

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 11th October, 1978

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

ROADS

*Nanutarra, Tom Price and
Paraburdoo Roads: Petition*

MR McIVER (Avon) [4.31 p.m.]: I have a petition regarding the condition of the Nanutarra-Tom Price-Paraburdoo roads which reads as follows—

The honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled.

We, the undersigned people of the Pilbara towns of Paraburdoo and Tom Price, sign this petition in protest against the present condition of the Nanutarra-Tom Price-Paraburdoo roads in this area, and respectfully request all access roads to the abovementioned towns be bituminised.

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

The petition bears 655 signatures and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 30)

PORNOGRAPHY

Exploitation of Children: Petition

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [4.32 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

The honourable the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly of State Parliament assembled:

The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia, Western Australia respectfully sheweth:

That we the undersigned, having great concern at the way in which children are now being used in the production of pornography
CALL UPON THE GOVERNMENT to introduce immediate legislation:

1. To prevent the sexual exploitation of children by way of photography for commercial purposes;
2. To penalise parents/guardians who knowingly allow their children to be used in the production of such pornographic or obscene material depicting children;
3. To make specifically illegal the publication and distribution and sale of such pornographic child-abuse material in any form whatsoever such as magazines, novels, papers, or films;
4. To take immediate police action to confiscate and destroy all child pornography in Australia and urgent appropriate legal action against all those involved or profiting from this sordid exploitation of children.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will protect all children and immediately prohibit pornographic child-abuse materials, publications or films. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition bears 38 signatures and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of this House.

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

(See petition No. 31)

PORNOGRAPHY

Exploitation of Children: Petition

MR MacKINNON (Murdoch) [4.34 p.m.]: I have a petition expressed in exactly the same terms as that read to the House by the member for Maylands. It contains 59 signatures and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 32)

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mrs Craig (Minister for Local Government), and transmitted to the Council.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Report*

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Police and Traffic), and transmitted to the Council.

**TAXI-CARS (CO-ORDINATION AND CONTROL)
ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

Second Reading

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [5.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Taxi Control Board is required to raise sufficient funds from within the industry to provide its working capital and to meet operating costs.

The purpose of this Bill is to provide an additional source of revenue to meet increasing costs due to inflation and a reduction in income from the sale of taxi-car licences.

Until recently, a major source of revenue to the board has been the issue of taxi-car licences at a premium but, due to the economic state of the industry and the policy encouraged by the board for taxi-car owners to "double shift" their vehicles, no issue has been made since 1974.

This has meant that as operators have paid out their indentures, revenue from this source has declined.

Whilst in 1974-75 the board received \$58 641 from instalments for premium plates, it is estimated that by 1980-81, it will receive only \$19 716. This figure will reduce even further in future years.

Given the present state of the industry, it is most unlikely that additional licences will be issued at a premium in the foreseeable future.

In 1976, in an attempt to correct the board's deteriorating financial position, Parliament increased the drivers' registration fee from \$5 a year to \$35 a year. This resulted in a temporary improvement when the board's surplus increased from \$6 533 in 1975-76, to \$26 552 in 1976-77.

However, in 1977-78 it fell again to \$18 633, and on the present basis of income, a deficit for

the current year of the order of \$11 000 is expected. This deficit will increase to \$51 000 for 1979-80 unless remedial action is taken.

While taking every care to ensure that a satisfactory service to the public is maintained the board has continued to meet fluctuations in traffic demand by closely monitoring the influx of drivers into the industry in an endeavour to ensure a reasonable livelihood for the present operators. This could result in a further downturn in funds by reducing the revenue raised from the driver registration fees.

In order to provide sufficient funds for its future operations, the board has examined alternative sources of revenue and has concluded that the owner of the taxi-car should be required to meet a greater share of the cost of the administration of the board, one of the effects of which is to provide protection for his capital investment.

To effect this, it is proposed to replace the present nominal transfer fee of \$2, which incidentally does not even cover the cost of administration, with a fee not exceeding 10 per cent of the market value of the taxi-car licence.

The market value will be assessed by the board by calculating the average "goodwill" value of taxi licences sold during the past 12 months.

It is anticipated that initially the fee will be based on 5 per cent of the market value and will be reassessed at the beginning of each year. It has been estimated that a 5 per cent transfer fee would raise approximately \$55 000 in a full year.

At present the Act provides for a driver's registration fee of from \$35 to \$50 a year—the actual amount to be prescribed from time to time. The Bill amends this section to provide for a fee of up to \$50 as approved by the Minister, as concurrently with the introduction of the transfer fee, it is proposed to reduce the present driver registration fee of \$35 a year to \$20 a year. This would cost the board \$27 500 in loss of revenue and would result in an overall net increase in revenue to the board of \$27 500.

Both of the proposals I have referred to have the written support of the Western Australian Taxi Operators' Association. It is also worth noting that New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia already have a similar type of fee.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr Davies: Another impost!

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr McIver.

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [5.10 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes a number of significant amendments to the Act. It extends the control of clearing to include Mundaring Weir, Denmark River catchment areas, and the water reserves of the Kent and Warren Rivers.

The Western Australian Water Resources Council put forward the view to the Government that these catchments are vulnerable and must be protected as far as practicable from increasing salinity which research has shown is accelerated when large areas of land are cleared.

Members will note that the Bill includes a provision that grants authority for additional catchments or water reserves to be added in the future, although there are no areas under consideration at present. This section could enable preventive action to be taken as a matter of urgency should the necessity arise.

Another clause provides that any additions to the schedule are subject to scrutiny by Parliament as though they were a regulation.

Included in the Bill is a provision to amend the preliminaries to construction. Following action taken against the Metropolitan Water Board recently regarding its proposal to develop groundwater at Jandakot and the subsequent amendment to that Act, an examination of the relevant sections of the Country Areas Water Supply Act was made. From this it was evident that the requirements to be met before construction could commence needed updating. The new sections in the Bill are the result.

The Public Works Department can meet the proposed requirements as set out, whereas it is impracticable to comply with the Act as it exists at present. The amendments will preserve the rights of the public to examine proposals and object if they so desire.

Another problem dealt with by the Bill is that related to contributions by subdividers to the cost of headworks. For many years the department negotiated with companies for the payment of

large sums of money towards the cost of headworks, some notable examples being—

Western Mining contributed towards the cost of upgrading the pipeline and pumping units serving the goldfields when Kambalda was developed.

Hamersley Iron provided funds towards the cost of developing the Millstream aquifer and the pipeline to Dampier.

Mt. Newman Mining contributed to the cost of developing the Yule and De Grey aquifers and associated pipelines.

In all these cases the facilities constructed became the property of the State and as the contributions were on a cash basis and were reached by mutual agreement, there was no need for statutory authority.

However, recently the department was approached for assistance with the provision of water to a proposed subdivision involving staged development over a number of years. This project, if it proceeds, could require the department to outlay a considerable sum in headworks which it has been proposed would be a charge against land and recouped as individual lots are sold.

The Crown Law Department has indicated that such an arrangement could not be entered into without an amendment to the Act.

Finally the Bill provides authority for the department, if so requested, to acquire water schemes, and whilst there are no proposals at present requiring such authority, it is a provision that will be required should the Government be approached to take over any of the water supply schemes owned by local authorities and others in various parts of the State.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson.

COUNTRY TOWNS SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [5.14 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill covers ground already explained to members when introducing the Bill to amend the Country Areas Water Supply Act.

However, in respect of authority to acquire sewerage works already constructed, there is already incorporated in the Act a section granting such authority which has been used on a number of occasions, the last time being when the Public

Works Department assumed control of the sewerage scheme for the town of Wickham.

The Bill amends this section in a minor way to make it compatible with other amendments proposed.

Similar to the amendments to the Country Areas Water Supply Act, there are new sections which update the provisions regarding preliminaries to construction. These new provisions will enable the department to meet its obligations and at the same time preserve the right of the public to object to proposals to construct and extend sewerage schemes.

The final point contained in the Bill is the introduction of the right to negotiate with the owners of land to be subdivided for a contribution towards the cost of works such as treatment plants, rising mains, and pumping stations. This authority will enable the department to enter into agreements with developers and allow fully serviced blocks to be placed on the market in and adjacent to some of our major country towns.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson.

WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [5.16 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill re-enacts the sections dealing with the supply of water to unrated land and land outside a declared water area with amendments which grant to the boards greater powers to negotiate with owners regarding terms and conditions of supply.

A new section also authorises water boards to negotiate with subdividers of land regarding the terms and conditions of supply, including a financial contribution to headworks.

This is an additional power which will be needed by water boards, particularly those administering the Bunbury and Busselton schemes as these fast-growing centres expand. It is designed to enable the boards to negotiate with land developers for an equitable contribution to necessary additional works, such as bores, pumps, tanks, and mains, to service new areas proposed to be subdivided for residential development.

Members would appreciate that with today's high costs and shortage of funds for capital works, development could be deferred indefinitely if

there was no power to enter into an arrangement whereby the developer makes a contribution.

The Bill introduces also the concept that a board may, if requested and with the approval of the Minister, acquire an established water scheme.

Although there are no proposals pending which would require such authority, it was considered appropriate to include this power as undoubtedly it will be required in the future.

I commend the Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Jamieson.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [5.19 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this proposed amendment to the Government Railways Act is to give the Railways Commission statutory authority to borrow funds in its own right. At present the commission is dependent entirely upon Treasury for its funding requirements.

The power to borrow will be made subject to the specific approval of the Treasurer or of the Governor in Executive Council.

The reason it is necessary to broaden the scope of fund sources available to the commission at this time relates to the attitude of the Commonwealth Government towards funding of the rehabilitation of the Kwinana-Koolyanobbing section of the standard gauge railway.

Following establishment of well-founded financial and economic justification for early rehabilitation of this section of railway, a case for financial assistance to undertake that work was presented to the Commonwealth Government.

The Prime Minister acknowledged the strong justification for the project but indicated the Commonwealth was unable to provide any form of financial assistance in 1977-78.

Efforts to persuade the Commonwealth to provide assistance by way of a grant of at least part of the total cost—estimated at \$76 million on December, 1977 prices—or to make additional loan funds available, were not successful.

The Prime Minister proposed that railways should borrow funds under semi-governmental conditions.

Accordingly, when the Australian Loan Council met in June of this year, it approved of a

semi-governmental allocation of \$14.5 million to the State Government in 1978-79 to cover expenditure on the Kwinana-Koolyanobbing railway rehabilitation project.

This amendment to the Government Railways Act will give the Railways Commission borrowing powers, initially for use to obtain the aforementioned sum of \$14.5 million in 1978-79.

In framing this legislation, an effort has been made to ensure that the powers provided to the Railways Commission are adequate for the task. Accordingly, sufficient authority has been provided for the Railways Commission not only to raise private loans but also to float a public issue if that course is necessary. In addition, the Bill provides for the Railways Commission to engage in such other financial transactions as are appropriate for trading corporations generally in the normal course of business practice.

Depending upon which borrowing power is used, the commission is required to obtain the approval of the Treasurer or the approval of the Governor. This requirement will ensure that borrowings comply with the financial programme of the Government and that the terms used are in accordance with terms currently approved by the Australian Loan Council.

The Bill provides for the Treasurer to give a guarantee on behalf of the State for the payment of interest and repayment of loans raised. The issue of a State guarantee is normal practice in loans of this nature and is of considerable assistance in finding lenders willing to lend to the body concerned.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr McIver.

LAW REFORM COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Premier)
[5.23 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Since its formation, the Law Reform Commission has been a valuable aid to Governments in formulating the basis of many important pieces of legislation.

As its name implies, the commission's function is in the area of reform and there is no doubt that with the multitude of legislation which exists today such a body is needed.

Since 1974 no fewer than eight major reports of the commission have resulted in the passage of important legislation through the Parliament on

subjects such as mortgage brokers, the sale of undivided shares in land, criminal injuries compensation, the administration of bonds and securities, and others.

Since the commission—and its predecessor, the Law Reform Committee—was established, it has had a variety of projects referred to it by Governments and it has now reached the stage where it needs an accession of strength in order to be enabled to fulfil its role adequately.

Law reform is not an area which we, as legislators, can allow to let slide. The laws of this State need to be constantly reviewed to take into account changing community attitudes, technological achievements, and the development of new administrative procedures.

The present Act provides for three part-time commissioners who give approximately one-fifth of their working time to the commission's projects, although, in reality, this is often exceeded. There is also full-time staff consisting of an executive officer, four research officers, two typists, and an administrative clerk.

The Western Australian Law Reform Commission is unique in Australia in that it comprises part-time commissioners only.

The Bill now before the House makes provision for the appointment of two additional commissioners on a full-time basis. It is considered more appropriate to appoint two full-time commissioners of relatively senior status rather than simply to add to the number of research officers. The new commissioners would not only be able to undertake basic research but also they would be able to supervise the work of research officers and relieve the present part-time commissioners of some of the work they are presently finding difficulty in dealing with as expeditiously as they would like.

It is envisaged that the full-time commissioners would be appointed for periods of up to five years with the provision for reappointments to be made up to a total of eight consecutive years unless there were special circumstances warranting a further extension.

Legal provision has been included also in regard to Public Service and superannuation matters.

The Bill also contains some changes in relation to the term of office of the chairman to bring this into line with the proposal for full-time commissioners. The existing staff and commissioners have done a highly commendable job over the years in the area of law reform and there are a number of current projects which will no doubt form the basis of future legislation. These include the areas of criminal proceedings

and mental disorder, the Justices Act, the Local Courts Act, and a review of bail procedures.

These projects are basic to the administration of justice in this State and are matters which need to be given priority; indeed, within the present structure of the commission, they are.

Law reform is an increasingly important responsibility of Governments and the provisions contained in this Bill will allow the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia to function more effectively for the benefit of the people of the State.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Pearce.

BILLS (2): MESSAGES

Appropriations

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

1. Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment Bill.
2. Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment Bill.

TEACHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading: Budget Debate

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR HERZFELD (Mundaring) [5.28 p.m.]: I am pleased again to support the Government. Once more it has shown a great deal of responsibility and restraint in handling the financial affairs of the State. It must be recognised that over the past year we have had some difficult economic conditions and as a result the Government has found it necessary to control its rate of expenditure. In his Budget speech the Treasurer drew attention to the fact that the Government had placed a freeze on the growth of the Public Service staff, with some exceptions, which he outlined, in the areas of education, health, and law and order.

It is a fact also that despite the difficult economic conditions recognised in this Budget, the Estimates impose no tax increases thus ensuring that the maximum amount of choice

remains with the taxpayer as to how he will use his pay packet in the year to come.

In his speech the Leader of the Opposition made much of some of the gloomy aspects of the year ahead, but said little about some of the more optimistic trends which would indicate that there was every reason to believe the economic year ahead could be considered in moderately optimistic terms.

I point to more factors which have already been outlined but which I will note again briefly for the sake of completeness. Following three fairly difficult years in the rural sector there is now every indication that we have bright prospects in the year ahead and, as a result, a significant increase in farm incomes will occur. Attention has been drawn also to renewed investment in resource development, and I will refer to some projects later in my speech. Associated with these, of course, will be infrastructure expenditures which also will help to improve the economy and the employment situation.

Perhaps one of the most significant new factors that has arisen—mainly as a result of the efforts of the Premier of this State—has been the provision of a new tier of borrowings to pay for the vital infrastructure costs associated with the resource development projects of which I spoke earlier. The effect of this money will be to help to create many more jobs; and because the money will be new on the scene it will add considerably to the number of jobs that will be created in the ensuing years.

The final feature which gives hope and optimism for the year ahead is the fact that whilst the inflation rate has been substantially reduced in the past 12 months, experts predict it will be reduced further to much more manageable levels.

I turn now, again as a matter of record, to mention briefly some of the main features of the Budget, and I will deal first with the estimates of revenue. We note that the overall growth in income in the Budget is 9.8 per cent, and this despite the fact that, as I said earlier, no tax increase is provided within the Budget. However, small increases will occur as a result of natural growth. An increase of approximately 10 per cent has been made in Commonwealth payments and provisions which are listed on page 28 of the Budget papers. A small increase of 5 per cent has been foreshadowed in earnings of public utilities such as country water supplies, sewerage, drainage, railways, and State Batteries.

On the expenditure side there have been some significant initiatives despite the fact that revenue has been severely restrained. I refer to the 14.6

per cent increase in expenditure on education, the 19 per cent increase in the allocation for health services, and the increase of more than 13 per cent in respect of law and order by way of increases in staffing for the Road Traffic Authority and the police.

The Budget also includes a significant increase—in fact 11 per cent—in the grants to charitable and other miscellaneous organisations which the Government supports. A 10 per cent increase has been allowed for in provisions the Government must make for losses incurred by Government business undertakings. That 10 per cent amounts to \$4 million which, of course, is money that cannot be spent in other areas, particularly for the creation of jobs.

I think it behoves me to make a few comments about the main features of the Consolidated Revenue Budget, because from listening to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition one would gain the impression that many things which could have been done were not provided for by the Government; although, of course, he did not spell out what his alternative policies might be.

It is fair to say that in the main the Consolidated Revenue Estimates represent the funds a Government requires to fund the day-to-day activities of government; because if we analyse the details of the estimates of expenditure we find that the great majority of allocations provide for wages paid to officers of the Public Service. In addition to that, of course, there are other items which are necessary to enable public servants to do their job. I refer to such items as the provision of offices and furniture, telephones, lighting, heating, stationery, equipment, office cleaning, and transportation where officers are required to travel.

When we take all those expenditures into account we find very little money is left to be used in other directions. So we are faced with the simple alternative that if we wish to change the thrust of a Budget dramatically we have to consider reducing staffing in particular departments and applying those savings to whatever other area we consider to be of greater priority. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that because of this very fact it was not possible for the Opposition to make any statement whatsoever about the way it would go about providing a little more imagination—to use the words of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Pearce: Weren't you here when he spoke?

Mr HERZFELD: The Leader of the Opposition said it is an unimaginative Budget. However, as I have indicated there is very little

scope for providing more of his so-called imagination unless funding is reduced in one or more of the areas provided for by the Treasurer. So I make the point that in fact very little scope exists for altering the direction of government through adjustments in the Consolidated Revenue Estimates, and if we wish to make alterations we must look elsewhere.

I would say that the Government should indeed be proud of its Treasurer and of the fact that he has been able in the past to bring down four successive balanced Budgets, and now has foreshadowed a fifth. This is the sort of responsibility and restraint that is recognised by the people of Western Australia, and it does not go unnoticed.

Mr Jamieson: It is a pity they didn't all read the Auditor General's report.

Mr Pearce: Didn't you hear the member for Mt. Hawthorn question the size of the surplus? It is not a balanced Budget, it is unbalanced.

Mr HERZFELD: One of the most outstanding features of the contributions by members opposite to the debate on the Budget to date has been the fact that each of them—I believe there have been five speakers from the Opposition so far—with the exception of the Leader of the Opposition has studiously avoided mentioning the Budget.

Mr Pearce: That is rubbish. I spoke about it.

Mr HERZFELD: The member for Gosnells interjects. I draw your attention, Sir, to the fact that he spoke about tow truck operators and about the teachers' strike.

Mr Pearce: I also spoke about the employment aspects of the Budget.

