

why I was not fully aware of the position when I am chairman of the trust. However, I am chairman of many organisations but I am not able to attend all meetings. I attended a meeting this morning and did not know anything about this problem. However, I have been made aware of it since, for obvious reasons.

That is the situation as I know it. The people on the trust would be most upset—tremendously upset—to think anyone should imagine they would do anything like this with malice or lack of forethought, or lack of ethical behaviour. Nothing would be further from their minds.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: It certainly appears as though they have.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Not when they met and found that they had two offers.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Wait a minute; we are going back to 1974.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In 1974 the York Shire Council was asked if it knew of any person or of any group in the shire which was interested. Before any offer and acceptance had been completed an individual offered \$14 950 and the shire happened to offer the same sum at the same time. That is the situation; I am not judge and jury and I do not have to sit in judgment.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I expect you to be like King Solomon.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Actually, I will re-examine the matter tomorrow.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Thank you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The matter has now been drawn to my attention. I would have preferred it to be drawn to my attention as a matter in which there had been an unfortunate result, perhaps. However, let me assure members that whatever the appearance may be I do not agree with the interjection by Mr Clive Griffiths.

Whatever the appearance may be of the situation there is no person on the trust who would for one moment behave in an unethical manner if he thought he was so doing; not one person—not by any stretch of the imagination. Those people on the trust have made a decision based on their belief of what they ought to do to protect the trust which is placed in them to administer the lands and the moneys which are the responsibility of the Education Endowment Trust. If the honourable member will accept my assurance that I will have a very careful look at the matter tomorrow, I will do so.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 19th May, 1976

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

QUESTIONS (39): ON NOTICE

1. STATE FORESTS

Logs: Concession Rights

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What individuals or firms in Western Australia hold concessional rights for the procuring of hardwood saw logs over particular areas, and what area does each hold?
- (2) What is the permissible intake of logs per annum from each area?
- (3) What timber mills operate without a concessional area?
- (4) Would he list the mills referred to in (3) and indicate the source of the logs on which each operates?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) and (2) None. The procurement of hardwood saw logs is now carried out under either permits or licences.

Information on areas and permissible intakes of permits is obtainable from the Forests Department in accordance with regulation No. 130 of the Forests Act.

- (3) All mills. See answer to (1).
- (4) The list which is voluminous is being compiled and will be conveyed to the member personally.

2. RAILWAYS

East Perth Terminal: Faulty Plaster

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has faulty plaster been used on the Westrail terminal in East Perth?
- (2) If "Yes" what area of walls is involved?
- (3) What right of action, if any, has Westrail got and what action, if any, has been taken and is intended to be taken by Westrail and against whom for the loss which it has suffered as a result of the supply of faulty plaster?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 1 100 square metres.
- (3) The contractors will make good all defective plaster at no cost to Westrail.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

Invoking of Sections 54, 55, 56 and 59

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Upon what occasions have the following sections of the Environmental Protection Act been invoked, utilised or put into effect—
54 (1), 54 (2), 54 (3), 55 (1), 55 (2), 55 (3), 56 (1), 56 (2), 56 (3), 59?
- (2) What are the details of each such action?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) 55(1), 55(2) and 59 are the only sections of the Environmental Protection Authority Act which have been invoked and this has been on numerous occasions. Provision of details of each such action would require extensive and time consuming searching of many departmental files.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION *Blackwood River*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Has the Environmental Protection Authority or the Department become involved in any way with a proposal by the Nannup Shire Council to effect changes to the Blackwood River ostensibly to make the passage easier for canoeists?
- (2) If so, what has been the attitude of the Authority to this proposal?
- (3) Has such action been carried out by the Nannup Shire Council or by any other body?
- (4) If the answer to (1) is "No" will he make enquiries so as to discover the present position?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) This matter has not been referred to the Environmental Protection Authority. However, the Department of Conservation and Environment has advised the Department of Tourism of the importance of logs and snags as riverine fauna habitat, and as a buffer to the erosion of river banks and that any desnagging should take cognizance of this.
- (3) and (4) Not to my knowledge but I will have further inquiries made.

