre in 1982. The future utilisation of the facility, as with all units, may vary from time to time depending on the overall needs of the division for the intellectually handicapped.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### HEALTH: MENTAL

#### *Graylands Hospital*

593. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in the *Weekend News* of 10 October in which it is claimed that more than 120 attacks on nurses by patients have occurred at the Graylands Hospital in the past six months?
- (2) Can he confirm whether the information is correct; and if it is, can he inform the House what action he is taking to improve the situation at that hospital?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) and (2) I read the article and I have discussed it with the Director of Mental Health Services. He will report back to me on the matter.

### POLICE AND RTA

#### *Amalgamation*

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

I am sure he has anticipated the question. I refer to questions without notice to him recently on the subject of the merger of the Road Traffic Authority and the Police Department. In

particular I refer to question without notice 525 on Wednesday, 23 September which the Minister answered by reading from a prepared statement stating that Cabinet had decided there would not be a merger of the RTA and the Police Department. On 29 September, just two weeks ago, I gave the Minister two chances to reconsider his previous answer, and he once again confirmed that such a decision had not been made. We note that in tonight's Budget speech that decision has been made. I am interested to hear what sort of rationalisation the Minister can give in the context of the clear contradiction.

Mr HASSELL replied:

I did not at any time say that a decision had been made not to merge the RTA and the Police Department although the member has just suggested I did. I said, "No decision has been made to merge". I say simply to the member that the answers I gave were true and accurate at the time they were given.

### MINING: ROYALTIES

#### *Increases*

595. Mr BRYCE, to the Treasurer:

I refer to the Treasurer's reference in this evening's Budget speech to mineral royalties and lease rentals wherein he indicated that an additional \$7 million would be raised in a full year and \$3 million in 1981-82 by way of increases in those royalties and rentals. Will he be good enough to indicate which sectors of the minerals industry will bear the brunt of the increase, or which sectors will provide the amount of \$7 million in a full year?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In my remarks I made it clear a detailed statement will be issued by the Minister for Resources Development, and that he will do. I did not want to weary the House with the details. If the member reads my statement—it was not unusual in a case like this—he will see that I said a statement will be issued by the Minister setting out the full details of the situation.

Mr Bryce: Can you give an indication of when that is likely to be?

Sir CHARLES COURT: It will be fairly soon. I think the member has enough to digest tonight.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## *Bridgetown*

596. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it intended to close the Department of Agriculture office at Bridgetown?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), when is it intended that such closure will take place?
- (3) If "No" to (1), is it intended to downgrade the Department of Agriculture office at Bridgetown and if so, will he give details of the extent of downgrading and timing?

Mr OLD replied:

I thank the member for some notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) No.

# STOCK: SHEEPSKINS

## *Treatment: Tests*

597. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are trials connected with the effects of Clout and the use of a changed formula for Clout being carried out in Western Australia?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "Yes", on how many properties are such tests being carried out, and where is each property located?
- (3) Are officers of the Department of Agriculture involved in these trials? If they are, how many officers are involved?
- (4) What is the estimated cost of these tests, and by whom will the cost be borne?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) to (4) I thank the member for the complete lack of notice of this question, and I thank him for his faith in my

ability to reel off from the top of my head the requested figures. Were I able to do so I would not. I suggest he put the question on notice. Briefly I can say that trials are being carried out. The member knows very well that they are because he is being fed with a fair bit of information from a certain quarter. If he would like to put the question on notice I will give him the answer tomorrow.

# EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES

## *Funding*

598. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

Is he aware a senior member of his departmental staff has told the committee of one pre-school—one at least—that the Education Department is considering providing no funding at all for four-year-olds to be accommodated at pre-school centres in 1982, and that where existing pre-school centres cannot fill their entitlement with five-year-olds the teachers will be put onto part-time duties, and, indeed, parts of centres or whole centres may be closed? Is he in a position to inform the House whether those statements are accurate? If so, when will an official statement to that effect be made?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I am not aware that such statements were made. If the member wants further information I ask him to put the question on notice.

# POLICE: ACT

## *Section 54B*

599. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Is it correct that the Police Department has refused a permit under section 54B of the Police Act to allow students from

Mt. Lawley college to march down the Mall to Forest Place carrying flags of different countries as part of Universal Children's Day, a function of the United Nations Association?

- (2) Is it correct that the Perth City Council raised no objection to the march which was to have been held on Saturday 17 October?
- (3) Is he prepared to review the Police Department decision?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) to (3) I have no knowledge of the matter raised. If the member puts the question on notice certainly I will give him an answer.