Mr HERZFELD: The member for Morley, who is not in the Chamber at the present time—otherwise he could bear me out—gave the House a history lesson. The member for Warren, who is presently busy writing or doing a crossword puzzle, spoke about bauxite mining. The member for Swan indulged in a grievance debate on the employment conditions of an SEC worker. I was not present when the member for Fremantle spoke, so I cannot comment on what he said; but if he was consistent with his colleagues, I am sure he did not speak about the Budget either.

Mr Pearce: He spoke about the economic conditions in this State.

Mr HERZFELD: So in respect of an effort like that one can only conclude that either there is a conspiracy of silence on the part of members of the Opposition or by their actions they have paid the highest compliment possible to the Treasurer of this State, because by their actions it is obvious

that they had nothing to say about the Budget. In fact, even the Leader of the Opposition who spoke for some two hours—and I must admit he gave us a very fine catalogue of strong adjectives such as “gloomy”, “unimaginative”, “disastrous”, “depressing”, and “calamitous”—and offered a great deal of criticism was unable to present one single alternative to the Budget presented to this House some two weeks ago by the Treasurer.

I feel what the Opposition is able to say about the Budget was summed up in a few of the words of the Leader of the Opposition when he said that the Budget had put the State in reverse, that it was unduly unimaginative and did nothing to cope with the problems confronting us these days—the problems of unemployment, inflation, and economic recession.

Mr Carr: That is the best part of your speech so far.

Mr HERZFELD: I quote those words because I wish to deal with the three points made in them by the Leader of the Opposition; I believe they are the central issues he raised. The Leader of the Opposition did not suggest any solutions for the improvement of those three matters should he be in the box seat—

Mr Barnett: You are devoid of your own ideas. You want ours as well.

Mr HERZFELD: The transcript of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition contains 36 pages. It is interesting to note his words on the fourth page which summarise his views on the Budget—

In summary, windy rhetoric is replacing positive action. Do we not get plenty of windy rhetoric from the Government and its Ministers? We get words which mean nothing. We want action.

How inconsistent! We hear all this windy rhetoric from the Leader of the Opposition, but he offers no alternatives, and therefore suggests no actions. That is what he has to say about a Budget which is extremely responsible and restrained.

Mr Tonkin: You went to the wrong school.

Mr HERZFELD: I will analyse the commentary and the three main points made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Barnett: We are still waiting for you.

Mr HERZFELD: The first point he made was that it is an unimaginative Budget. I have already said that the Consolidated Revenue Fund provides little scope for any dramatic change of direction. The only way that dramatic change can be achieved is either to sack some of the members of the Public Service, or not pay them. Alternatively their desks, or their offices, or the lights they

work under could be taken from them. Their typewriters could be removed—

Mr Hodge: At least they have electric typewriters.

Mr HERZFELD: There were a number of initiatives outlined in the Budget. I have already mentioned some of these—

Mr Barnett: Why do you not take their cars away and give them to the members of Parliament?

Mr HERZFELD: There are other minor matters which are quite commendable in the economic conditions in which we find ourselves presently. I mention, for example, the Government's progress in its programme to be rid of probate. That is an initiative which has been strongly resisted by the Opposition.

The Budget contains an initiative to help small businesses affected by the drought. There are sums of \$200 000 allocated for the horticultural exhibition conservatory to be built in Perth; \$200 000 to encourage the local film industry; \$290 000 for dieback research; and the allocation for solar energy research has been trebled. The Government should be commended for these initiatives when one considers the very stringent conditions in which we find ourselves.

It is a fact that the Opposition, both through its leader and other members, is constantly urging the Government to improve Government services in all areas. I instance a number of areas which have come to my notice during the time I have been here. Members always hear about the need for more police and RTA officers; the need for more teachers—always a great cry from the member for Gosnells. The member for Morley has often called for more safety inspectors. These matters are warranted. If people ask for more services, they will have to pay for them. The hallmark of the approach of the Opposition is never to suggest from where the money should be obtained.

I ask the Opposition to spell out where it considers that this Budget has gone wrong; where it believes that new initiatives could be taken; the staffing of which departments it believes should be increased, and by how many. I invite the Opposition to tell us from where the money should be obtained. If it believes the Budget to be unimaginative, it should tell us how it would go about improving it.

I refer to a further matter which demonstrates the lack of honesty in the way the Opposition has approached this Budget. I mentioned earlier that the member for Swan—and I am sorry that he is not in the Chamber this evening to hear what I

have to say—completely ignored the Budget and spoke about an unrelated matter. However, the same member was recently very vocal in the Press and around the community about the Government's proposal to close down or to reduce the operations of the Midland Junction Abattoir. He expressed concern about the loss of jobs there. Undoubtedly his concern was shared by members on this side, including members of the Government. He made a plea for everyone to support him in representations to the Minister and to the Premier for the closure not to take place. What he did not point out to people was the fact that the Government would be faced with a \$5 million loss in this financial year if operations continued—

Mr H. D. Evans: Who created that situation? It has been this Government, over the years. This is the biggest disgrace in the history of Western Australia.

Mr HERZFELD: —and if the meatworks were to continue to operate on the basis of their operations at the present time. Members will see by reference to the estimates of expenditure that the Government, by its action, has been able to reduce to \$2.2 million the loss at the Midland Junction Abattoir. Without this Government action the loss would have become quite intolerable; it is far too much to lose on any undertaking. The fact of the matter is that \$5 million "down the drain"—

Mr H. D. Evans: Tell us the reason why. This is only the start.

Mr HERZFELD: —means \$5 million which cannot be spent on creating employment. When a loss of that order is being incurred, the money is used purely in maintaining the status quo. It creates no multiplier-effect jobs. It is simply "going down the drain". It provides nothing.

I find it unpardonable—

Mr H. D. Evans: So do we!

Mr HERZFELD: —that the member for Swan should spend 45 minutes contributing to a Budget debate and speak about something quite unrelated, when his time would have been better employed in explaining how that \$5 million could have been better spent at the abattoir rather than in other areas of Government expenditure.

Several members interjected.

Mr HERZFELD: I cannot help it if the member is not here. He has a duty to be in this place. Presumably—

Mr Barnett: He is representing this State.

Mr HERZFELD: If other matters are far more important, that is his choice.

Mr Barnett: He is at a conference, representing this State. That is something you could never do!

Mr HERZFELD: Mr Speaker—

Mr Barnett: A disgraceful attitude!

Mr HERZFELD: During his speech the Leader of the Opposition made great play of the increase in service charges. I refer to charges related to services provided by public utilities, such as bus and rail transport, water supply, sewerage, and so on.

The Opposition's ploy in this regard was despicable because it tried to hoodwink the public into believing that service charges were in some way related to the Budget and the other services which Governments offer.

There is a vast difference between services of the nature provided by these public utilities and services such as education, health, and welfare.

The difference in this respect is that public utilities provide people with services, services which do not have to be bought. People have the choice to buy them or not—

Mr Pearce: They choose whether they use water or electricity?

Mr HERZFELD: People can choose how much water to use.

Mr H. D. Evans: Next they will want us to stop breathing.

Mr Pearce: I suppose you do not have to buy food, either.

Mr HERZFELD: If a person can live on water.

Mr Pearce: If you can afford it, on what you charge us!

Mr HERZFELD: It is dishonest and irresponsible to suggest that the Government should continue to bear these ever-increasing costs in supplying services to the public. These increases in costs result from inflation—

Mr Hodge: I thought inflation was being dealt with.

Mr HERZFELD: It is.

Mr Hodge: Why do charges have to be increased, then?

Mr HERZFELD: The inflation rate is down to 8 per cent. It will continue to decrease. It must be obvious to the member for Melville that these changes will not take place overnight. The trend has become established, and the reduction in inflation has been extremely significant.

Mr Hodge: Three years you said it would take you.

Mr HERZFELD: It took the Labor Government only about 18 months to bring the

rate of inflation up to unmanageable proportions. We are doing very well—

Mr Hodge: You cannot give us all the credit.

Mr HERZFELD: To the extent that it is possible, I believe that users should pay for the services that they require, provided that those who are disadvantaged through isolation or other factors do obtain support from the rest of the community by way of rebates. That is what the Government does. Losses have been incurred by the Country Water Supply. I had the figure here, but I cannot find it. It is a subsidy which the Government rightly pays to the people living in the country. That is a decentralisation measure.

Mr Shalders: It is \$25 million—and they are jolly grateful for it.

Mr HERZFELD: I am indebted to the member for Murray.

The Leader of the Opposition made much play about the fact that the Government has done nothing to generate improved employment opportunities. On the other hand the Opposition criticises the Government for increasing the very modest charges levied for public utilities services. The Leader of the Opposition discovered, through questioning, that the increases incurred recently amount to about \$34 million in a full year. If those increases had not been levied, the Leader of the Opposition would find that the Government would have had \$34 million less to spend under its Consolidated Revenue Estimates, and that would have meant that \$34 million-worth of jobs would not have been provided under these Estimates. It would have been necessary to remove a total of 2 000 jobs from the Public Service. Inconsistencies and thorough dishonesty are displayed in this two-faced approach by members opposite. They cannot have it both ways. The people of Western Australia are far too intelligent to fall for that sort of double talk.

I come now to the question of employment generation, a matter to which the Leader of the Opposition devoted a considerable amount of time when he spoke. Everyone recognises that under the tight economic conditions which we have been experiencing, and which we expect to experience in the next 12 months, it was commendable for the Government to place restraint on Public Service staffing. It did this quite vigorously and positively with the exception of the areas where it undertook to increase staff in order to fulfil its policy commitments. However, apart from those areas it provided a ceiling for staffing in the Public Service. I believe that to be a very commendable strategy.

We will find also when we debate the Loan Estimates that in fact negative growth in available funds has occurred. This means, of course, a great deal of difficulty is involved in providing additional jobs. Nevertheless, we will see that the Government has been very positive in the manner in which it has distributed the funds available. I cite the Public Works Department building programme which has been increased substantially by 36 per cent. This is a positive move which will ensure as much stimulus as possible is given to the building industry.

In the areas of the SEC, the Metropolitan Water Board, and the railways there has been a substantial rise in loan fund provisions from \$61.8 million to \$96.8 million. This will stimulate employment and improve the employment situation.

The important matter to note, of course, is that in the four areas I have mentioned a desirable multiplier effect will be generated, because further employment opportunities are provided outside the projects through the supply of materials and services. I believe a great deal of imagination has been shown by the Government.

I come back to the point that, despite all these imaginative moves made under extremely tight economic conditions, the Opposition feels that insufficient has been done, but it has not said how more could be done. Under their programmes, members opposite would support inefficient industry. I have mentioned one example already. The member for Swan wanted to keep the Midland Junction Abattoir operating despite the fact that substantial sums of money were being lost. From time to time members opposite give us further examples. They support inefficient day labour by Government which is another way of dissipating money and reducing jobs.

In the background of the policies of members opposite is the ever-present spectre of nationalisation. Such disincentives are anathema to members on this side of the House, because we believe the proper course to follow is one of stability and responsibility in government which will encourage investment and development, and will generate confidence. It is these policies which will create employment.

I can best summarise what I have been saying by concluding with the following words: By failing to provide one single alternative to the Treasurer's strategy in the Budget Estimates for the coming year, the Opposition has paid the Treasurer the greatest single compliment of his Ministry. It has failed to take issue with even minor aspects of the Budget Estimates. So far members opposite who

have spoken, perhaps with the exception of their leader, have failed their electors and deserve the condemnation of the electorate.

The Opposition, through its leader, has shown itself to be either very naive or deceitful because on the one hand while it criticises the Government for its job creation programme, on the other it has put forward a policy which will result in job reduction. The Opposition has also criticised increases in charges for public services such as power, gas, water, and rail. It has criticised the Government for ensuring its public undertakings operate efficiently and at a minimum level of loss. Resource development and the associated infrastructure programme, and improvements in the rural sector all do provide indicators for economic recovery in the coming year.

The Budget is sound and responsible. I believe it is conducive to a growth in the confidence of investors, and therein lies the solution to our economic troubles. For all these reasons I support the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 6.07 to 7.30 p.m.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [7.30 p.m.]: In addressing my remarks to the Budget debate I would like to take the opportunity to compare the report of the Auditor General submitted in 1973—the last year of the Tonkin Government—and the report submitted by him this year, five years later. When one looks at the two reports one is immediately impressed in one way, and depressed in another way, by the vast differences which have occurred in the funding associated with the Budget.

It is interesting to study the Budget and to ascertain the vast differences between the estimates for the various items and the actual expenditure. Indeed, if this so-called private enterprise Government were in private business and made estimates similar to those in the Budget, it would go to the wall very quickly. It would not last 10 minutes, and it is a disgrace that the Treasurer, with his accounting training, has allowed these differences to occur and has not taken his Ministers to task for their failure to be more accurate in their departmental estimates.

Several members interjected.

Mr JAMIESON: Maybe he does not want to. Either the public are being deliberately misled by a falsification of the actual estimates for the various items in order to establish a reserve on which to work or the Government has been inefficient.

It is worth drawing attention to the funds held or invested by the Treasurer at the 30th June,

1973, and the 30th June, 1978, the two years to which I have referred.

At the 30th June, 1973, the amount invested was \$154 606 276 which is a fairly sizeable amount to be held or invested by the Treasury for the affairs of the State. At the 30th June this year, five years later, the figure had risen to the astronomical amount of \$354 957 000. I admit that the problem of inflation must account for some of the escalation and all sorts of other budgetary problems have been encountered. But surely the Budget for the funds required to be held at that time should have been estimated more accurately.

I am well aware of the fact that it is necessary to have a carry-over amount, but I am concerned about the cash resources of the Treasury. It is because of these cash resources that the Treasurer has been able to balance his Budget so well at the close of the year.

Including the short-term investments, the money held at the 30th June, 1973, was \$81 270 158, while this year the amount was \$202 697 000—an escalation of 1½ times in five years. Of the \$81 270 158, the figure as at the 30th June, 1973, the amount in short-term interest investments was \$80 307 751, leaving a balance of about \$1 million which was available for any purpose.

Several members interjected.

Mr JAMIESON: I suppose that in a Budget of \$1 billion it is not unreasonable that there should be \$1 million petty cash. However, I do take the Government to task for the fact that of the \$202 697 000 cash resource of the Treasury at the end of the financial year, only \$197 941 529 was invested. This means that \$5 million was floating at this juncture—five times the amount available five years ago. It is obvious that a thorough investigation should be made of the budgetary affairs of this State. Indeed, the departments in other States which either overestimate or underestimate their requirements are subject to a good deal of criticism by the committees of their Parliaments. It is probably time a more thorough examination was made in this State of the estimates of the various departments instead of our allowing the present situation to continue.

Goodness knows how much interest is accruing in respect of the short-term investments because such interest could range from 1 per cent in one week to any amount, depending on the short-term money market. It is exceptionally lucrative and judging by the figure of \$202 697 000, the Government has plenty of finance with which to

play. So it should have, in view of the estimates of some of the departments.

One of the departments which is very much at fault—indeed I will refer to the Auditor General's comments about it in a moment—is the Education Department. On page 19 of the Auditor General's report the matter is dealt with. Last year, under item 156—students' fares to remote centres—an amount of \$220 000 was allocated, which is almost a quarter of a million dollars. However, the actual amount spent was \$6 425. It would be impossible to reconcile those two amounts. Surely the department should have some knowledge of the fares which would be required. Obviously this was an amount included to provide finance required in some other area.

On pages 18 and 19 of the Auditor General's report is to be found criticism of the fact that the estimate last year for item 44—technical schools and colleges—was \$1 260 000, but the actual amount spent was \$3 690 930. Obviously the extra money was gained from item 40—administration expenses—the estimate for which was \$3 083 000 of which only \$585 271 was actually spent. This is the kind of budgetary nonsense with which we are faced.

Mr Tonkin: He reckons he is a good housekeeper!

Mr JAMIESON: If he had been in private enterprise he would have gone to the wall ages ago.

Mr Barnett: He could not even wash the dishes!

Mr JAMIESON: The Auditor General's report is presented to you, Mr Speaker, and I know you would have gone through it with a fine tooth comb and would be acquainted with all the comments made by the Auditor General. On page 19 is the following—

It is considered that authority to vary the annual appropriations between item 40—Administration Expenses and item 44—Technical Schools and Colleges, should have been sought under section 35 of the Audit Act.

I am sure, Mr Speaker, that you have also studied section 35 of the Audit Act which is rather interesting. The side note of the section is "Power to vary the annual appropriation". The section itself reads as follows—

35. (1) If in the opinion of the Treasurer it is necessary to alter the proportions assigned to the particular times comprised under any subdivision in the annual supplies, the Governor may, by order, direct that there shall be applied, in aid of any item that may

be deficient, a further limited sum out of any surplus arising on any other item under the same subdivision.

(2) Every order by which such altered application may be made shall be delivered to the Auditor General, and a copy thereof shall be laid before both Houses of the Parliament within seven days after the making thereof, if the Parliament be then in session and actually sitting; or, if the Parliament be not then in session or actually sitting, within seven days after the commencement of the next session or sitting.

(3) Nothing hereinbefore contained shall authorise the Governor to direct that any such sum as aforesaid shall be applied in augmentation of or as an addition to any salary or wages.

Particularly where a large item, such as the item I mentioned, involves transferring millions of dollars from one section to another, it is very clear that the Auditor General has a right to know about it and Parliament has a right to know about it, because the Audit Act says it has a right to know about it. From the comment of the Auditor General it is obvious that neither was informed.

If this kind of thing is going on in one field, how deep does one need to go to find out exactly how thoroughly these accounts are being vetted and scrutinised by the Ministers and their departments? They should be made to front up on these issues, and they should not be able to submit these vast amounts which obviously cannot be used for the purposes for which they were allocated.

Apart from that, we are looking for action to get people working and provide building workers with jobs; yet we see that in regard to homes for the aged, \$350 000 was allocated and only \$93 000 was used. Many people could have been working for a considerable time had that allocation been taken up. No-one can tell me there is not a demand for homes for the aged.

I am picking out only a few of the items. Of course, a number of others could be mentioned, such as Kalgoorlie-Boulder unemployment relief. Evidently relief for unemployment there was not as necessitous as the Treasurer would have us believe. He appropriated \$500 000 for this purpose and only \$265 267 was spent. Surely the Pinnaroo Cemetery Board would have some idea of its budgetary requirements over a particular year and would know whether or not it intended to proceed with certain work. It had an allocation of \$350 000 and took up only \$186 859.

Then we come to "Road Transport—Regular Service—General Goods", whatever that heading means; but it is a good one. I suppose when one sees that allocation in the Budget one thinks, "I don't know what the hell it is all about, so I won't query it." But whatever it is all about, \$110 000 was allocated and only \$3 574 was spent—again, an obvious budgetary muck-up.

I have already mentioned students' fares.

The University of Western Australia was looking to a post-graduate medical education foundation, for which it had an allocation of \$10 000 and did not take up any of it. These items should not be listed in our Budget papers unless the authorities concerned are planning to take some action and use the money. If they are going to have allocations for no purpose at all, they should not be listed in the Budget papers.

It indicates to me that sooner or later more responsibility must be taken by Ministers and members of Parliament in looking closely at the various items in the Estimates, questioning them more, and if necessary getting further information from departmental heads.

I do not know what kind of Budget has been drawn up. I was associated in various ways with drawing up three Budgets, and they took considerable time to frame. It was not without a great deal of consideration that each item was finally approved, and large items were certainly questioned in detail as to why they were necessary and why they were being proceeded with.

I think I have given a clear indication that I am not very happy with the situation which prevails in relation to finance. It is of no use the Treasurer proclaiming a balanced Budget. The Tonkin Budget five years ago was not balanced. As a matter of fact, it was estimated to be somewhat out of balance. It was stated on page 4 of the Auditor General's report for 1973 that—

Transactions of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the year resulted in a deficit of \$3 489 510, which was \$1 587 490 lower than the budgeted deficit.

I think that is better budgeting than this proclaimed balancing by juggling figures from one department and one section to another. Obviously the allocations were not needed for the purposes stated; otherwise they would have been used.

Figures are always a problem, with the liars figuring and the figures lying. One cannot derive any satisfaction from them. The Auditor General's report and the figures made available to us in the Budget papers last year and this year show that all is not well with the present

budgetary methods of the current Treasurer, and he should be pulling his socks up in this regard.

I now want to mention a few mundane subjects. I have previously explained that while I might chide the Treasurer, I have a distinct problem in keeping a balance between my left and right pockets. So having said what I have said, and having used other people's judgment because they have created the figures, not I, I will turn to some matters which I consider need airing.

Members will be aware of an article in the Press as late as this evening dealing with Perth metropolitan transport. The article was headed, "Perth lags behind in the railway stakes". When I first saw it I thought "Here is something racing", but when I read the article I realised it referred to a different kind of railway stakes and not the railway stakes in the Christmas racing carnival.

For many years I have endeavoured in this Chamber to have Parliament give serious consideration to the Perth metropolitan transport problem. A number of reports on this matter have been published. The Government is wedded to a type of busway system. It runs away from the idea every now and then; it denies it is wedded to such a system; it denies it intends to close suburban railways, and it then does nothing to keep them open.

The Press article to which I have referred clearly indicates the run-down state of the suburban rail system. It also clearly indicates—as was obvious to me on a recent overseas visit—that despite the cost, rail transport is the only modern means of transport around the city which is at all viable in the long run. From the fares and the return from them we cannot gauge the exact value a rail system gives to a city in providing efficient transport.

Some years ago, when I introduced into this Chamber the Perth Regional Railway Bill which gave permission to the Government of the day to go ahead and prepare for an underground rail system in Perth, members who were on this side of the House at the time screamed that it would cost millions of dollars. We were throwing around between \$55 million and \$85 million to put the railway underground. That might not have been a true estimate, but in line with modern trends and tunnelling techniques throughout the world, that was about the estimate we could have looked at. The same proposition would now cost more than twice that amount, and ultimately Perth will be forced into a second lower stratum of transport.

The streets of Perth were never intended for the type of transportation it has today, and the shame of it is that the city is not yet 150 years old. One

compares them with the wide thoroughfares in many of the European cities. Of course, those cities have probably had the opportunity through wars and in other ways to clear away buildings and create new thoroughfares. Nevertheless, the provisions which were made for wider thoroughfares to cope with traffic in the future must have been known to the designers of the City of Perth, and while we give credit to some of our pioneers, it is to their eternal shame that they did not make provision for larger streets. Had they been students of civil engineering and studied what was done in other countries, they would have learnt of the necessity for larger roadways, streets, and means of communication. Therefore they have left us a legacy of nowhere to go except to build another layer higher up or underground.

It has always proved to be very successful to bury a transport system if it is at all possible because it does not have the untidiness that an overhead system is inclined to have, it is also less noisy, it is very efficient, and it can provide easy access to most areas. Indeed, the appendix to the Wilbur Smith report, stating that all the alternatives were very nice but recommending busways, indicated there could be a loop railway system under the city with stations one kilometre apart, which would mean people working in the CBD would have only 500 metres to walk to a railway station.

This would have been an ideal type of transport system for a city like Perth, and had an electrified rail system been persevered with and made efficient the Government of the day would have been justified in financing it in a way which was recommended several times; that is, a tax on land areas served by the system to be guaranteed to the running authority. Naturally, the passengers would be charged a nominal fee, but basically finance would come from a regular rating system.

Then, the people who choose to run their own motor vehicles and provide their own system of transport could pay for that alternative—provided, of course, they could find the parking space which I believe probably could be made more expensive.

We should not expect the MTT to try to pay its own way from the fares it receives; it cannot. An organisation like the MTT must have a regular income. It is like the local authorities. If they were forced to find another way of raising income to run their affairs, other than by rating properties, they would encounter a great many problems. If these instrumentalities had their own regular income they would avoid many of the problems which are besetting the MTT today.

I hope that before long there is a Government in this State brave enough to lay down a plan for the future so that the people of metropolitan Perth will have a reasonable system of access to the city, a system which attracts them from their motorcars, a system which London and similar cities cannot live without.

People who have visited London know what a problem it is to move around on the surface, by taxi or bus; one stays in the one spot for hours because of the congestion. However, one can quickly move from one point to another using the underground transport system. The same situation prevails in Paris, where a much more modern system is in operation. Munich and a dozen other cities have similar transport facilities.

Nobody can tell me that Perth is too small to have the same sort of metro system when a place like Lucerne in Switzerland—a city of some 100 000 people—has its own metro. True, it is only a couple of kilometres long but nevertheless it is an underground system which runs from the port to the main town area. That city would be completely gummed up without its underground, although, of course, it does have surface transport in the form of trolley buses and fuel-engine buses.

Just as the main mode of transport between those two centres in Lucerne is the underground service, or the metro, many other cities have similar transport systems or are moving towards installing such a facility.

The longer we leave it the more difficulty we will have. The Government is still trying to get the system under way in Melbourne, and such a system has been running efficiently in Sydney for a long time. We cannot put a value on such a project because the various commercial and business undertakings in the city would benefit enormously from the improved access to and egress from the city that an underground system would provide. Until we get around to installing such a system, we are not going to get very far.

We have reached the chicken or the egg stage, and the Minister wants to stand off until the chicken lays an egg so that he can find out what hatches. This is not good enough; we must plan for the future and know where we are going. We should not remain in the present situation of stalemate, where the Government is prepared to let the maintenance of railway carriages run down to the point where the carriages fall off the lines, at which time the Government will move over to bus transport saying, "We do not have the rolling stock to keep the railways going."

Recently I travelled on a picnic train to the Toodyay area; the train used was the *Australind*.

It was a very wet day and the carriages leaked copiously; water was running everywhere. The lack of maintenance was so apparent it was not funny. One of my colleagues, a former railwayman, said to the guard, "The seats need some attention. Could you make note of that so it can be attended to?" The guard replied, "Oh, mate, it is no use putting in a report on anything that is going to cost money. They just will not do it." This is the general attitude which has been adopted towards our railway system. It is disappointing, because the people working in the Railways Department have been given no encouragement to be proud of our railway system; and, it is a system of which we could all be proud if we got it going properly. However, as usual, probably my words fall on deaf ears.

One day, some Government will find it necessary to take the action I have recommended and which I endeavoured to take earlier in this Parliament. I am sure if the Government bucked up and proceeded to improve our system, we would find the city would be much better off within a period of only 10 or 20 years.

I wish briefly to refer to the matter of our agents in other countries. While I was away, I happened to arrive in London during the 149th anniversary of the establishment of Western Australia, held in the Agent General's office in London. This was quite a convivial affair and we were well looked after by the Agent General, who seems to have gained a lot of knowledge from his stay in Japan; certainly, he runs a fairly neat house in London.

Western Australia also has an office in Tokyo which is headed by the Government representative, assisted by one typist and a clerk. Queensland has an office headed by the "Agent General" or "Agent-at-Large"; he has a much grander title.

Western Australia exports far more goods to Japan than any other State of Australia. Naturally, of course, we cannot import as much as some of the Eastern States; however, we take our fair share of imports, too. Certainly, our exports far outstrip the other States; in fact, I would venture to suggest our total value of exports to Japan exceeds the combined total of the other States.

Notwithstanding this, the standard of our office in Japan is less than that of the other States. Queensland exports some coal to Japan; that is about all it does. I suppose it trades back a few manufactured items such as motor vehicles and electronic goods, as do the other States. Yet Queensland has a very impressive office in Tokyo.

Victoria probably does not export anything to Japan apart from wheat and wool, the normal produce of any State. Nevertheless, Victoria has an agent of fairly high standing in Tokyo, supported by an office staff. I do not think South Australia has yet established an agency in Tokyo; I think it is just on the point of doing so. New South Wales certainly has a considerable agency, yet all it exports is a bit of coal.

The point I am getting at is that the Japanese people seem to regard a State by the front it puts up. While all these other State offices have a chauffeur driven vehicle at the disposal of their agents, our fellow gets out in the street and hails a taxi. Although we may say, "That is fair enough, he can book it up to the office" the Japanese do not understand.

Why should our representative suffer by comparison with other States, when Western Australia is the major trading partner with Japan of all the Australian States? I realise it is expensive to provide these facilities in Japan but it is also expensive not to have an open front door to Japan. We should be looking towards establishing these facilities, because the other States will be gathering us up. They have put on a better face to the people of Japan. The Japanese probably think we are some sort of hillbilly State. We are better than that and we can be better than that. Certainly, we are better in London, where our office compares favourably with the offices of the other States.

It is high time we established proper offices in places like Hong Kong and Singapore. Goodness knows how much money the Government is spending on television advertisements in Western Australia reminding us it is our 150th birthday next year. I believe this is quite unnecessary, because the message is through to the people of Western Australia. We should be aiming to attract visitors to this State. Surely the people we should be hitting with these sorts of advertisements are the travelling public of Hong Kong and Japan and those people passing through Singapore.

Western Australia is not receiving its fair share of the tourists visiting Australia. We should be using our money to place advertisements with the television stations of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Japan in an endeavour to get people interested in making the effort to visit Western Australia for our 150th birthday.

We would achieve a lot more in this direction than by constantly trying to convince the people of Western Australia that they can catch big marlin with a rod off Rottneest. We all know that,

and those who have the facilities to catch marlin can and will go out and catch them; they do not need to be reminded by television advertisements. So, the message is falling on the wrong ears.

As I say, it is high time we had proper offices in Hong Kong and Singapore, and they should be incorporated with branches of our Government travel agency. There would be no problem in that direction, and the officers could channel enough tourists from the various Asian countries to Australia to make their appointment worth while. Even if they had to be subsidised for a while, at least we would establish regular contact with these people.

It is fairly obvious why we should establish an office in Hong Kong. Today, we are being beset by the Japanese, who want to act as shopkeepers for our iron ore and nickel. Instead of Western Australia selling direct to China, Japan is making the deals and the pacts with China, and they are taking the trader's share off the top of our commodities. Does CBH do that? No, it sells its wheat direct; it does not trade through Japan.

Mr McPharlin: CBH is not a marketing authority.

Mr JAMIESON: I stand corrected; I meant the Australian Wheat Board. The point I am making is that Australia sells its wheat direct to China; it does not go through some shopkeeper who gets a rake off.

Mr McPharlin: We have one agency selling out.

Mr JAMIESON: This is the sort of practice I want to see adopted with our minerals.

Mr H. D. Evans: And our meat. They have been ripping us off on our meat for years.

Mr JAMIESON: My colleague, the member for Warren who knows all about meat indicates that this happens with meat, also.

In the short time remaining, I wish to deal with another item. Of course, I could deal with three or four more matters, but time does not permit. I wish to deal rather severely with the Premier at a later stage with respect to the transport allowance granted to members of Parliament. However, that is better left to the discussion on the Vote for Parliament.

I would like now to deal with the role of the State Electoral Department. I have asked a few questions on this subject this year and the Deputy Premier has indicated certain talks are taking place. It seems strange to me that these talks must take so long. This Government is always looking for money to spend, yet here is a

department gobbling up \$500 000 a year; money that could be saved.

It has not been found necessary for a number of years to spend this kind of money in other States except in Queensland and I am sure we do not want to model ourselves on the deep north. The fact is that State Electoral Departments can work in collaboration with the Commonwealth in producing electoral rolls. In New South Wales the Electoral Department consists of one officer and two typists because its work is done by arrangement with the Commonwealth. Of course this work would not be done for nothing but they would not be spending \$500 000 a year to keep an unnecessary department going, which is what this State insists on doing.

This Government does not care whether it happens this year, next year, or 20 years from now. The Government is always saying it has no funds. That is understandable if it continues to squander money in an unnecessary way. The amount of stationery and everything else involved in running an Electoral Department means it runs into high-cost finance so far as State funds are concerned.

This is one of the areas where an immediate cut-back could be made. It could occur this year. If it does not it will not occur for another four or five years because we will run into a series of elections again which will be the excuse for both the State and Federal Electoral Departments not co-ordinating their efforts. I suggest the Minister look at this problem without delay.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [8.17 p.m.]: I rise to support yet another excellent State Budget. The most interesting aspect of this Budget is the lack of any significant criticism from anywhere in the Western Australian community. In fact, it is noticeable there is virtually no criticism from the Opposition either. It is the fourth consecutive balanced Budget, which in itself is a great feat. It is set in a climate of restraint yet it is also imaginative.

The restraint is seen by the percentage increase—about 10 per cent—in the revenue which is the lowest for approximately 10 years. The Budget has been described by the Treasurer as one of consolidation and restraint and I think that sums up the position accurately. There are many features, however, are of particular benefit to our State.

The major income feature of the Budget is the further steps in regard to halving death duties by the 1st January, 1979, and their complete elimination by the 1st January, 1980. It is, again, a Budget without tax increases.

I was passing through Sydney on the 6th September and I picked up an issue of *The Sydney Morning Herald*. It had some interesting headings such as these—

No increase in taxes
More teachers, police
Welfare funds rise

The major heading is, "State Government to end death duty". The article points out how the New South Wales Government under "Nifty" Wran was in the process of abolishing death duties. One noticeable difference between the Wran Government and the Court Government is that the latter has balanced Budgets. I read in that paper that, "The deficit is expected to be just over \$2 million compared with \$697 000 in 1977-78."

Of course, that is what one would expect from a Labor Government; a Budget which puts the community into a hole. Again, "Nifty Neville"—

Point of Order

Mr HARMAN: I think the member is transgressing our Standing Orders by referring to the Premier of New South Wales in the way he has.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order! The member for Maylands has indicated he believes the member for Karrinyup has impugned the integrity of a member of another Government. I ask the member for Karrinyup to use a less colourful description whilst making his address.

Debate Resumed

Mr CLARKO: Certainly, Mr Acting Speaker, and I would ask that you take note of the time lost on that frivolous point of order and allow me a little extra time at the end of my speech. It is interesting also to note that the New South Wales Budget—

Point of Order

Mr H. D. EVANS: I do not approve of the member casting reflections on the Acting Speaker as he has done by suggesting you upheld a frivolous point of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Mr CLARKO: With respect, the member for Warren must have been asleep or eating an apple because you, Sir, did not uphold that point of order.

The New South Wales Budget had an increase of 10 per cent in its Education Vote compared with the previous year. Members should compare that increase with the increase in Western Australia, where the vote is approximately 15 per cent higher than last year. The education aspect is of particular interest to me. Our Budget allocates \$332 million for education, which is an increase of \$42 million on last year. It is an increase of 14.6 per cent as compared with the general revenue increase of 10 per cent.

The Education Vote is nearly 25 per cent of the State Budget and as the Premier has said, "It shows our real commitment to and our support for education." The effect of this additional money is to provide many more staff appointments. This will have the effect of again reducing the teacher-pupil ratio at both primary and secondary levels.

Specifically, the additional specialist teachers and teacher aides for grade I classes will be provided as a three-year programme. So there will be more to come in that direction and I am sure it will be very welcome by all teachers and people interested in education in this State.

In particular, there will be 90 extra specialists in primary schools involved in areas of art, music, and physical education. There will be 20 more specialist teachers for handicapped children. Our Government is most keen to give extra thrust to technical education and there will be an additional 69 teachers in that area.

The additional ancillary staff include not only those extra aides for grade I classes but also extra aides for pre-primary centres. There will be extra aides for libraries and extra clerical and laboratory assistants. All this ancillary staff will be of great benefit and assistance to the teachers in our schools.

Mr Harman: How many?

Mr CLARKO: The additional numbers for primary schools in full-time equivalence is 108. For secondary schools the figure is 17, and there are an extra 20 for technical education.

Our record in dollars is supreme.

One of the matters I have great pride in commenting on when talking to a teacher who supports the Labor Party, and there are not many of them, is that the statistical record shows how Liberal Governments in this State have put their money where their mouth is.

It is interesting to note that when the Hawke Labor Government brought down its last Budget before it was defeated in 1959, it was spending about 11 per cent of its Budget on education. One should bear that in mind when considering the

dramatic escalation, year by year, of the Court Government's expenditure on education.

When Labor came into office in 1971 expenditure on education was \$82 million, an increase of \$16 million on the previous Budget. The allocation for 1972-73 was \$94.5 million, an increase of a further \$12.5 million. In the third and final year, that Labor Government spent \$116 million on education, an increase of \$22 million.

Members should compare those amounts with the first Court Budget for 1974-75 where the expenditure on education went up by \$50 million; that is from \$116 million to \$166 million. That was the increase in one year alone and it was a breath of fresh air for education expenditure. The increase was equivalent to the total increase for the three previous years of the Tonkin Government.

Mr Harman: Was it 10 per cent in real terms?

Mr CLARKO: It was an increase in actual money. Such an increase has never been made by the Opposition in percentage terms. After an increase of \$50 million, one might think the Court Government would take a break, but no, the next year it increased the expenditure on education by another \$50 million to a total of \$216 million for 1975-76. In 1976-77 the Court Government increased expenditure on education by a further \$35 million, making a total of \$251 million.

When we get to the second Court Government, in 1977-78 the figure was \$290 million, an increase of a further \$39 million. The present Budget has allocated \$332 million, which is an increase of \$42 million on last year. I challenge any member of the Opposition who is interested in education to take out the expenditure figures over the last 15 years and compare our record with theirs.

Mr H. D. Evans: Look at the Commonwealth records.

Mr CLARKO: It is not just a matter of dollars, but money is the first consideration if one is to make some progress in education. We have given money in a magnificent fashion. There are other important things. A most important decision made by our Government is the decision to locate a resident superintendent in each country region; that is a matter of considerable moment. It does not mean much by way of dollar expenditure, but it is important to have these people located in country regions and not have them do a Friday flit to Perth and then another Monday flit back to start the week.

Mr Jamieson: If you apply for a position in the Kimberley we will recommend you.

Mr CLARKO: We have also involved ourselves with pre-primary centres and it is a great pity the member for Dianella is not here because he was one of the leaders—

A Government member: Don't forget the member for Gosnells.

Mr CLARKO: He is not here either, but I think we should consider ourselves fortunate. The member for Dianella has an interest in pre-primary education. I know he is associated with at least one kindergarten. What he and others did was to start scaremonger tactics in this State, implying that our pre-primary school education system was undesirable and evil. But what has been the effect of this system?