#### HOUSING: RENTAL

*Emergent: Mr D. R. Tulloch*

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

- (1) Why has the State Housing Commission not arranged for an inspection of the urgent housing needs of Mr D. R. Tulloch of Bassendean referred by me on 16 September, in spite of efforts by welfare workers to arrange for the repayment of tenant's liability on former State Housing Commission accommodation made known to the commission?
- (2) Is he aware that this invalid pensioner is paying \$45 per week for a private two-bedroomed house for his family of five children ranging in age from four to 12 years?
- (3) Is he aware also that one of these children suffers from muscular dystrophy?
- (4) Will he undertake to see that a State Housing Commission inspector calls on the family this week and that their need for adequate housing will be dealt with as a matter of high urgency?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (4) The State Housing Commission has a long-standing policy of not divulging personal details of its clients to the public.

The questions asked by the member will be examined and the answers will be supplied by letter.

The member has asked whether I will consider this matter urgently. I assure him that I will do so. I make the point that in asking the question the member gave many details about the particular applicant for assistance. Some 25 000 tenancies are handled by the commission, and thousands of people presently require assistance. I have no knowledge that any of those people want their personal details divulged to the public through this Parliament.

Mr Wilson: You don't know how desperate they are. If you did you would worry.

Mr LAURANCE: In the interests of privacy, if the member wishes to raise matters relating to the personal details of either tenants or applicants he should do so in writing to me and I will reply in writing.

#### PRIVATE HOSPITALS AND NURSING HOMES

*Medical Practitioners: Financial Interest*

601. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Did he attend a recent Health Minister's Conference at Darwin that recommended to the Federal Government that it should disallow private hospital subsidies and nursing home benefits to private hospitals and nursing homes in which doctors had a direct or indirect financial interest?
- (2) Is it a fact that the Health Ministers recommended to the Federal Government that the details of ownership of private hospitals and nursing homes should be revealed before Government benefits are paid?
- (3) Does he agree with and support the decision taken by the Health Ministers' Conference?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) to (3) I did not attend that meeting, but I was represented at it by the Commissioner of Public Health.

I understand that what the member has said is correct. I have not had a report on that meeting at this stage and have not discussed the meeting with the commissioner, but intend to do so. I will be then in a position to answer the third part of the question.

#### WATER RESOURCES: CATCHMENT AREAS

##### *Declaration*

602. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Has he seen an article on page 10 of today's *Daily News* headed, "Government Accused over Stand on Clearing"? The article refers to clearing of land east of Toodyay by a big pastoral company, JIMWA Pty Ltd.
- (2) Further on the article states that the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife said that the Government is powerless to intervene, but is disappointed by the company's decision. Why is the Government not prepared to use section 9 of the Country Areas Water Supply Act to declare the area a water catchment area?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (2) I have seen the article. The answer to the question asking why the Government does not declare the area as a water catchment area is twofold. Firstly, the member would know that areas have been declared, not from the point of view of trying to defend agricultural pursuits, but from the point of view of the creeks and waterways which make up the public water supply. In the area mentioned, according to the advice I have, it is not envisaged that in the foreseeable future creeks and waterways will make up part of the public water supply.

It might well be that, as a result of clearing, certain salinity of land occurs, and certainly salinity of creeks occurs which could be to the detriment of certain farmers.

Secondly, even though intervention could not be considered under provisions in the Act, the paying of compensation would be prohibitive. The member could calculate the amount. When he compares the cost of the land per hectare or acre, or any unit he chooses in the areas presently being declared, with the costs of the land the subject of the question, he will realise that under the present conditions the Treasury simply could not afford to pay compensation.

#### TRAFFIC: RTA

##### *Resignation of Senior Executive*

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

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the rumour that a very senior executive officer of the RTA resigned today?
- (2) Is he aware of any resignation at the higher levels of the RTA today?
- (3) If "Yes", can he advise the House of the details?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.

#### ABORIGINES

##### *Lang Hancock: Statement*

604. Mr PEARCE, to the Premier:

In the context of the outrageous statement made on Aboriginal affairs quite recently by Lang Hancock, and his Government's ambivalent attitude to the

question of racism, is it his Government's intention to legislate during his time as Premier to outlaw discrimination of this type or any other type of discrimination on racial or other grounds?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I assume the member for Gosnells is referring specifically to the remarks made by Mr Lang Hancock. I think the Government has expressed itself in very specific and appropriate terms on this matter. We certainly do not condone what Mr Hancock has said, but heaven forbid that we have a Government which would stop people from saying things, even if they are wrong things.

If the member for Gosnells wishes everyone to run around with a gag on his mouth so that he cannot say things, whether they are right or wrong, then he should say so. I cannot see what this matter has to do with bringing down legislation of the type to which the member has referred.