The Education Department annual report for 1976-77, which is the latest available, and perhaps this is one area of education that needs attention, indicates that the number of children in pre-primary centres as at August, 1976, was 4 488. I suspect that figure is now around 6 000. So there are about 6 000 additional four-year-olds receiving pre-primary education as a result of this Government's policies.

Members opposite, as a result of peculiar reasoning, have decided they want to lock themselves into the old kindergarten system. That system was a good one in many ways; but it was iniquitable and it denied educational opportunities to a number of young people.

Many other changes are necessary in the field of education. One such change is that continued emphasis should be placed on literacy and numeracy. When the subject was first raised on some of the committees I am associated with a few years ago, many of the teachers took offence and tried to defend the levels of literacy and numeracy in schools. However, after a few years national studies have indicated these teachers cannot maintain their stand. I am glad that at last they have come around and are being realistic about the standards of literacy and numeracy in our schools.

I should like to see a great deal more emphasis placed on vocational subjects in schools. A serious aspect of education today is that children are undergoing a type of educational course in our secondary schools which involves a great deal of English, but little spelling. Generally little teaching is given in relation to grammar. A great deal of literature and the ability to write free of restraints is included. A large amount of mathematics is incorporated in the courses. I believe the amount of mathematics taught in the schools today is far more than is required by the average citizen. There is a tremendous amount of

pressure in our community to force, persuade, and cajole young adults into entering our tertiary institutions. Many young people attend tertiary institutions and take courses which in effect have no great vocational merit. Such courses are likely to leave our young people waiting in the unemployment queues for a long time.

Mr Harman: What would be an example of that?

Mr CLARKO: An example would be arts degrees. Another example is a peace studies course. Such a course might be of value to a person such as the member for Maylands who has another career; but if a young person took a peace studies course or a course in English, philosophy, or history, he would be setting himself up for a long wait before he obtains a source of income unless he is in the top 2 per cent of the academic stream.

My final comment in regard to education is that I am most delighted by the emphasis which the Government has placed on the provision of libraries in the last four years. We have built 149 libraries.

Mr H. D. Evans: Where did you get the money from to do that? From the Whitlam Government.

Mr CLARKO: I am delighted the member for Warren has asked me that question. All money comes from the taxpayers and that is one matter members opposite never learn. We have built 25 halls and gymnasiums and 119 pre-primary centres. That is a marvellous achievement.

Mr H. D. Evans: Had there not been a tied grant they would not be there.

Mr P. V. Jones: Absolute rubbish!

Mr CLARKO: I should like to deal with the matter of arts and cultural activities. The measure of a civilisation is whether a Government is willing to allocate money to projects such as Her Majesty's Theatre. We are allocating \$2.25 million this year. Last year we allocated \$2 million. That is the sort of allocation we do not expect from the Opposition unless it is making such allocations as a result of a printing money programme.

This year we are allocating \$47 000 to the WA Library Fund compared with \$35 000 last year and \$25 000 the year before. That is a substantial increase. We are allocating \$126 000 to the WA Symphony Orchestra this year compared with \$91 000 last year. We are allocating \$1.6 million to the WA Arts Council this year which is \$102 000 more than last year. A figure of \$1.4 million has been allocated to the Art Gallery which is an increase of 21 per cent.

Mr Carr: What are you doing about country cultural centres?

Mr CLARKO: One can only talk about the arts and culture if one has an audience which appreciates it. I do not think members opposite fall into that category.

But let me get away from a situation where the Government has granted \$250 000 for the provision of art works to a matter which is more basic. I am referring to a glass of water.

If ever we have seen a debacle in recent times it has been the attitude of the Opposition to the new water charges. These charges will ensure principally that water in Western Australia is conserved. The fundamental questions to be asked are: Are the charges too high and are the charges fair?

The international consultants who were appointed by the Water Board recommended that no water allowance be given and that the system be on a pay-as-you-use basis only. The Government decided to adopt a system which provided a water allowance. It is interesting to note the Opposition supports a water allowance also. However, for members opposite the debate hinges on the question of an allocation of 200 kilolitres versus an allocation of 150 kilolitres. We might have chosen a figure of 200 kilolitres. On the other hand we might have chosen a figure of 300 kilolitres which is approximately the average metropolitan household consumption. Had we chosen the higher figure, however, we would of necessity have had to charge a higher figure than \$36 as the basic fee. The board needs a certain aggregate income and no matter which way it is arrived at, it must have a certain sum of money. Clearly the lower the water allowance, the greater the pressure to conserve water; and the higher the basic water allowance, the lower the pressure to conserve water. From the start we can see the Opposition favours a system which lessens the pressure to conserve water. Therefore, it is not concerned about conserving water to the same degree as is the Government.

If a basic allowance of 300 kilolitres is chosen, we encourage people who use less water than the basic allowance to waste water. Also we put such people in a position where they are required to pay more than they might otherwise have to pay, because their share of the cost must be a fair proportion or averaging of the higher figure. That is the great weakness in the argument.

Another way of looking at the cost of water in Western Australia is to compare it with the cost of water in the six State capital cities and the Federal capital city in Australia. Of those seven

cities, Perth is in the middle—it is fourth from the top and fourth from the bottom. I do not think anyone can argue that water is dear when we compare it with the standards in other Australian capital cities.

Mr Carr: It is cheap by country standards.

Mr CLARKO: I agree with the member for Geraldton. I should like to use my own situation as an example. Last year I received a basic water bill of \$60. Had the system this year been framed in the way in which it was framed last year, I would have expected to pay another \$5 or \$6. For the purposes of arithmetic tidiness, let us say I would have had to pay \$66. Last year I was allocated 471 kilolitres for which I paid \$60. In fact, whether I used 150 kilolitres or 471 kilolitres I still paid \$60. Clearly that system in no way encouraged me to conserve water and it is essential that we conserve water.

The system under which we operated last year in my opinion—and my socialist opponents opposite will not agree with me—is unjust, because my water allocation and the sum I paid for it was tied to the value of my house and land. That is a ridiculous concept. Such a system should have gone out with spats and celluloid collars.

The idea that the larger the house, the larger the income, is not necessarily true. In fact these days many wealthy people live in small town houses and units whereas a family with a number of children must of necessity live in a large house. Therefore, that larger house must be more valuable than a smaller one and the system under which we operated last year meant that these relatively poorer people had to pay more. As far as I am concerned, one of the tremendous advantages of this piece of legislation is we are not taking the old Victorian approach that the bigger one's house the greater one's income.

It is important that once and for all someone tries to show the argument as put forward by the Opposition that the more water one uses, the cheaper it is, is spurious. The Opposition says if one pays \$36 for 150 kilolitres, it means one's water costs 24c a kilolitre, and if one uses more than 150 kilolitres the cost drops to 17c a kilolitre which is obviously cheaper. Such an argument put forward by members opposite is a lot of codswallop.

Mr Carr: The Leader of the Opposition said people who use more water pay a higher rate. I appreciate the point you made as far as you went, but if you want to be fair you should go further.

Mr Harman: He has no intention of being fair.

Mr CLARKO: Of course I am not fair, because I spend a great deal of time in the sun.

I should like to point out to members opposite that within the sum of \$36 is a central basic charge. If one wishes, one may choose the figure of 17c per kilolitre which will result in a cost of \$25.50 per 150 kilolitres of water. Therefore, we have a basic charge of \$10.50 which must cover the cost of the man who reads the meter twice a year, the cost of his office, and the like. If members opposite are fair, they would have to agree that if a person had a beach cottage in Safety Bay and that house did not use a drop of water throughout the year, it would cost the Water Board at least \$20 per year to check that the man had not used any water at his house there. It is quite ridiculous.

Mr Barnett: Absolute rubbish!

Mr CLARKO: It is ridiculous to suggest one can work out a water rate based on the \$36, because it is impossible.

Mr Harman: Are you saying it costs \$10 to read a meter?

Mr CLARKO: I am saying if we work it out at 17c a kilolitre for 150 kilolitres we are left with \$10.50 as a basic charge. If a person visits my house twice a year to read my meter, and has a vehicle to do this, an office in which to do his paper work, receives superannuation and long service leave, it would cost much more than \$10. Four or five years ago it was claimed that it cost \$5 to send out an account.

Mr Harman: Is that the Government's rationale?

Mr CLARKO: No, it is my rationale and it is factual because if a person does not use any water it costs the Government money.

It is important to remember that many people are not deducting sewerage and drainage charges from the total account they receive from the Water Board. They are not deducting sewerage and drainage costs.

Last year I paid \$60 and now I shall pay \$36. When I spend \$24 more I am back to the position I was in last year. If the basic figure became \$40, I could spend \$20 and be in the same position.

In addition, the matter of retrospectivity must be taken into account. The Government was criticised in regard to retrospectivity and we have now corrected the situation. I think that is very important.

In the article which appeared in *The West Australian* under the political leaders' notes, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that many industrial and commercial water users do not

have a meter. I am assured by the Water Board that places which use water in their production processes and are large users of water—whether it be a dairy or bottle-washing factory, or a brewery—do in fact have meters. However, the man who runs the Karrinyup toy shop in the Karrinyup shopping centre and who pays \$1 000 in water charges, but has only a little tap the water from which he uses to make a cup of tea, does not have a meter because it would be a waste of money to install it.

Meters are being installed now in large blocks of home units, because of the new allocation of 150 kilolitres. If one looks at a person in the metropolitan area, one will see the average figure for water usage is 300 kilolitres per annum. This year that person will pay \$61.50.

Mr Harman: Are you going to bring in a pay-as-you-use scheme for the retail section?

Mr CLARKO: If a person uses 600 kilolitres this year in a metropolitan household, which is twice the average figure, he will pay \$112.50. That amounts to \$2 per week. If anyone tells me water is expensive when an amount of \$2 per week is the cost for twice the average water usage in the metropolitan area, then I have a markedly different idea of money from him.

In addition, this new system will give people the opportunity to determine how much water they want to pay for, or how much they want to pay for their water. I hope the people of Perth do not panic in regard to water charges. When they sit down and work it out they will see that not a large sum of money is involved.

I hope the people of Perth do not rip out their front lawns and their street lawns. I hope they will remain because Perth is one of the most beautiful cities in the world, and one reason for that fact is the magnificent lawns and gardens that we have.

The water restrictions were supposedly introduced because of the shortage of water in our dams. However, the water in my area came from an underground source; it did not come from the dams. But in fairness to everyone, we were also placed on water restrictions.

Mr McIver: What is the Government doing about planning for additional dams?

Mr CLARKO: The Opposition has talked about the basic allowance of 150 kilolitres being raised to 200 kilolitres. That would mean a loss of \$8.50 from each consumer, or a total loss of \$1.5 million. If that \$1.5 million is not paid by the consumers, it will have to be raised in some other manner. It will not spring from some artesian bore! The argument has been raised that people who use the most are the richest people. I can

assure members opposite that I know many rich people who drink no water at all.

Mr Pearce: That is why the tax on whisky was put up!

Mr CLARKO: The people on lower incomes generally will be the largest consumers of water, and the proposal put forward by the Labor Party will affect them the most. I think I have said enough on that particular subject, and I will now pass on to another very interesting matter.

At the beginning of this century there was a leading Australian politician who was known as "Yes-no Reid". He got the name because one week he wanted free trade and the next week he wanted protection. We have here in our present Leader of the Opposition a "Yes-no Ron". His comments on nationalisation are tremendously inconsistent. What he says yesterday, certainly cannot be repeated today. On Wednesday, the 4th October, an article appeared on the main page of the *Daily News*. It was written by Geoff Kitney, who generally does not give us much pleasure. The article stated—

A high-powered Labor Party committee has proposed that a future Labor government take over private companies to give it greater control of the economy.

It says nationalisation would be necessary to move Australia to "a more just and equitable society".

A little further in the article it is stated—

In a report to the ALP's committee of inquiry, a copy of which has been leaked, the economic policy group says: "State intervention must be of a different nature than just organising capital more efficiently.

"Its intervention needs to be of the nature whereby major private firms are taken into public ownership..."

That article appeared on the 4th October. The next day, in *The West Australian*, an article appeared under the heading "Nationalise big firms". The article dealt with an ALP discussion paper on nationalisation. On the following day, Friday, the 6th October, another article appeared under the heading "Davies ridicules nationalisation". The article appeared in *The West Australian* and, in part, was as follows—

The Leader of the WA Opposition, Mr Davies, said yesterday that he would resign if the Labor Party ever adopted a policy of nationalisation of major private companies.

A little further the article states that Mr Davies said—

I believe the likelihood of its becoming party policy is so remote that I am prepared to say I would resign if it does, because we would never win an election.

What a risk. The ALP would not want an election. So, we get to the Saturday where an article appeared under the heading "Davies modifies stand on industry". This is "Yes-no Davies". The article, in part, states—

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Davies, yesterday shifted from his hard-line stand against nationalisation.

On Thursday he said that he would resign from the Labor Party leadership if it ever adopted a policy of nationalisation of major private companies.

But in a statement yesterday he said he unequivocally supported official ALP policy on economic management.

This included a mixture of measures including consultation—

Imagine how much consultation there would be when about to take over a \$100 million firm, such as BHP. The article continues—

—regulation, private public sector competition, joint private sector ownership, government procurement and some forms of selective nationalisation.

That is what he said on the Saturday; "Yes-no Davies". Quite opposite from what he said on Friday. Of course, who telephoned him?

Mr Pearce: Perhaps he was reported more accurately on the second occasion than he was the first time.

Mr CLARKO: A little further on in the article it is stated—

His remarks were believed to have caused some concern in sections of the ALP because official policy refers to some forms of selective nationalisation.

So, there he is on Friday saying he was opposed to nationalisation, but on Saturday he was saying it was okay.

I will now go to his Federal leader, to see what Mr Bill Hayden had to say. He said—

I'm totally opposed to nationalisation. I think it's a clumsy, unnecessarily provocative tool. It brings more political ill-will than benefit. We're very limited in what we could nationalise—if indeed anything.

What will the Leader of the Opposition do now? Heavens above, his Australian leader has said the opposite from what he has said. However, I do not think he needs to take it to heart. I will refer to

Geoff Kitney again—he will be in trouble. In an article about the Labor intervention in Queensland, he says that as soon as that matter was over Mr Hayden was off to Western Australia. The article, in part, reads—

Once the Queensland situation is resolved Mr Hayden will turn his attention to WA, about which he has, at a private level, expressed considerable concern.

Mr Hayden has already been to WA to look at the party's situation in the State and has talked at some length with the state leader, Mr Davies, the State Secretary, Mr Bob McMullan, and the party's federal MPs.

I think he was talking about senators. The article continues—

Nevertheless, Mr Hayden intends to have a very close look at the WA branch of the party and to examine, in conjunction with WA officials, the causes and effects of its poor performance and ways of improving it.

I will refer now to the Launceston Commonwealth Conference, 1971, of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr Pearce: That is a long time ago. Has not your party changed its policy since 1971?

Mr CLARKO: Under the heading "Economic planning", it is stated—

3. With the object of achieving Labor's socialist objectives, establish or extend public enterprise, where appropriate by nationalisation . . .

Where appropriate! In 1973 the 30th Federal conference was held at Surfers Paradise where, no doubt, the delegates were sitting by a pool enjoying themselves. At that conference, under the same heading, virtually the same thing was said, as follows—

4. With the object of achieving Labor's objectives, establish or extend public enterprise, where appropriate by nationalism . . .

Of course, the word "nationalism" was meant to read "nationalisation".

In 1975, the economic planning of the ALP included—

5. To achieve Labor's objectives, establish or extend public enterprise, where appropriate by nationalisation . . .

That is all there, for "Yes-no Davies" to know about. The 1977, 32nd National Conference of the Australian Labor Party was held in Perth, but the booklet covering the conference has not yet been printed. However, it was stated that the

nationalisation policy was relaxed, but it was still there. Friday one thing, Saturday something different! The member for Fremantle has his own views as well, and they are quite different.

Now that the member for Morley is in his place I want to touch briefly on the question of Standing Committees in Parliament. He has spoken on this subject on many occasions, and he has spoken well.

Mr Tonkin: I think so, too.

Mr CLARKO: When I was in London I attended a seminar dealing with Standing Committees. Among other things, we had an opportunity to question a panel, and I asked a particular English member of Parliament what committees he was on. He said he was on a transport committee, and one other. He said he could not stand the transport committee and was on it only because he had been posted to it. When I asked him what he did, he said he usually sat in the corridor until an attendant came along and told him he was needed to vote. He said at that point he left off writing, or left off talking to someone, entered the meeting and cast his vote.

I attended several meetings—I think four times. The committees met in a room about three-quarters as large as this Chamber, and seating similar to that in our Speaker's Gallery was provided. The particular committee was supposed to have a dozen members from each side, but when I attended there were only three from the Government side and four from the Opposition.

The member for Morley has claimed that members interested in certain subjects would come forward and speak directly and seriously to the committee not as they would speak to a public gallery. They would be experts in certain fields and would concentrate on particular matters, which would not be decided on a party basis. However, all the speakers I heard were the same as those one would hear if an audience of 1 000 were present. I attended four meetings and they were all much the same in this regard. In my opinion—and I do not say this as a conclusive statement—those committees were a flop.

I now want to touch briefly on one of the most serious matters affecting us today; that is, the number of fatalities on our roads. Recently I saw some statistics which showed that in the 1960s, 30 000 Australians were killed and 760 000 Australians were injured in road accidents. I want to make the point that when seat belts were made compulsory for the first time in Victoria, late in 1970, there was a dramatic drop in the fatalities in that State. It is also interesting to note that in a newspaper during the last day or so there

appeared an article stating that in the United States, there was a dramatic increase in the number of deaths and injuries caused by those drivers who would not now keep to the maximum speed limit of 55 miles per hour which earlier had been imposed to save fuel during the petrol crises and had led to a lowering of car accident injuries.

I want to say—and I am aware that my farming friends will not agree with me—I would very much like to see in Western Australia, on a trial basis, the maximum speed reduced from 110 kilometres per hour to 100 kilometres per hour. Whilst I do not expect any support from my colleagues who are used to driving at a high speed on our country roads, I believe this would be a worth-while trial and it would save many lives.

There is one other brief point I want to make. Just as we have moved in regard to water charges, which are not related in any way whatsoever to the value of a house or land, I would very much like to see local government rates charged on the same basis. I see no reason that two school teachers on exactly the same salaries living next door to each other, having to pay different rates simply because one person decides to build some additions onto his home. The fact that rates are a decreasing proportion of local government revenue year by year due to Federal Government grants is a further argument in favour of my proposal.

I now want to touch on a rather tender subject, and I am sure some of my colleagues will not agree with my remarks. I refer to the question of wage indexation. Wage indexation has attracted considerable attention in Australia during the last couple of years. It has played a major part in the battle to reduce inflation, from which we have been suffering. I feel it is essential for everybody to realise that if we stay too long with a system involving plateau indexation that removes a proper percentage of what a man used to get as a margin for skill over some sort of basic wage, Australia will ultimately suffer. I hope we will be able to move rapidly back to the situation where the percentage which a skilled worker receives is based on some sort of basic wage, and that the percentage is restored to its proper margin.

Some years ago I remember reading an article which compared the situation in the United States with that in the Soviet Union. The margin for skills is much greater in the Soviet Union than it is in the United States. The foreman of a factory in Russia receives a greater margin over the salary of a floor operator in that factory than does his counterpart in the United States.

I want to finish on this note: We are discussing a Bill dealing with the Budget, and without question the western world has embarked on a campaign of taxation cuts. It was very interesting to read that Governor Gerry Brown of California totally opposed the proposition which was responsible for across-the-board tax cutting in that State, but having fought the proposition all the way, had this to say when he realised he had lost the battle, "If you want a decision-maker as your Governor expect him to be wrong sometimes." This gentleman has now joined the campaign for tax cutting.

The Budget before us tonight illustrates that the people of this State and of this nation are tax weary, and that it is from Governments such as ours that they will get the best deal tax-wise. Although it is our opponents who supposedly offer the most to the electorate, the only way they can offer the most is by offering it at the taxpayers' expense.

MR McIVER (Avon) [9.02 p.m.]: Over the last few days I have listened intently to Government members and their contributions to the Budget debate. All we have heard has been a repetition of what has been said since the Government came to office. There has been nothing new. Of course it is Liberal Party philosophy to introduce the Budget weeks before it is actually introduced into this Parliament. To clarify that statement, I mean that the taxes and charges are always increased before the Budget is brought to Parliament.

Mr Clarko: What happened in New South Wales? Exactly the same.

Mr McIVER: This is the course that Liberal Party Governments have followed over a long period. Government members have criticised the Opposition by saying that they have nothing constructive to say, nothing positive. Of course there is nothing constructive that Opposition members can say, because there is no Budget. Anyone can balance a Budget with figures. One does not have to be a fully-fledged accountant to balance a Budget as our Treasurer does. Anybody could do that.

Many of the Government members who have spoken in this debate do not live in country areas and they have not experienced the effect of the increases in State taxes and charges. Nor have they experienced the effect of that monstrosity that was introduced not long ago in Canberra—the Federal Budget.

I assure members that country people are now experiencing the effects of the drastic measures imposed by the Federal Government, and this situation will worsen. It is useless to speak about

education, water, and electricity supplies; much greater problems are facing the State.

Perhaps the most serious problem facing us today is that of unemployment and the future of our young people. Somehow we will always obtain water and electricity supplies, but what are we to do about the thousands of young men and women who do not have jobs and who are not likely to obtain jobs in the future? This Government could not care less about them.

Criticism has been directed at these people by those who enjoy double incomes, and perhaps even additional incomes that their wives earn. Many people who hold well paid jobs say that the unemployed are dole bludgers and do not want to work; they want to spend their days on the beach. That is a lot of nonsense. In no way is the Government coming to grips with the problem.

I must be fair and say that certain aspects are retarding the Government in its efforts because no money is coming to the State from Canberra. The greatest disaster in Australia is sometimes referred to as the Prime Minister. That is the greatest disaster this nation has ever known. He is the most obstinate and the most dictatorial Prime Minister we have ever had. I hasten to add that I hope nothing happens to him until after 1980, but I am afraid the knives are now coming out and I will give him about six months before he is removed as the Federal leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr Bateman: It will not take that long; they are moving already in that direction.

Mr McIVER: I trust that he will last a little longer, and that he will keep on delivering the same speeches he is delivering at the moment. Even the dumbest political scholar must be aware of the pattern that is emerging in Australia today. If the Prime Minister remains the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Australian Labor Party will face the cheapest campaign it has ever faced.

Mr Bateman: Don't encourage him to go—for heaven's sake!

Mr McIVER: We must get our young people interested; we must let them know that they have a role to play in the development of our State. This Government fails to realise the facts. It has made many false promises by saying that thousands of jobs are available for young people. Many times we hear that the North-West Shelf will provide all these employment opportunities. The members who say this do not know what they are talking about. They do not know the complexities that the company faces. They do not know how the gas will be brought to the shore, let alone where the markets for this product will be.

ask the Government who will buy this gas, and when will it all happen?

I must say that we said the same thing when we were in Government. We hoped the development would be expedited so that we could receive the kudos for it. We certainly did assist in the initial stages of this project, but it is proving to be a much longer-term programme than originally proposed. The big white father who sits on the other side of the House tells us constantly what the North-West Shelf project will do for Western Australia, but it will be a long time before it gets off the ground.

Mr Laurance: Twelve months.

Mr McIVER: The inner Cabinet is now saying that it will get off the ground in 12 months. I would bet that the company would be delighted to hear that; I hope the honourable member is right.

Mr Laurance: I was beginning to doubt that the way you are talking.

Mr McIVER: I will have a charity ticket on that with the honourable member because I believe it will be a great deal longer than 12 months before it gets off the ground.

Mr Bateman: Every week *The Sunday Times* tells us that another 8 000 will be employed.

Mr McIVER: What will happen in December? Many more young people will be looking for jobs, just like the young men and women who have completed their law studies. It is extremely difficult for these young people to obtain articles. Even if they are fortunate enough to be articulated, what will happen at the end of that period?

The teaching profession has come to a dead stop. There are no long-term opportunities for school teachers now.

We must face up to the problems involved with technological changes. I believe the people of Western Australia do not really know how the changes will affect them, or that they will affect every man, woman, and child in Western Australia. Although we have read a great deal about this problem, it has not really hit us yet. Other countries have been living with it for quite some time. I would like to see an all-party committee established to look into the whole situation to consider whether we should spend vast sums of money on these machines that will cut out jobs.

An example of such a technological change is the validating machines that will be put into use by the MTT. Already thousands of dollars have been allocated for these machines to cancel the tickets for triple journeys on our buses and our suburban rail services. Are we ready to accept

these machines? I have seen them in operation, and there is nothing wrong with them. Many other countries of the world use them, and although we are told that the present ticket collectors will be absorbed into another department, it still represents a narrowing of job opportunities. Also, the initial outlay for these machines could well be spent in other directions. Do we have our priorities right?

I understand that it will not be long before tellers are no longer necessary in banks. One will simply present one's bank book to a machine which will either collect one's deposit or pay out the money that one wishes to withdraw. It is no wonder that the banking fraternity are concerned about it. More and more job opportunities are drying up. Such instances as this do not assist us in our endeavours to find more jobs for our young people.

It is no wonder that there is more and more violence in our State. In last night's copy of the *Daily News* I read about a community projects bus in Maylands which was attacked by vandals. Seats were slashed, and probably the bus will be a write-off. Where are we going wrong? This is not a matter of politics. As the legislators of Western Australia, surely we can offer some solution. We are the ones who make the laws, but are we giving enough attention to this situation? Are we concerned enough about the education of our young people?

We all know that speed and alcohol are perhaps the greatest contributing factors to our road toll. However, no matter what deterrents we use, our road toll is increasing. We are not coming to grips with the problem. The previous speaker suggested that the speed limit should be reduced to 100 kilometres an hour. What a lot of nonsense! I believe that the motorist who travels slowly and who hugs the middle lane is as much of a hazard as is the speed hog who exceeds the recognised speed limits.

Mr P. V. Jones: What about the situation in the United States where they lowered the speed limit to 60 miles an hour as an energy consumption measure and it was decided to retain the limit because of the reduction in road accidents?

Mr McIVER: The Minister for Education has raised a very important point, but I do not feel it is a very fair comparison because of the volume of traffic and the population of the United States compared with that of Western Australia. I do not think that is a fair comparison—

Mr P. V. Jones: The point is still valid on an energy consumption basis. It is also valid on a road safety basis.

Mr McIVER: If the Minister would look at the newspaper tonight, he would see where America is losing control of the road toll situation. It is getting right out of their grip. The Minister is strengthening my argument by raising this point. He is supporting what I am saying.

I maintain that the training of our young people is the most important aspect in Western Australia. It is not water, nor power, nor anything else. The future generation of this State is important. This Government is doing absolutely nothing to tackle the problem. All it does is to abuse the young people.

If members will look at the figures—the national figures are no longer permitted to be broadcast or publicised in the Federal sphere—they will find that there is definitely an increase, month by month. The Government accuses Opposition members of offering no alternatives. We do not have to offer any; we are not the Government. That is in the lap of the Government. The people over there are the Government. They are the ones who have to make the decisions. It is their place.

Mr Stephens: You have some constructive suggestions?

Mr McIVER: If we had, what difference would that make? I do not think the member for Stirling could make any suggestions. The Government would not take any notice of him at the present time. I do not think he would get very far with a recommendation.

Mr Stephens: If you would like to pause for a moment—the first amendment I moved, the Government supported.

Mr McIVER: All I can say is, "Congratulations. Welcome home!"

The employment of our future generation is an important factor. I trust that the Government will give it more consideration than is being given to it at the moment.

I wish to deal with costs in the country. They are at a high level. Country people cannot bear much more as far as costs are concerned. This applies particularly to primary producers. In the next financial year, fuel costs alone will be a strain on country people, and most certainly on the farming fraternity. However, those people are the controllers of their own destiny. They must realise that they put this Government where it is. Perhaps in 1980 they will give consideration to their ballot papers when they go to the polls. All these matters reflect on the decisions of the Government. Irrespective of the protests they make now, the answer is in their hands.

I wish to take the Government to task for several of its transport policies. What is happening in the transport field in all facets of transport? I wish to touch particularly on the issue of tendering.

At election time this Government proclaims that it is a Government of free enterprise. It suggests that it follows a free enterprise system, and that a vote for Labor is a vote for socialism. However, every piece of legislation introduced by the Government is of a socialistic nature. That has been the case for years, and no doubt it will continue to be the case while this Government holds the Treasury bench.

Freezer traffic has been taken over by road transport. The situation is still in utter chaos. I suggest that tenders be recalled every two years. I say two years, because I do not think 12 months is enough time for a company. If this proposal were adopted, the Government could practice private enterprise in its truest sense. If there are competitive freight rates, the people north of the 26th parallel—the people in the Murchison—will be given the benefit of those competitive freight rates. They will be able to live in those areas far better than they are now able to do in relation to the cost of living and the prices of consumer items. Under the present system, this situation will not improve.

Mr Rushton: What about a three-year period? They have a lot of capital invested.

Mr McIVER: I will go as far as that. I am suggesting two years to keep the operators on their toes. If someone put an argument to me that two years was not economic or was not practical, I would be prepared to go to three years.

No-one can tell me that somewhere along the line there is not a lot of graft in our road transport system—

Mr Rushton: Cut it out!

Mr McIVER: I honestly believe that, from the information that has been supplied to me. There is graft.

Mr Rushton: Could you let me know something more about that?

Mr McIVER: The Minister may recall the Government introduced a Bill last October—an amendment to the Transport Act. If the Minister reads the debate when I handled the second reading of the Bill for the Opposition, he will notice that I mentioned an instance when a contract in the area north of the 26th parallel was subcontracted four times. The fourth person involved had to accept the price. It was so low he

had only to blow a tyre and he would lose his profit.

This is why the former Minister for Transport (the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) introduced amendments to the legislation in order to eliminate the problem and why the Transport Commission now has the right to go to those companies and examine the freight rate being charged. So, it is not just me saying it; it is common knowledge.

The Minister for Health has promised me he will investigate the matter of meat going north of the 26th parallel in sacks, whereas we all know the Public Health Act specifies it must be hung. Officials of the Transport Department cannot be on duty 24 hours a day; they cannot be expected to examine each truck. However, these people should not be able to get away with it. If they tender to do a job, they should do that job within the transport laws of this State.

This brings me to the matter of the road maintenance tax. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction in the transport community because there is so much evasion of this tax. I urge the new Minister for Transport to have a really good look at this situation. In particular, when tenders are called they should be called on a proper basis; the contracts should not be just handed over on a gold plate like they were to OD Transport which was granted freezer contracts. The Government should allow other companies to have a bite of the cherry.

I noticed from the report of the fishing inquiry headed by the member for Cottesloe that the fishermen in Hopetoun must wait by the side of the road with their catch to go to market. They do not know when the transport truck is coming through. This is supposed to be 1978! Where else in the world would such a situation be tolerated?

What is the Government doing about this matter? The fishing industry is a very important industry to Western Australia. Has any Government member from either House brought this matter to the notice of the Government? Not one! They are all silent. One would think it is Armistice Day.

Mr Jamieson: And it will remain Armistice Day with the new Minister, do not worry about that.

Mr McIVER: These are serious matters to the people concerned and to the transport industry.

I noticed earlier today from an answer to a question that the cost of constructing our highways and bridges is escalating, and that the estimated cost of completing the Burswood Island bridge now is in the vicinity of \$37 million. Of

course, that amount is beyond the financial capacity of any State Government.

Mr Jamieson: Yet the Brand Government promised to build it years ago, in 1965.

Mr McIVER: We are used to broken promises from this Government. I understand the abutments have been down in the vicinity of Haig Park for years; I suppose that is as close as we will ever get to completing the project.

Are we heading in the right direction in an effort to solve the total transport problem? Is such a massive expenditure on one bridge justified, or will traffic be at saturation point only 10 or 15 years after its construction? Will we receive an adequate return for our outlay of \$37 million in an attempt to come to grips with traffic congestion? Are we heading in the right direction in the construction of freeways and major highways? These are all problems with which the new Minister must come to grips.

We will not solve our overall transport problem by planning something which is beyond our financial capacity to deliver. At the moment we cannot afford to build the Burswood Island bridge or any other bridge, for that matter, and they are not going to get any cheaper.

The answer, of course, is the extension of the State's rail services. Members have heard me speak on this subject many times before, but it must be said and repeated to try to get it home. The bulk freight—the major haulage—is carried by rail. A fortnight ago I had the privilege of attending a heavy haulage conference at the Sheraton Hotel, attended by 638 delegates from 16 countries. Every one of those delegates, from chief engineers to research officers from the universities of the world, could not emphasise strongly enough the amount of money being spent in the various cities on improving rail transport and heavy haulage facilities, and the amount of money going into research towards developing heavier axle loads to carry greater tonnages with more safety and to shift the multitude of people. Each delegate told the same story. In this area, of course, Western Australia is stagnant due to lack of planning, lack of understanding and lack of funds.

Mr Rushton: Koolyanobbing-Kwinana is hardly stagnant.

Mr McIVER: We will get to that in a moment. I do not know how the Minister can obtain additional funds from Canberra. I do not suppose we are alone in this problem. Every State wants a greater allocation of funds, whether it be for transport, education or any other facility.

To the Government's credit it has endeavoured to impress upon the Prime Minister the necessity for this. The measly amount of money given to the Kwinana-Koolyanobbing project is unbelievable. Surely the Federal Government recognises the importance of the east-west link. Surely that Government realises the line's future importance in more ways than just a freight system.

If the Prime Minister stayed at home for 12 months and did not go on his expensive junkets around the world, we would probably have the money for the project.

After hearing the comments from the speakers at the conference held at the Sheraton Hotel—they were not just local engineers speaking—it is obvious to me insufficient money has been allocated for this project and we are skimping on the necessary ballasting of the line. If this aspect is not given sufficient consideration we could find ourselves in trouble in 15 years' time.

Mr Rushton: Our overseas and interstate visitors were very impressed with what they observed in Western Australia in regard to our railways.

Mr McIVER: Does the Minister mean facilities such as freight terminals?

Mr Rushton: The general attention to our system.

Mr McIVER: The Minister is digressing from the subject matter. I am talking about the upgrading of the Koolyanobbing-Kwinana line; I am talking about the tonnage of ballast we are going to use. The speakers at the conference felt we were not spending enough on the project and were being entirely too skimpy with our allocations. I cannot debate the merits or demerits of that as I am not an engineer, but that point was made very clearly. I would like to pay a compliment to Dr Paul Greenwood who presented Western Australia's paper at the conference; he did a magnificent job. I give full marks to him; his address was appreciated by everyone. I would like the Minister to take note of my comments in this regard and only time will tell who was right or wrong.

I would like now to touch on the matter of housing. I am strongly opposed to the rent increases inflicted on working people and pensioners in State Housing Commission homes, especially in country areas. What happened, apparently, was that officers of the Department of Social Security and the State Housing Commission got together and worked out that a home occupied by a pensioner couple was worth so much and then worked out a rental figure.

They have worked out a common denominator which they feel the pensioners should have to pay.

Some of these homes in the country areas were built in the late 1940s and have since been paid for twice over. Because of reduced maintenance allocations, no maintenance or general paintwork and so on has been undertaken for many years. I maintain that this is a big "take". If this were private enterprise, the estate agent involved would be in really hot water. This position applies not only in my electorate but also in all major country centres. I strongly oppose the severe rent increases imposed by the Government.

I now make a plea on behalf of retarded children in the State. I direct my remarks to the Treasurer and ask that he find more money to be allocated for the education of these children. I hope my plea does not fall on deaf ears.

These children cannot make a plea for themselves and there are a growing number of them in this State. Medical reports indicate that one in 20 pregnancies produces a retarded child. Many people feel that because they are in the high income bracket they will not be affected; that retarded children are born only to those families in the lower and middle-income brackets; of course, this is not factual.

We have many institutions in Western Australia helping these children which are running at a great loss. To make things worse, funds from the Federal Government are becoming smaller. This is an area of concern we should not lose track of. We must give these children the opportunity to play a part in our community and be given responsibilities the same as are given to other children. This cannot happen if we do not have the funds.

It makes one a little hard and bitter when one considers that the brewery and similar establishments can get thousands of dollars as inducement payments to move to such places as Cannington. This is difficult to accept when organisations helping retarded children have to scratch and scrape for a few dollars to keep operating. In my opinion it shows this Government has no compassion.

Sir Charles Court: Record amounts have been given to these institutions.

Mr McIVER: I trust the Treasurer will listen to my plea because there will be a \$500 000 deficit in this area alone in Western Australia this year. The Treasurer is the first to say that money has to come from somewhere. I believe the Government has a very strong responsibility in this area.

Sir Charles Court: We have given record amounts.

Mr McIVER: I ask the Treasurer to make an extra allocation to clear up this deficit.

Sir Charles Court: Have you read the miscellaneous items of the Budget?

Mr McIVER: There will still be a \$500 000 deficit.

Sir Charles Court: Someone is misleading you. These people have a very close liaison with the Treasury and they work out a very satisfactory arrangement. None of those people would say they have been treated unfairly by the Treasury, not, at least, since I have been here.

Mr H. D. Evans: They have been treated unfairly with travel conditions.

Sir Charles Court: You are trying to stir them up.

Mr McIVER: The State Government is not the only Government that should be blamed; its counterpart in Canberra also is to blame. The Government must see that this area of education is kept functioning.

Sir Charles Court: It is.

Mr McIVER: The member for Karrinyup spoke generally on the matter of education. To me this is an important part of education. Irrespective of what is contained in the miscellaneous items, it can be seen they are being starved of funds.

I have used the opportunity afforded to me tonight to make these points and to speak on the Budget and the manner in which it is affecting the country people of Western Australia. I have mentioned also the way the Budget is affecting the sick, the infirm, the aged, and the retarded. Members should not run away with the idea that Western Australia is a place of excitement. We have never been at a lower ebb.

I conclude by saying, as I have said previously, that I hope nothing happens to the Prime Minister. I hope he continues to adopt the policies he has adopted in the past.

Mr Laurant: For many years.