We do not condone racial discrimination, and the best way to show that is by our own actions. That is the best way one can demonstrate that one does not condone racial discrimination. The Minister for Community Welfare made his attitude and his Government's attitude to Mr Hancock's remarks very clear. For my own part, I am amazed that the Press took his comments so seriously, because they were so outrageous.

Mr Pearce: Are you going to legislate on it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: If we have to legislate against Mr Hancock making such remarks, then we will have to legislate against some of the comments made by the member for Gosnells.

Government members: Hear, hear!

#### MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

##### *Financial Interests: Disclosure*

605. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

Taking note of the Premier's apparent public acceptance of the need for disclosure of financial interests of

members of Parliament, can he inform the House, and the public, when he will be in a position to announce the Government's policy on this matter?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I cannot be precise as to when we will be prepared to make a statement. However, I do want to say that the Government will not indulge in the stunting and grandstanding in which the member is indulging in an attempt to give the impression that he is holier than thou and that one-one has as much honesty or integrity as he has on his side. I would pit my men against him any day.

Several members interjected.

Sir CHARLES COURT: When the findings of the Nigel Bowen report are studied and the Government and the joint party decision has been made, we will make an announcement. However, I cannot be precise as to when that will be, knowing the Attorney General as I do and his thoroughness and competence in these matters.

Mr Pearce: Slow.

Mr Bryce: Probably won't remember the 1980s.

Sir CHARLES COURT: He will report fairly promptly and the joint party members will then consider the matter and make a statement.

#### HEALTH: DISABLED PERSONS

##### *International Year*

606. Mr PEARCE, to the Premier:

In the context of the Premier's apparent lack of desire to have anti-discriminatory legislation of any type, is it his Government's intention to make any significant gesture to the disabled people in this year of the disabled, before the year ends?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I do not know how many more times the member for Gosnells wants to put his foot in his own mouth. If ever there were a Government with a continuing programme of care for the disabled,

whether they be physically disabled, mentally disabled, or intellectually less advantaged than some of us, then it is this Government. The member for Gosnells did not listen to what was said during the Budget speech when reference was made to all the efforts being made in the health field and the field of education for the disabled.

We are working very closely with the committee which is involved with the International Year of Disabled Persons 1981. I do not think a single member of that committee can claim otherwise.

The Minister and I, as well as others, are trying to get across to the public the fact that this is not a once-only thing. This year is intended to alert people to the significance of the disabled and the problems they face. It is hoped that there will be a better awareness, particularly amongst young people, of the problems of the disabled. The dealings with this programme will not be for 1981 only.

#### MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

##### *Financial Interests: Disclosure*

607. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

On the matter of disclosure of financial interests again, I ask the Premier the factors on which has been based the apparent change in policy expressed by the Premier publicly recently when he conceded that the disclosure of financial interests was probably a desirable thing.

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

There has been no change of policy at all. The Government made its position clear a long time ago.

Mr Brian Burke: When?

Sir CHARLES COURT: When we asked the Federal Government and the then Prime Minister to arrange for the whole

question to be discussed at a Premier's Conference so that we could have some unanimity throughout the whole of Australia, with a common rule and code of conduct as well as the method of disclosure which would follow the same line. Out of that came the Nigel Bowen report.

At that time we thought we would have a vehicle through which some unanimity could exist. I understand the Federal Government has within its ministerial ranks some who comply to some parts of the report. However, some back-bench members have not offered their support. We have asked the Attorney General to ascertain what aspects of the report the Government should reappraise and, if appropriate, whether we should adopt them as policy and bring them to this Parliament as a policy. There has been no change in policy and I have expressed myself on the basis that I do not believe that an open register is desirable or necessary. It would be a haven for sticky beaks. It will keep away those with a performance or some ability and assets to his credit. They will think twice before becoming involved in public life and in most cases they are the people we want to attract.

If we follow the statement of the Leader of the Opposition to its logical conclusion, we will see a sign outside here which states, "Only non-performers and no-hopers need apply".

#### MINING: DIAMONDS

##### *Marketing*

608. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Resources Development:

My question relates to the negotiations between the State Government and the

Ashton Joint Mining Venturers so far as the future diamond industry is concerned in Western Australia. Is the Government giving consideration to exploring the possibility of developing a method of marketing diamonds from Western Australia outside the scope of the Central Selling Organisation, bearing in mind that the principal market for gem and industrial diamonds

is North America and Japan, and that there appears to be no compelling reason for Australia's diamonds to be marketed through Europe?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

In answer to the direct question contained in the early part of the member's question, the answer is "Yes".