Mr McIVER: I hope the Prime Minister remains as head of the Liberal Government in Canberra until 1980. A general pattern has emerged from the Federal by-election at Werriwa and the State election in New South Wales, and it will most certainly be reflected in the election in Victoria. This pattern will emerge in Western Australia in 1980 when a Labor Government will be returned to this State and some sanity will be restored in the allocation of funds.

Sir Charles Court: I have heard you say that before.

Mr McIVER: The Premier will hear me say it again.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Crane.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR TONKIN (Morley) [9.42 p.m.]: This Bill, which will improve the machinery whereby bans can be enforced against goods which are unsafe, is very welcome. Members may recall we referred to this matter in our policy speech to the people in 1977. To a degree it provides better machinery to ensure commercial interests cannot exploit people by selling goods which may be dangerous. For that reason, it is very welcome.

The other matters contained in the Bill are technical. They are necessary, but they are certainly not controversial. For these reasons, the Opposition has no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier), and transmitted to the Council.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool) [9.45 p.m.]: This Bill contains a small amendment to the Act and we have no difficulty in supporting it. On occasions such as the sesquicentennial celebrations we may wish to introduce the festivities in a fitting manner on Sunday evening. It is a great pity that, because of the provisions in the Act, licensed premises cannot take advantage

of such celebrations on Sunday evening. As a result, this amendment is necessary.

The Bill deals also with licensed club premises and the provisions in relation to guests. It has been found that in some cases guests who are present on such club premises are not legally entitled to be there and to use the facilities. As a result, it has been necessary to legalise such activities. This is a sensible proposition.

A further provision in the Bill relates to liquor being supplied at establishments training in the service of food. My leader will have a few words to say about this matter. Several years ago I was in Tasmania attending a Constitutional Convention. As the leader of the party at the time, I was privileged to be invited with the other party leaders to attend a dinner organised by the State Government and hosted by the then Premier (Mr Neilson). The venue for the function was an establishment which provided facilities for the training of stewards in the serving of food. The building had been modernised and turned into a restaurant for the purpose of instructing correctly the stewards in the serving of food and liquor. It was interesting to observe the training given in this rather old building. It was an enjoyable evening. I do not know whether the Deputy Premier was present. The Premier might have been there.

We were even treated to some Tasmanian wines which were probably the only bottles available at the time. We survived the ordeal.

Mr O'Neil: Sparkling-cascade, vintage 1976.

Mr JAMIESON: I am not sure where the grapes were picked; but the wine was reasonable.

It is part and parcel of the present-day system to train people in the serving of food and we are going only part of the way if we do not train them also in the correct ways to serve liquor. Both food and drink are served in restaurants. Full training should be provided by these courses. I see nothing wrong with the provisions contained in the Bill. Further comment will probably be made on the matters to which I have referred. However, the Opposition has no great hesitancy in supporting the Bill.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [9.50 p.m.]: I want to do two things. I want to congratulate the Government on the speed with which it moved in one instance, and to condemn it for its lack of sensitivity and action in another instance.

Earlier this year I received a letter from a Mr Robert Maher, managing director of a number of nightclubs. His address is Homeric House, Murray Street, Perth, and he sent a letter to the

Premier pointing out that this year New Year's Eve fell on a Sunday and that the planned celebrations could go somewhat haywire if liquor was not freely available at the various night spots at which people would be celebrating the New Year.

I mentioned this to the Minister in charge of that aspect of the Government's activities and I will not repeat what he said to me. However, he indicated that that aspect had not been considered. Nevertheless, the Government acted promptly and I wonder whether under normal circumstances, had it not been that this New Year's Eve will precede the beginning of our 150th celebrations, there might not have been some opposition to the proposed amendment. The provision will apply not only to the Sunday of this year, but also to any Sunday at any time when, under certain conditions, nightclubs and other premises will be licensed to enable them to quite properly celebrate the New Year.

Some people say it is not necessary for a person to have access to liquor in order to celebrate, but nevertheless we have been conditioned to believe that no social function is complete unless adequate supplies of liquor are available.

I do not know what the Government is doing about the effects of liquor on some people. At one stage it was suggested that out of licence fees a certain amount should be made available for research. I do not think this has ever been done; nor has any money been specifically put aside for research in the field of alcoholism.

This is the greatest problem facing Australia today, next to the Fraser Government and unemployment, and therefore it is something which should be considered seriously.

Mr Jamieson: You are not suggesting that money should be put aside to investigate the Fraser Government are you?

Mr DAVIES: That is beyond investigation.

We are supporting the Bill because we believe it is not unreasonable as New Year's Eve will not fall on a Sunday very often. It is unfortunate that it should do so this year, but I will not try to blame the Government for that. It is just one of those things which we must accept.

However, the Government did act fairly quickly on the matter and I am pleased it did so because had the legislation not been put through there would have been all kinds of public outcry.

The Government did not act so quickly in regard to the provision of a liquor outlet relating to the supply and sale of liquor at institutions involved in the training of catering students. I

have been to the Bentley Food Trades College on a number of occasions because it is on the boundary of my electorate, and I have had some association with the students and staff there. As a result of those visits, on the 16th November, 1976, at page 3995 of *Hansard* I asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education question 25 as follows—

- (1) Why is it not possible for the bar at the Bentley Food Trades School to be licensed?
- (2) What is being done to overcome the apparent impasse?

Mr Grayden replied—

- (1) The Education Department has no desire to license the bar at the Bentley Technical College at this time.
- (2) No impasse exists.

That shows how far from reality the Minister for Education and the Minister representing him were at the time, because initially the college had been built with provision for a bar so that students and apprentices could be trained properly in the handling of liquor. Shortly after it became operative, those in control at the college were told that they did not have a licence and could not use the bar. This was of some concern and consternation not only to the students, but also to the staff.

An impasse did exist and no-one was doing anything about it. The department had in effect told the college that it should mind its own business and that section of the almost brand new institution was left idle because no-one would initiate any action to get a licence for it, despite the fact that it was considered to be essential as part of the training; despite the fact that representations had been made; and despite the fact that the people who went there expected to be able to procure liquor as part of the dining process. That just shows how out of touch the Government was at that time.

It was getting towards the end of the session and I did not follow up the matter. I sent the answer to the staff of the college and what they said about the Education Department I could not have recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr Jamieson: Members have been getting away with all sorts of things this year.

Mr DAVIES: The Government should have introduced this amendment a long time ago. At least two years' training has been lost because of the reluctance of the Government or the Education Department to seek a liquor licence for the college.

It is all very well for the Government to say that the students could have trained with lolly water, coloured water, or soft drink; but if students are training, they want the real thing with which to practise. The food served up to guests was not plastic, soya bean paste, or synthetic. It was the real thing. If the students are to be properly trained and are provided with real food they should have real liquor also.

Mr P. V. Jones: You are not suggesting we have not been using the real thing are you?

Mr DAVIES: According to the staff that is so, and that is what the Minister told me in 1976.

Mr P. V. Jones: Have you been there to see what is being used?

Mr DAVIES: I have not been there for 12 months. If the students are serving liquor without a licence, they have been breaking the law because we are only now amending the law.

Mr P. V. Jones: I'm asking a question.

Mr DAVIES: When I was there in 1976 and the following year they did not have a liquor licence. The bar was closed.

Mr P. V. Jones: They have a permit.

Mr DAVIES: They were unable to operate the bar and Mr Cox, the head of the college at the time, was fairly unrestrained in what he said concerning his attempts to get some kind of permission to trade out there. If they are trading out there now, they have been doing so against the law.

The point is that if the Government had taken notice of what was said in 1976, an amendment would have been made at least in 1977. However, here we are nearly at the end of 1978 which is two years since I asked the question. The Minister has said I do not know what I am talking about, and maybe he is quite right.

Mr P. V. Jones: I did not say that.

Mr DAVIES: I have not been to the school for some 12 months, but I knew what I was talking about in 1976 and my question was not prompted by some flight of fancy on my part, but by the strongest possible request by the staff at the college. If the Minister says I am wrong and that liquor has been served to outside guests—especially if they are paying for it—this must have been done outside the law. So once again the Government deserves condemnation for its reluctance to act in the matter which is being overcome simply now by an amendment. The Government has been reluctant to take this action. I suppose it considers it has had more important things to do, but it is a pity it adopted that attitude.

The other provision is intended to clarify an amendment made in 1976. We all thought that the 1976 amendment would have enabled members of an association to entertain their wives and guests. I must say that generally the liquor arrangements in the State over the past five years have been more sensible and more relative to the Western Australian type of living than they were for many years previously.

In the long run, I do not know whether we are doing a wonderful thing and whether we are increasing the likelihood of alcoholism becoming a greater problem in the community. The fact remains at least it seems a little more civilised; certainly not cheaper, but more civilised.

We support the Bill. We are pleased the Government has acted so quickly in one respect, but we have condemnation for the length of time it has taken to make the other amendment relating to the serving of liquor at colleges which train people in the catering trade.

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Chief Secretary) [10.01 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the legislation. I intended to explain to the member for Welshpool that we have in Western Australia a facility in much more modern surroundings than the one he attended in Hobart. I attended a function at the Bentley Technical School—the special catering section—at the invitation of the Hon. Graham MacKinnon when he was Minister for Education. On that occasion the students provided a meal for a considerable number of members of the Cabinet. Certainly liquor was served on that occasion, but, of course, it does not follow—as has been said—that it was served illegally. It is possible to be served with liquor on unlicensed premises. I think there is still a number of restaurants in Perth which have not taken out liquor licences, but those restaurants are able to serve liquor supplied by the guests.

Mr Jamieson: It would be a little difficult to organise a BYO show for Cabinet.

MR O'NEIL: I am not sure who supplied the liquor on that occasion.

I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who mentioned the occasion he first became aware of the fact that the premises at Bentley were not licensed. I personally was not aware of that. I must say when an approach was made to me relevant to the serving of liquor as part of the training course at tertiary institutions under the control of the Minister for Education, I had no hesitation in making the appropriate recommendation and the Government had no hesitation in accepting the recommendation. Where the recommendation of the Leader of the

Opposition went to I am not certain. Certainly there was no reluctance on the part of the Government to accept what seemed to be a fairly reasonable proposition. I imagine it would be fairly difficult to mix a "Bloody Mary" using lemonade and lolly water! Since the mixing and serving of drinks is part of the training course, it seems to be a fairly reasonable amendment.

Whilst special consideration has been given to the Bentley training institution, the amendment is such that if any other tertiary institution under the control of the Minister for Education is established similar provisions can be made for liquor to be supplied and sold at such places. I do not want it to be imagined that the bar is open at the Bentley training centre for the benefit of students. It must be run as part of the normal operation of the institution, essentially in the training of people in the catering trade.

I am also given to understand that it is possible for people to make arrangements to have lunch at the Bentley institution. Whether or not that still applies, I am not sure. Certainly we were given the advice that it was a simple matter for anyone who desired to take guests to the centre—perhaps visitors to Western Australia—to make arrangements for those visitors to be taken to lunch. I also understand that meals are available on a couple of nights each week.

Mr Tonkin: That is correct, and the meals are very good, too.

MR O'NEIL: I have not availed myself of that opportunity. It could well be that members who have visitors from other States, and who want to have a meal in very nice surroundings, will take the opportunity to show those visitors who are interested just what Western Australia can do in this aspect of trade training.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [10.08 p.m.]: The fact that a Bill to amend the parent Act is before the House for a second time within a month is an indication of the state of desperation the Government has reached with regard to its abattoir policy.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr H. D. EVANS: If one follows through the implications of this measure, small though they may be, they are rather frightening to rural producers in Western Australia. It is an effort to reduce the loss with regard to abattoir services at Midland and Robb Jetty, and the Minister's explanation makes this abundantly clear. The Western Australian Meat Commission will have power to allow selected clients, who are able to provide a continuity of stock for sale, to receive a discount or a rebate. That is basically what is involved with regard to this Bill.

I would point out it seems more than strange to provide the Western Australian Meat Commission with these powers. It seems more than strange that this Government has increased slaughtering fees in Western Australia by from 110 per cent to 141 per cent on the local market for local use, and from 80 per cent to 115 per cent on the export market. Now the Government suddenly realises the slaughtering fees are a source of embarrassment. The increase in slaughtering fees has been 100 per cent over five years, an average increase of about 20 per cent per annum. That is far above inflation or wage increases.

These charges, along with everything else, have been raised to a desperate level and it would not surprise me if this Government did not end up with a handy slush fund next year. That is not the worst aspect. The fees charged by the Public Health Department Meat Inspection Branch rose by 270 per cent in the same five-year period, an average in excess of 50 per cent per annum. So, at this stage we find that the Government now suddenly is becoming aware of the importance of fees, and the impact that fees have on the operations of the WA Meat Commission, and the Government is endeavouring to do something about it. It is not before time that the Government is making a move, belated though it may be.

I noted with interest an announcement in *The West Australian* of the 26th September that the

abattoirs were to be given power to compete. That announcement gives voice to the proposition the Minister has before the House at present.

I draw attention to the fact that the South Australian Meat Corporation has introduced a reduction in fees of something in the order of 20 per cent, and I understand it is reported that the throughput result has been "spectacular". I make the contrast to the action of the Western Australian Government.

While talking about fees it is apposite to draw the attention of the House to the fees charged in the various States. The slaughtering fee of the Metropolitan Meat Industry at Homebush in New South Wales is \$31; at Midland it is \$24.83 on average, plus 6.81c per kilogram over 125 kilograms. So our slaughtering fees are in excess of those charged in New South Wales. The slaughtering fee for sheep and lambs is \$4.25 in New South Wales, while at Midland it is \$4.0685 for sheep and \$4.9685 for lambs; so that operation compares favourably with the operation in New South Wales.

Mr Old: More than favourably.

Mr H. D. EVANS: We find the comparison with the charges of the South Australian Meat Corporation at Gepps Cross and Protean Pty. Ltd. in Victoria is not quite so favourable. The killing charge at Gepps Cross is \$19.80 for everything over 91 kilograms, while in Western Australia it is \$23.27 plus 6.81c per kilogram for all animals over 125 kilograms. The slaughtering charge for sheep and lambs at Gepps Cross is \$3. These are the figures as at the 29th July this year.

It is against that background that Samcor in South Australia has reduced the fees by 20 per cent. The details of the reduction are not as specific as I would like, but the reduction serves to indicate the degree of success Samcor has had, which might encourage the Government in this State to think along similar lines.

In his Budget speech, on page 3154 of *Hansard*, the Treasurer outlined three alternatives for the Midland Junction Abattoir which are currently being considered. They are, firstly, the closure of the beef and pig floors or their lease to private operators; secondly, closure of the lamb and mutton floors at the conclusion of the seasonal peak unless sufficient stock is put through to justify keeping the facility open; and, thirdly, closure or lease of the boning room facilities and consolidation of cold storage operations at Robb Jetty.

I have indicated previously that the position in relation to abattoirs in Western Australia is a disgrace, and the disgrace is attributable 100 per

cent to those on the other side of the House. I have previously traced the genesis of the Midland monster, and it should be compulsory reading for every country member in this place. A number of aspects of the statement of the Treasurer need closer examination and some answers should be given. I hope members of the National Country Party understand what is going on and will take into account the responsibilities they have to those they purport to represent.

Mr Speaker, you are a man of discernment and understanding, and I ask you: If it is viable for a private operator or a consortium to take over the Midland pig floor or beef floor, why is it not viable for the Western Australian Meat Commission to do so?

I have the figures relating to the meat trading operation of the Meat Commission in the last two years. In 1976-77 the Midland division showed a loss of \$190 323 and the Robb Jetty division a loss of \$25 817. In 1977-78 the loss was \$237 862 at Midland and \$73 042 at Robb Jetty.

It would probably have been better had the National Country Party had the intestinal fortitude to hold out for the operation of part IV of the Marketing of Lamb Act to give complete trading powers as far as sheep meats are concerned. That is just another adjunct, but it is also just another stage in the disgrace that the abattoir industry in Western Australia represents.

So my first question is: If it is a viable proposition for a private operator or consortium to take over the pig and/or beef floors at Midland, what is wrong with the Western Australian Meat Commission? It is of no use the Minister suggesting I am belittling men of good standing in the meat industry. The figures reveal they have shown a shocking loss, for which the Western Australian public have picked up the tab. I am not criticising members of the Meat Commission; nor am I praising their acumen. They have been placed at an acute disadvantage by the Government, and successive Governments of the same ilk.

The second question in relation to the Treasurer's suggested alternatives which needs to be answered is: What would be the lease figure to a consortium or private operator; and, balanced against that, what would be the cost of running Midland to allow either floor or both floors to operate? The Government cannot just lease it and walk away from it. It will be leased at a certain sum per day, week, or head, but I have not been able to find out what it will be. The veil of secrecy on the other side is rather hard to penetrate.

I come back to the point that Midland will be kept going at a cost. Certain rendering works and effluent disposal will have to continue. That will have to be paid for, but will it be covered by the leasehold figure?

In answer to a question the Minister said that the leasehold figure will have to be determined in negotiation with whoever is interested. This brings me back to my first point: If it is viable for a consortium to lease and to operate the Midland Junction Abattoir for its rendering plant, its by-products, and its effluent disposal, surely the Meat Commission or the Government should be in a position to make a better fist of running it than it is doing at the moment. This is the very point made, and it is implicit in the alternative suggestion.

Another point worries me. If the pig floor and/or the beef floor are to continue to operate, what will happen to the saleyards? Nobody seems to have mentioned the saleyards lately, for reasons which I cannot fully appreciate. The saleyards are very important, and if they close completely without a satisfactory alternative, then heaven help the farmers of Western Australia.

Mr Grewar: There will be a lot more regional centres.

Mr H. D. EVANS: And boy, would that be a harvest for the operators, the beef barons, and the meat moguls. They would move in and manipulate the market more than they can do at the present time. This would be the name of the game, and members opposite know it. They are not prepared to face the problem and do something about it.

The point I am making is that, if the pig floor and the beef floor are to be maintained as well as the saleyards, a facility will still be needed to dispose of the effluent. Who will provide that facility, and at what cost?

The very generalised alternatives that the Premier has put forward take no account of the services that will be provided. How will the services be maintained, and what is more important, who will bear the cost? What will be the cost involved? As the Premier has not given us the explanation, perhaps the Minister will. The House is very keenly interested to know precisely what is entailed.

Why has this amending legislation been introduced at this stage? A motion to establish a Select Committee to inquire into the abattoir industry in Western Australia is presently before the House. This legislation is an affront, not only to the rural population but also to the entire population of Western Australia. The Minister

made it clear that he is not disposed to support my motion for a Select Committee. I will have the opportunity to reply to the points he made.

The Meat Commission was set up as the vehicle to bring about meat marketing reform which is desired by the farmers of Western Australia. The commission emanated from a referendum put to the farmers, a referendum which nobody could really understand. It was loaded right from the start. It was never intended that there would be meat marketing reform. The Meat Commission was set up, and the farmers of the State were told, "Here is your reformed meat marketing body." What a sham, what a charade. It is not even a decent deodorant.

Mr Old: What does this have to do with the Bill we are debating?

Mr H. D. EVANS: It has everything to do with it. We are talking about meat marketing.

Mr Old: It has not. We are talking about an amendment to one section relating to operators. What you are saying has nothing to do with the Bill at all.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It has everything to do with the Bill because the Bill touches on meat marketing. That is what we are talking about.

Mr Pearce: What do you have abattoirs for, for heaven's sake?

Mr Old: You would not know, sonny.

Mr Pearce: I would know perfectly well.

Mr Old: You know what they do—goodness me!

Mr H. D. EVANS: It looks like I will have to call on you for your generous protection, Mr Speaker. Members opposite are trying to wriggle out from under on this one.

The purpose of this amendment is to endeavour to set up a more economic operation with some chance of success. We have seen headlines such as this, "Abattoirs to get the power to compete", "Abattoir charges follow re-think", and "Midland to get another chance to pay its way". This is what we are talking about. We are talking about a body which has been reconstituted in the interests of the farmers of Western Australia so that they have a reasonably fair chance to market their product. This provision was introduced by the Government. I am saying that it is a shocking charade, a sham, and a deodorant. That was the comment I made, and I maintain that it is a correct comment.

Mr Old: It will make good reading.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Those members who represent country electorates must have been

touched on the raw. We are talking about meat marketing in Western Australia, and the hollow promises made by this Government to the farmers who sought to express themselves through a referendum which was loaded to the gunwales.

Mr Stephens: The same old story—divide and rule.

Mr Pearce: You would know all about that!

Mr H. D. EVANS: One side rules and one side does not.

I have mentioned the essential points not referred to by the Minister in his speech. No way would he refer to these matters; he does not want to advertise the shortcomings of the Government. It has sold out the rural population time and time again, and it is continuing to do just that.

Mr Grewar: You are wrong.

Mr H. D. EVANS: There will never be orderly meat marketing in Western Australia, not while the Liberal Party is in Government. The Government is more concerned to assist the meat moguls and the beef barons. Too much finance is involved. The situation is as cold-blooded and as ruthless as that.

We will not oppose this Bill.

Mr Old: Goodness me—after all that!

Mr Laurance: Where is the charade now?

Mr Old: What a charade!

Mr H. D. EVANS: I oppose totally and utterly the philosophy and concept of this Government in regard to meat marketing and its attitude towards rural producers. However, the Government has shown a very faint glimmer of hope that the working operation at the Midland Junction Abattoir and the Robb Jetty Abattoir might be improved, and although there is no guarantee of that, although the chance is small and remote, if the Opposition were to deny it, we would be the ones who would be open to criticism. It is for this reason we do not oppose the Bill, but we still say it is a sham and a charade on the part of members opposite, and it shows that the Government lacks the intention ever to bring about meat marketing reform, or marketing reform of any kind.

Mr Old: Do not forget the deodorant.

Mr H. D. EVANS: It will be a long day before we see any marketing reform in this State.

Mr Stephens: Fair go, the Government did it with the fishermen at Albany when it said they had to sell to one company only. Is not that a reformist-type move?

Mr H. D. EVANS: I believe I have made the position of the Opposition clear beyond any

doubt. I have made quite clear our attitude to the Government's policy and its humbug.

We have also shown in its true perspective just what the amendment means. It is a pebble aimed at the moon; but as it is a pebble aimed in the right direction—even lacking force and lacking much optimism of success—we support it with the qualifications I have expressed.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [10.30 p.m.]: The attitude of the member for Warren was quite predictable. In fact, one could almost—

Mr H. D. Evans: Of course it is predictable when faced with that situation.

Mr OLD:—have written the speech for him. It was his No. 2 Meat Commission speech that we heard tonight.

Mr Jamieson: He is keeping the No. 1 speech to use on you next week.

Mr OLD: That speech of his comes down to the usual denigration of the Meat Commission, which was expected.

Mr H. D. Evans: I made the point explicitly that it was not an individual denigration.

Mr OLD: No, it was a collective denigration of the whole of the commission.

Mr H. D. Evans: Because you put them in that position.

Mr Davies: You are now getting reply No. 1A.

Mr OLD: What the member for Warren omitted to mention is the fact that the Government has been subsidising the Midland Junction Abattoir in particular for quite some time at an increasing rate.

Mr H. D. Evans: Because you fouled it up in the first place as a result of your own stupidity.

Mr OLD: It was not that at all. If the colleagues of the member for Warren, the union members, would get off their backsides and give us a little more productivity at the Meat Commission works perhaps they would be able to compete with the private works.

Mr H. D. Evans: Are you blaming the shambles at Midland Junction on productivity?

Mr OLD: These are the people that the member for Warren wants to bring in as partners on the Meat Commission; and that is the most stupid thing I have ever heard in my life.

The private works have had an advantage over the Meat Commission not only in respect of their ability to discount, but also because their employees work under different awards. The member for Warren knows that very well. The awards have been a contributing factor to the

problems of the Meat Commission. Unless the commission can compete on equal terms with private enterprise, it has very little chance of success. In an endeavour to give the commission a chance of success we have introduced this small amendment to the Abattoirs Act to enable the service works to discount where an operator gives an undertaking that he will provide a certain amount of livestock on a regular basis.

If the operator does not put up the livestock for slaughter he will still be subject to the fee for the amount of stock that he contracted to put up. To me that is good business, but obviously to the member for Warren it is humbug and deodorant.

Mr H. D. Evans: You have put up the fees by 20 per cent a year for the last five years.

Mr OLD: If the member for Swan were here he would tell us that we need deodorant at Midland Junction. He raised that matter regularly, until we got to the stage where we are now subsidising it to such an extent that the deodorant will have to work on everything coming out of the by-products.

Mr Davies: Say that again slowly.

Mr OLD: It will be recorded for the Leader of the Opposition to read in *Hansard*.

Mr Davies: I don't think it will make much sense.

Mr OLD: I was intrigued to hear the member for Warren's assessment of the experiment being carried out at Gepps Cross. He said it has been an overwhelming success. I would like to obtain a copy of the report he has read which leads him to believe it is an overwhelming success, because my information is quite the opposite.

I would like also to ascertain the position in respect of the SAMCOR operation. Two abattoirs are involved, one of which has been downgraded from its export standard to local kill. This allows it to work under conditions different from those under which the Western Australian Meat Commission export abattoirs must work. We have no intention of allowing either of those abattoirs to be downgraded—in fact, it would be irresponsible of the commission and the Government to allow it—because we have given an undertaking that adequate kill space will be available for the peak lamb kill which we recognise as being most important.

The comparison of killing fees is a bit of a red herring. The member for Warren knows as well as I know that the average killing fees are easily manipulated if one wishes to compare them with other fees. It is my firm belief that the killing fees at Midland Junction and Robb Jetty compare

favourably with those at Gepps Cross, despite the great reduction made at the latter works. The fees at Gepps Cross were so high as to be prohibitive, and that was part of their trouble.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is not so.

Mr OLD: The people at Gepps Cross also had an undertaking from the Meat Industry Employees' Union of South Australia that, in return for the drop in fees, productivity would be increased. No such undertaking has been given in Western Australia.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is no wonder considering the way you treat the union.

Mr OLD: I have not treated it at all.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is right.

Mr OLD: I have made it clear publicly that I am prepared to talk to the unions if they come to me with a proposition to increase their productivity. They have not bothered to take up the challenge. In fact, when they were asked to increase productivity, they said they would increase it provided they received an additional reward.

Mr H. D. Evans: Who would deal with someone who speaks like that?

Mr OLD: The member for Warren raised the matter of leasing of floors. Once again he introduced a red herring and spoke of control. We are used to this tactic.

Mr H. D. Evans: How about giving the information about the negotiations?

Mr OLD: We will not make public the negotiations of the Meat Commission until something is decided upon and a contract is drawn up. It would be stupid to do so, and if the member were a businessman of any sort he would know that. Obviously he is not a businessman. One does not run around showing one's hand until the arrangements have been made.

The honourable member also raised the matter of cold storage. He knows full well a tremendous surplus of cold store space exists in Western Australia at the moment. He also knows that operators are able to take advantage of the sale of their by-products to other organisations and to utilise cut-price cold storage capacity because of the surplus. These are problems with which the Meat Commission has been faced, and it is endeavouring to cope with them in a businesslike manner. It has been charged by the Government with endeavouring to keep losses down to a reasonable amount, and not to bring the industry into a profit situation.

We must realise these are service works and as such are difficult to run. No Government can

afford to subsidise service works to the extent we are being called upon to subsidise the two works in Western Australia at the moment. The Government has adopted a most responsible attitude in respect of keeping the Midland Junction works in operation for as long as it has. How long it will be able to continue to operate is another matter. However, we have surplus killing space and surplus cold storage capacity, and we also have a surplus in by-products capacity at Robb Jetty. It is an imposition upon the taxpayers of Western Australia to ask them to keep in operation two service works which are uneconomical. The commission is doing its very best to keep the Midland Junction works in operation and is currently negotiating with private operators.

Further negotiations will be carried out when this amendment is passed in an endeavour to have an amount of contract kill put up by operators at a discount price. This is something which will be of great benefit not only to the Meat Commission but also to the producers, generally.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

STOCK DISEASES (REGULATIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [10.42 p.m.]: There are times when even this Government introduces desirable legislation, and this is one of those occasions. I understand this amending legislation emanated from the identification by a senior officer of the department of a weakness in the stock diseases legislation which needed to be rectified as soon as possible.

At present, legislation exists to bring down regulations to control enzootic diseases, which are diseases already existing and known. As a matter

of fact, the Minister for Agriculture gave quite a list of those, as well as of exotic diseases.

While the existing legislation is satisfactory to a point, it does not provide for a situation where a new exotic disease is identified. The Governor may declare an emergency after which regulations can be imposed to attend to enzootic and exotic diseases. However, the situation must be described as an emergency.

It could well occur that some disease could be identified in its early stages, when it was not causing widespread sickness or death of stock, in which case under the existing legislation the Governor could not declare an emergency situation, giving time for the disease to become well established.

This situation could arise; we live in a shrinking world. There is nothing surer that ultimately, other exotic diseases will enter this country and the damage and devastation which are wrought will depend upon the preparedness of the Western Australian Department of Agriculture.

It seems to be desirable to amend the legislation and, accordingly, the Bill has the support of the Opposition.

MR OLD (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [10.45 p.m.]: I thank the member for Warren for his very accurate assessment of the Bill, and for his support. As he said, we have reached a situation where a weakness has been pointed out in the legislation and this amendment will make provision for the department to regulate for the restriction on the movement of stock within the State when it is desirable, and when either enzootic or exotic diseases are suspected, although they may not be clinically evident. I thank the member for Warren for his support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 10.49 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WATER SUPPLIES

Consumers: Residential

1882. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is the answer to part (2) of my question 1673 of Wednesday, 20th September, 1978, still correct, i.e., the estimated number of residential properties in the metropolitan area to which water will be supplied in 1978-79 is 288 000?
- (2) Is it a fact that the 288 000 residential properties will each pay an annual service fee of \$36 in 1978-79?
- (3) Is it a fact that 288 000 residential properties will gross the Metropolitan Water Board approximately \$10 368 000 in annual service fees in 1978-79?
- (4) If "No" to (2), what is the estimated number of residential properties to which water will be supplied in 1978-79 that will pay the annual service fee of \$36?
- (5) What is the estimated total consumption by residential properties in the metropolitan area in 1978-79 for which consumers will pay 17 cents per kilolitre

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes (but the figure referred to residential units).
- (2) No. Those additional units which are added during the year would pay portion only of the \$36 prescribed standard charge.
- (3) No. Refer to (2).
- (4) Approximately 276 000 existing for the full year will pay \$36.
- (5) A reliable forecast cannot be given.

WATER SUPPLIES

Revenue Lost and Allowance

1883. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is the answer given to part (2) (a) of my question 1534 of Thursday, 7th September, 1978 still correct, i.e., the Metropolitan Water Board would forgo approximately \$2.3 million if the annual allowance under the new pay-for-use water scheme was increased by 50 kl from 150 kl to 200 kl?

(2) If "No" to (1)—

- (a) why has the approximation changed;
- (b) what factors determined the change in the approximation realising that less than one month has expired since the figure was stated;
- (c) what is the correct approximation of the revenue the Metropolitan Water Board would forgo if the annual allowance was increased by 50 kl from 150 kl to 200 kl?

(3) If "Yes" to (1), is it a fact that the Metropolitan Water Board would forgo approximately \$2.76 million, based on the approximation that the Metropolitan Water Board would forgo \$2.3 million if the annual allowance was increased by 50 kl, if the annual allowance was increased by 60 kl from 150 kl to 210 kl?

(4) If "No" to (3), what is the approximate revenue the Metropolitan Water Board would forgo if the annual allowance was increased by 60 kl from 150 kl to 210 kl?

(5) If "Yes" to (3), is it a fact that the approximation reported in *The West Australian* of 4th October, 1978, where Government M.Ps were quoted as saying that if the annual allowance was increased by 60 kl to 210 kl the Metropolitan Water Board would forgo about \$1.9 million, is over \$800 000 less than the approximation of \$2.76 million given in answer to question (3)?

(6) What are the factors that determined the \$800 000 discrepancy in less than one month?

(7) Is it a fact that the total volume of water to be allocated by the Metropolitan Water Board to residential consumers in the metropolitan area in 1978-79 as an annual allowance is 43.2 million kilolitres?

(8) If "No" to (7):

- (a) what is the total volume of water to be allocated to residential consumers in 1978-79 as an annual allowance;
 - (b) what is the number of residences on which the answer to (a) is based?
- (9) How many residential properties in the metropolitan area in 1978-79 supplied with water by the Metropolitan Water Board were unmetered?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) No. 2 (a) of question 1534 referred to an increase of 25 kilolitres to 175 kilolitres.
- (2) (a) A more accurate estimate of unused allowances has been made.
- (b) Additional time allowed computer analysis to be completed.
- (c) \$1.5 million.
- (3) No.
- (4) \$1.9 million.
- (5) and (6) Not applicable.
- (7) No.
- (8) (a) Approximately 42.3 million kilolitres.
- (b) 288 000 residential units.
- (9) On 1st July, 1978 238 323 of the 241 274 domestic water services were metered (i.e. 98.8 per cent).

BRIDGE

Burswood Island

1884. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it still the Government's intention to construct a bridge in the vicinity of Burswood Island?

(2) If "Yes"—

- (a) when is it contemplated work will commence; and
- (b) what is the estimated current cost?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) No date has been set.
- (b) An estimate for the construction of the bridge and the supporting road system from the Hamilton interchange to Great Eastern Highway is \$37 million including the cost of land.

TRANSPORT: ROAD

Fuel

1885. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Were tenders called for the carting of fuel from Port Hedland to Telfer?

- (2) If "Yes"—
 (a) when were they called; and
 (b) who was the successful tenderer?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) No.

TRANSPORT: ROAD

Lime

1886. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many permits have been issued since 1st September, 1978 to cart lime from Swan Portland Cement to Telfer?
 (2) How many permits have been issued since 1st September, 1978 to cart general freight from Perth to Telfer?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) This information will take some time to collate.
 I will arrange to forward the data to the member as soon as it is available.

TRANSPORT: ROAD

Railway Sleepers

1887. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Are permits being issued for the carting of railway sleepers from the Goldfields region and other regions?
 (2) If "Yes" would he name the towns and who received the permit?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) This information will take some time to collate.
 I will arrange to forward the data to the member as soon as it is available.

TRANSPORT: ROAD

Frozen Goods: Checks

1888. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Are freezer trucks travelling to the north-west, viz. Mt. Newman, being checked for carting of freight against their permit issued?

- (2) If "Yes"—

- (a) How often are the checks carried out; and
 (b) what has been the result up to 1st October, 1978?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
 (2) (a) In conjunction with normal patrols.
 (b) To provide this information it would be necessary to underake a detailed examination of all interceptions. This is not considered practical. However, where goods are carried in contravention of the conditions of a licence, appropriate action is taken.

BRIDGE

Mandurah Traffic Bridge

1889. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

Would he advise the current situation of the construction of the new traffic bridge at Mandurah?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The alignment of the bridge has been determined and some foundation investigation carried out. Preliminary design work has commenced. There is no firm timetable for the actual construction.

I might mention that recently a number of changes were made, including adjustment of parking bays, to aid the movement of traffic through Mandurah. The improved traffic flow on the Queen's Birthday holiday suggests that these changes will alleviate the congestion that has been experienced in the past.

WATER SUPPLIES

Sprinklers

1890. Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) As there is confusion in Northam and district on the use of water sprinklers, would the Minister advise—
 (a) is it in order to use sprinklers on lawns and gardens; and

(b) is there set times sprinklers may be used?

(2) If "Yes" to (b) would the Minister indicate the permissible times?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

(1) (a) and (b) Yes.

(2) Sprinklers may be used between the hours of 6.00 to 7.00 a.m. and 6.00 to 9.00 p.m.

MEAT

Transport

1891. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Can fresh meat be packed in sacks when being transported by road to north of the 26th parallel?

(2) If "Yes" would he advise the correct method?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

WATER SUPPLIES

Country Area Scheme

1892. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Treasurer:

(1) What amount of finance for development of water supplies in country areas has been offered by the Commonwealth over the next five years?

(2) (a) Are there any conditions placed by the Commonwealth on the availability of this finance; and
(b) if so, what are the conditions?

(3) Has the Western Australian Government applied for any of this funding—

(a) if "Yes" how much;

(b) if "No" why not?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) The Commonwealth has made provision through the National Water Resources (Financial Assistance) Act of 1978 to assist all the States to fund water resources development over the next five years. Over that period a total of \$200 million is to be allocated.

However, no specific allocations have yet been made to Western Australia.

(2) (a) and (b)—

The allocations can be made by loan, or otherwise.

It is expected that they will be made for specific purposes.

The conditions are set out in the National Water Resources (Financial Assistance) Act.

(3) The State Government has applied for assistance for the following works in country areas—

\$

(a) the De Grey scheme for augmentation of the water supply of Port Hedland.....	3 506 000
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

(b) measures to reduce the salinity of water in the Wellington reservoir.....	4 750 000
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

(c) flood protection of the town of Carnarvon	4 850 000
-----------------------------------------------------	-----------

A submission to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in the development of a farmland reticulation scheme is in the course of preparation.

The Act was tabled (see paper No. 411)

EDUCATION: TEACHERS

Industrial Dispute: Punishment and Leave of Absence

1893. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Education:

(1) Will teachers who participate in strikes being called by the WA School Teachers' Union be required to fill in application forms for leave of absence?

(2) Will the fact that teachers have participated in such strikes be recorded against them and considered in their assessment and confirmation of teaching certificates?

(3) Precisely what penalties will be imposed on teachers who participate in strikes called by their union?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1) and (2) No.

(3) The only penalty associated with the present series of rolling strikes called by the Teachers' Union is the loss of one day's pay.

TIMBER

Nannup Mill

1894. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Forests:

- (1) At its present intake how many years of cutting is it expected will be available to the Nannup timber mill?
- (2) (a) Is it expected that the permissible intake of the Nannup mill will be reduced; and
 - (b) if so, by how much; and
 - (c) from when?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) On page 72 of part 1 of the Forests Department general working plan No. 86 of 1977 it is stated that the approved cut for each sawmill will remain confidential to the company concerned. This is so because release of details could affect the trading arrangements of the forest-based industries.

However, on present indications, there should be no concern as to the future of the Nannup mill for the remainder of this century.

HOSPITAL

Warren District

1895. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Health:

Will funds be made available for extensions to the Warren District Hospital in the 1978-79 financial year, and if so, how much and for what purposes?

Mr YOUNG replied:

No.

WATER SUPPLIES

Rates: Boyup Brook

1896. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Can he explain why the water rate assessment for the Boyup Brook hall increased from \$74 in 1977-78 to \$800 in 1978-79, the flax mill site increased from \$40 to \$198 in the same period and the council depot from \$16 to \$46, while 19 other assessments were charged a maximum of \$30 or less?

- (2) (a) Will the Boyup Brook Shire Council be accorded any reduction of these assessments; and
 - (b) if so, what amount?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) New valuations used for rating purposes under the Country Areas Water Supply Act for the 1978-79 year were adopted from 1st July, 1978. The previous valuations were adopted from 1st July, 1969. The effluxion of time between revaluations, and the effects of inflation over that period has accounted for the substantial increase in rates for the Boyup Brook Shire hall and offices, the council depot and flax mill site.

Domestic properties, however, are subject to a maximum rate which for 1978-79 has been prescribed at \$30 per assessment.

- (2) (a) A decision has been made that there will be a flat charge in lieu of water rates for offices, depots and similar premises used by all local authorities and not let or leased for commercial purposes. Houses will be charged as normal domestic rates premises, subject to the prescribed maximum rate.
- (b) The charges in lieu of water rates will be \$160 per year and will apply from the beginning of the 1978-79 rating year.

1897. This question was postponed.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Rents: Rebates

1898. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What number of tenants of the State Housing Commission were in receipt of a rebate on their rentals at 30th June, 1978?
- (2) (a) What was the weekly value of rebates approved at 30th June, 1978; and
 - (b) what was the total of rebate concessions granted in the year to 30th June, 1978?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) 10 832.
- (2) (a) \$150 392.
- (b) \$7 094 002.

HOSPITAL

Donnybrook

1899. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Health:

In view of the conditions that exist at the Donnybrook hospital, will he advise why the construction of a new hospital was not included in this year's estimates?

Mr YOUNG replied:

Of the \$38 828 000 budgeted expenditure of General Loan Funds for 1978-79 all but \$100 000 is required to complete or continue works already in progress. \$100 000 was budgeted to allow a commencement on the replacement hospital for Leonora, a project of much higher priority than Donnybrook.

RECREATION: COMMUNITY RECREATION COUNCIL OFFICER

Transfer from Albany to Fremantle

1900. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Recreation:

Further to question 1844 of 5th October, 1978:

- (1) Was the Albany based Community Recreation Council officer one of those who applied for the Fremantle position?
- (2) If so, why was it necessary to advertise the position when apparently a decision had already been made to transfer the Albany officer?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) It is a matter of practice that field staff within the Community Recreation Council are advised of all positions either newly created or resulting from vacancies. Appointments are then made to suit the needs and commitments of the council, and the seniority of the applicants, while considered, is not the ultimate criterion in the selection of the officer to fill a position.

RECREATION

Point Walter Camp

1901. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Recreation:

- (1) Has the State Government handed control of the recreation camp at Point Walter over to the Melville City Council?
- (2) If "Yes" on what date did the transfer occur and were any conditions imposed by the Government?
- (3) If conditions were imposed, what are the details?
- (4) If conditions were imposed, have they been agreed to by the Melville City Council?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
- (3) and (4) Negotiations have not yet been finalised.

EDUCATION

High School: Toodyay

1902. Mr HERZFELD, to the Minister representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) What is the purpose for which the sum of \$40 000 has been allocated in the General Loan Fund Estimates under item 13—Toodyay District High School?
- (2) When is the work scheduled to proceed?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) Change rooms and showers.
- (2) The calling of tenders is planned for early November, 1978.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

BP Refinery, Kwinana: Tradesmen and Retrenchments

1903. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

With respect to work presently being carried out installing plant to upgrade production capacity at BP Refinery, Kwinana:

- (1) What was the highest number of tradesmen employed on this work at any one time?

- (2) How many tradesmen are presently employed?
- (3) On what date is it anticipated that the bulk of the present workforce will be stood down?
- (4) Is he aware of any like projects which may possibly employ these tradesmen?
- (5) If "No" will the Government involve itself in attempting to look to the future of the tradesmen to be displaced?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) 375.
- (2) 275
- (3) Lay-offs have already begun and will continue until completion of the project towards the end of October.
- (4) and (5) Many of the tradesmen are employed by local subcontractors and will be engaged on other work arising out of their normal operations. Owing to the shortage of skilled tradesmen generally in the State it is envisaged that there will be little difficulty in placing the remaining tradesmen. Projects which are anticipated to provide substantial employment opportunities for both skilled and unskilled workers in the near future include Wagerup and Worsley alumina refineries, and the Yeelirrie pilot plant project.

TRANSPORT: AIR

Internal Fares

1904. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it a fact that international airlines were able to offer budget fares for departures and arrivals within Australia if they coincided with the criteria set for budget fares offered by domestic airlines?
- (2) Is it a fact that this procedure has ceased and only normal fares apply?
- (3) Is it a fact that this change means a person travelling from Perth to Melbourne and beyond now pays \$54 more for the economy rate?
- (4) Who made this decision and when?

- (5) Will he make representations to have the budget fare retained?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) From inquiries made through the Commonwealth Department of Transport, I have been advised that the use of budget fares within Australia on international services is not and, in fact, never has been permitted. This type of fare is only available on the services of Ansett Airlines of Australia and Trans Australian Airlines.
- (2) It was brought to the notice of the Commonwealth Department of Transport that an international carrier was offering a budget fare on its services from Perth to the eastern coast. As the tariff of charges filed by the carrier and approved by the Commonwealth Department of Transport does not permit utilisation of this fare type, the carrier was requested to withdraw the facility. The carrier has conformed with the department's request.
- (3) I understand the difference between the budget and the economy fare from Perth to Melbourne amounts to \$57.
- (4) The Commonwealth Department of Transport.
- (5) I have been informed that the Commonwealth Minister for Transport will shortly make a policy statement relating to the review of Australia's international civil aviation policy. When I have had the opportunity of studying this policy document, I will decide as to whether any further representations on the foregoing matters are considered necessary.

MINING

Companies: Government Loans or Guarantees

1905. Mr McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

- (1) How many mining companies have been assisted by the State Government by way of loan money or guarantee over the last three years?
- (2) Which companies have been assisted?
- (3) What are the amounts of money involved?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Ten.
- (2) (a) Western Selcast (Pty.) Ltd.
 (b) Mount Isa Mines Ltd.
 (c) North Kalgurli Mines Ltd.
 (d) Metals Exploration Ltd.
 (e) Freeport of Australia Inc.
 (f) Hill 50 Gold Mine No Liability.
 (g) Kalgoorlie Lake View Pty. Ltd.
 (h) Western Titanium Ltd.
 (i) R. T. and S. L. Parker.
 (j) South Alligator Uranium N.L.—for housing at Nepean nickel mine.
- (3) (a) \$6 000 000 (Guarantee).
 (b) \$4 000 000 (Guarantee).
 (c) \$500 000 (Loan).
 (d) and (e) \$1 000 000 (Loan).
 (f) \$300 000 (Grant/subsidy).
 (g) \$440 613 (Grant/subsidy).
 (h) \$1 000 000 (Guarantee).
 (i) \$8 000 (Loan).
 (j) \$1 020 000 (Guarantee).

COMPANIES

Manufacturing: Government Loans or Guarantees

1906. Mr McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

- (1) How many manufacturing companies have been assisted by the State Government by way of loan money or guarantee over the last three years?
 (2) Which companies have been assisted?
 (3) What are the amounts of money involved?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Answers as follows based on "manufacturing companies" only—

(1) 7.	
(2) See statement below.	
(3) 1975-76.....	\$ 1 660 000
1976-77.....	3 586 000
1977-78.....	2 718 000

Department of Industrial Development

Financial Assistance to Manufacturing Industry

Financial Years 1975-78

Name of Firm or Company	1975-76		1976-77		1977-78	
	Type of Assistance and Amount	Guarantee Loan	Type of Assistance and Amount	Guarantee Loan	Type of Assistance and Amount	Guarantee Loan
Agnew Clough Ltd.....	\$	1 570 000	\$		\$	
Albany Battery Manufacturing Co. Pty. Ltd.....		90 000				
Bunbury Foods Ltd.....					*2 618 000	
KBB Malting Co. Pty. Ltd.....			300 000			
Mitex International (Australasia) Pty. Ltd. (Receiver and Manager Appointed)			200 000		100 000	
Phillips Merredin			86 000			
Westralian Plywoods Pty. Ltd.....			3 000 000			
Total		1 660 000		3 586 000		2 718 000

*Funds not released.

EDUCATION

Country High School Hostels

1907. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many high school hostels are there in Western Australia?
- (2) Which of these is administered—
 - (a) by the Country High School Hostels Authority;
 - (b) independently?
- (3) What are the term fees charged by each hostel?
- (4) What subsidies are available from State Government sources to—
 - (a) parents of students attending hostels;
 - (b) the hostels themselves?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) (2) and (3) There are 17 high school hostels in Western Australia.

	Term
Country High School Hostels Authority	\$
Amity House, Albany	400
Priory Hostel, Albany	410
Bunbury Hostel	440
Carnarvon Hostel	370
Central Midlands Hostel	410
Esperance Hostel	390
Geraldton Boys' Hostel	430
Geraldton Girls' Hostel	430
Katanning Hostel	420
Merredin Hostel	410
Narrogin Hostel	375
Northam Boys' Hostel	405
Northam Girls' Hostel	390
Port Hedland Hostel	500
Independent	\$
Swanleigh Hostel	570
Morawa Hostel	370
Kalgoorlie Hostel	400

- (4) (a) \$150 per student.
- (b) Basic subsidy of \$3 per student per week applied to hostels other than Kalgoorlie and Morawa.

Esperance—\$4 per student per week.

Carnarvon—\$5 per student per week.

Port Hedland—\$6 per student per week.

In addition, the Government meets operating deficits of Country High Schools Hostels Authority hostels as necessary.

TRAFFIC

Tow Truck Operators

1908. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

Will he table in the House the following details of each traffic accident in the metropolitan area during 1978 from which damaged vehicles were removed by tow truck:

- (a) the location of the accident;
- (b) the name of the Road Traffic Authority officer(s) attending;
- (c) the name of the tow truck firm providing the tow truck(s) involved;
- (d) whether the tow truck firm was nominated by the crashed driver or by the Road Traffic Authority officer attending?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

I am advised that it is estimated some 9 000 vehicles could have been involved. The member should appreciate the considerable amount of research that would be required to provide the information in the form required, particularly in respect to (a) and (b). The member should be satisfied that the Commissioner of Police has instituted a full investigation into allegations of malpractice in this industry. In these circumstances it would seem proper to leave the investigation where it rightly belongs with the commissioner.

TRAFFIC

Tow Truck Operators

1909. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

In light of recent development in inquiries into the tow truck industry, will he reconsider his decision not to table the report produced by the Road Traffic Authority as a report of the complaint made by Mr P. R. J. Shurd?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

No.

FISHERIES

Boat Facility in Geographe Bay

1910. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) What studies have been made to locate a suitable site for a fishing boat facility in Geographe Bay?
- (2) When did studies commence and are they complete?
- (3) Will he advise the sites that have been under consideration?
- (4) What has been the cost of investigations to date?
- (5) (a) Has any priority been given to the need of a fishing boat facility in Geographe Bay; and
(b) if so, can he indicate?

Mrs Craig (for Mr O'CONNOR) replied:

- (1) Hydrographic and proving surveys have been carried out in Geographe Bay.
- (2) Studies have progressed intermittently over the past 15 years and are not yet completed.
- (3) Sites have been considered at Eagle Bay, Pt. Picquet, Curtis Bay, Siesta Park, Bass diversion drain, near Busselton Jetty, East Busselton most eastern groyne and Wanerup Estuary.
- (4) This information is not readily available.
- (5) (a) Some priority has been given to the need for a fishing boat facility at Geographe Bay.
(b) It has been included in the early part of a 10-year programme for fishing industry facility requirements and is at present scheduled for 1980-81, subject to the availability of funds and the overall State requirements for fishing industry facilities.

TRANSPORT

Charter and Tourist Bus Services

1911. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many operators have been granted licences to either operate—
(a) charter bus services; and/or
(b) tourist operators licence, during 1977-78 year?
- (2) (a) How many operators re (1) have been granted permit to charter tourist buses from intra and interstate; and
(b) who are the operators concerned?
- (3) (a) How many buses have been involved; and
(b) for what period?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (3) This information will take some time to collate.
I will arrange to forward the data to the member as soon as it is available.

HOUSING: RENTAL

Rents: Collection

1912. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it a fact that the State Housing Commission has contracted some of its rent collecting work out to private agencies?
- (2) (a) If "Yes" when was this new arrangement instituted;
(b) who are the private agents involved; and
(c) what are the terms on which they have been engaged?
- (3) Are tenants with queries about rent increases being referred to these private agencies?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) to (3) No.

ABORIGINES: HOUSING

WAIT Aid Report

1913. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Has a report on Aboriginal housing been prepared for the Community Welfare Department by WAIT Aid?
- (2) If "Yes" when does he expect to be in a position to announce action arising from the recommendations of the report?

- (3) (a) Is the report to be released to the public;
(b) if not, why not?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) No action will be taken on the recommendations of the report.
(3) (a) No.
(b) The decision not to publish was based on concerns relating to the methodology used in the research and the consequent validity of conclusions drawn by the consultants.
These concerns were conveyed to the consultants on the 28th February, 1978.

CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

South African Government's Policy

1914. Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Now that he has shown an active interest in the matter of human rights is it his intention to give support to the efforts of the Uniting Church in Australia in its efforts to encourage the South African Government to adhere to the principles contained in the international covenant of civil and political rights?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The implication in the first part of the member's question that any interest I have in human rights is of recent origin, is rejected completely, and it does the member no credit to make the comment he has.

So far as the rest of his question is concerned, I have no current plans to become directly involved in any representations in conjunction with the Uniting Church of Australia.

In any case, I hope the member is correct when he refers to "the Uniting Church in Australia in its efforts to encourage the South African Government to adhere to the principles contained in the International Covenant of Civil and political rights", because some of my complaints to church leaders who have discussed the subject with me are—

They show little appreciation of the practical problems in South Africa. They have not been prepared to express encouragement through public appreciation of the progress the political leaders in South Africa have made in the face of very difficult situations in moving towards a desirable result—even though it would be appropriate at the same time to, remind South African leaders that much more has yet to be achieved.

The continual criticism and condemnation of South African leaders—without an acknowledgment of progress made—eventually becomes self-defeating.

The member will also know of the current controversy within the World Council of Churches about the use of some of the funds which have been paid to terrorist organisations. This does not help the work of any of the churches within the World Council of Churches when they desire to be critical of a country like South Africa.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HEALTH: HERBICIDE 2,4,5-T

Reports

1. Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he recall an undertaking given by his predecessor that endeavours would be made to obtain the reports of investigations made in Victoria and in Queensland into the use of 2,4,5-T?
(2) Can he tell the House what endeavours have been made by him or his predecessor to obtain these reports?
(3) If they have been obtained, will he make them available to me?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) to (3) When the member for Maylands was not present in the Chamber the other day I answered his question and tabled the report of the Victorian finding. I also read some copious notes from it.

MINING: IRON ORE

Marketing System

2. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

In the light of the very great significance of the iron ore industry to this State's welfare and destiny, does the Parliamentary NCP, as a coalition partner in this State, support the Federal Government's ultimatum through Mr Anthony that Australia's five main iron ore producers have one month in which to devise a co-ordinated marketing approach or run the risk of being put into a centralised marketing system?

Mr OLD replied:

I suggest the Deputy Leader of the Opposition place his question on the notice paper.

FUEL

Shell Service Stations: Rent Increase

3. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) What is the Government's policy with respect to the service station rent hike by the Shell company?
- (2) Will he join with the WA Automobile Chamber of Commerce in asking this enormously wealthy company to agree to a moratorium on the exorbitant rent increases which are as high as 150 per cent?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) I will discuss the matter with the Minister for Labour and Industry who is more directly involved in this matter. My own understanding is that it is an entirely commercial matter between two parties and that it would not normally be a matter for Government intervention.

TRANSPORT

Studman Report

4. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

Would the Minister advise whether he has had an opportunity to peruse the Studman report and when will the report be made available to Parliament and to the public?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

A report in relation to transport of goods from south of the 26th parallel of latitude to the north thereof has been prepared by an officer of the Transport Commission to the Commissioner of

Transport. I am now considering this report.

STATE FINANCE

Interest on Short-term Investments

5. Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

- (1) In each of the years ended the 30th June, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978—
 - (a) how much interest was earned on short-term investment of Treasury cash;
 - (b) how much of that interest was used—
 - (i) for capital purposes;
 - (ii) for revenue purposes;
 - (iii) for finance deficits?

- (2) How much interest on short-term investment of Treasury cash had not been spent as at the 30th June, 1978?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The honourable member can obtain the information requested from the reports of the Auditor General for the relevant years.
- (2) \$33 430 121.

Of the total it is proposed to use—

\$13.9 million to supplement Consolidated Revenue Fund (See Budget speech, page 10)

\$10 million to supplement General Loan Fund (See Loan Estimates speech, page 4.)

TRAFFIC

Tow Truck Operators

6. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

Further to my question 1908 in which I sought certain statistical information about accidents in the metropolitan area and in reply to which the Minister told me I should appreciate that a considerable amount of research would be required to provide the information in the form requested, can I assume the information is not being compiled by or for officers undertaking the investigation mentioned?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Yes.

MEAT*Transport*

7. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Health:

I apologise for not providing the Minister with notice of my question, but it arises from the answer he gave to question 1891. As fresh meat transported as far as the 26th parallel cannot be handled in sacks—as I have been advised most consignments north of the 26th parallel are transported in sacks—will the Minister take it upon himself to have his officers check that future transport of meat as far as the 26th parallel is packaged in such a way that it will not create a hazard to public health?

Mr YOUNG replied:

I will do so.

MINING: IRON ORE*Marketing System*

8. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

My question relates to the same subject as my previous question without notice.

I ask the Premier, in respect of his outburst aimed at the Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the National Country Party, as Minister for National

Development, who is advocating the need for a centralised marketing system for iron ore, when the Premier has explained his position has he done so as a matter of his own personal view or has he consulted with his coalition partners in Western Australia? Has he expressed the view of the coalition Government, or the view of the Premier?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, my attack has been on the Commonwealth Government and not on any particular Minister, because I am assuming that the Minister concerned is expressing the views of his Government at the time. So, I have been outspoken in my criticism of the enunciated policy—or what has been purported to be the policy; in other words, what was reported by the media.

Also, I would like to make it clear my protests have been to the Prime Minister, which is right and proper in the circumstances. A Premier should normally make any representations through the Prime Minister.

I also want to say that in making my views known I am making known the views of the Western Australian Government, and not the personal views of the Premier as an individual.