5. WATER SUPPLIES

Damming of Murray River

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Is it intended that a dam should be built on the Murray River within the foreseeable future?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

The answer to this question depends on what the member understands the "foreseeable future" to be. Undoubtedly at some time the Murray River will need to be harnessed to meet the growing demand for water. At the present time some preliminary studies on the environmental aspect of such a proposal are being undertaken.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION *Canning River: Water Quality*

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Have any studies been made as to the enrichment of the Canning River by nitrates or phosphates?
- (2) If so, what are the details?
- (3) Have there been any other studies of the Canning River water as to its quality?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) Seven sites as far upstream as Brookton Road bridge are monitored by the Swan River Conservation Board in association with the Government Chemical Laboratories, for ammonia plus albuminoid nitrogen and total phosphorus. Monitoring is on a three monthly interval and is still continuing.

A site just upstream of Canning Bridge was monitored by the Swan River Conservation Board at monthly intervals during 1974-75 at various depths for nitrogen fractions and total phosphorus.

In 1975 the Town of Canning engaged a consultant to carry out a study of the effects of the mosquito eradication proposals in the river flats of the Canning River in the area between Riverton Bridge and Kent Street weir.

The study included limited investigations into nitrate and phosphate levels in groundwater samples. The study report is still being considered by the Town of Canning.

Canning Dam is intermittently monitored by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board for nitrogen fractions and total phosphorus and this has been undertaken over the past ten years and is continuing.

A site on the lower Canning River, near Araluen, is monitored by the MWSSD Board at monthly intervals for nitrogen fractions and total phosphorus which is also continuing.

- (3) Yes. All the above-mentioned studies have included the measurement of other important pertinent water quality parameters.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Committee for the Understanding of the Environment

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Is the Committee for the Understanding of the Environment still in existence?
- (2) If so, who are its current members?
- (3) Has it always been entirely voluntary or has an honorarium or salary been paid?
- (4) If so, what are the details?
- (5) On what occasions has it met over the past 12 months, what was the duration of the meetings, and who attended each meeting?
- (6) What publications have been issued or other activities undertaken by the CUE during the past 12 months?
- (7) What funds have been set aside for its use for each of the years since its inception?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Mr B. E. K. Ward (Chairman), Miss V. M. Knowles, Mr K. A. Flanagan (Secretary).
- (3) and (4) Meeting fees only have always been paid to the chairman and members, but not to the secretary. At present rates the fee is \$30 per formal meeting.
- (5) Formal meetings in July and December, 1975, and May, 1976. In addition members have been consulted on an informal basis as and when required.
- (6) The committee's activities include a number of ongoing responsibilities such as the maintenance of a public environmental reading room, a travelling school book display and a lending library of CUE films. Specific activities over the past 12 months, including some carried out in conjunction with other organisations, include production of school posters, an environmental documentary film and three audio-visual slide presentations; organisation of the Sir Thomas Wardle Conservation Prize for school children and the

display of entries; mounting of displays for World Environment Day 1975 and co-ordination of activities; development of a conservation display centre at Claremont; talks to schools and other groups.

- (7) No funds have been set aside specifically for the use of the committee. Projects undertaken have been financed by the Department of Conservation and Environment.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Chittering Lake Reserve

Mr A. R. TONKIN, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Was the temporary damming of the Chittering Lake a success this year?
- (2) Will the damming become permanent?
- (3) If so, how will it be used to control flooding after heavy rain?
- (4) What steps is the department taking to dredge the lake of deposited silt to encourage a washout when the new season's rains start?
- (5) What is the department doing to prevent shooting on the reserve?
- (6) What is the status, vesting and area of the reserve and when was it created?
- (7) Was the burning of some sections of the lake area at Easter authorised by any department?
- (8) If not, what action is his department taking to prevent the burning of the verge?
- (9) What plan does the department have for making the lake a more attractive reserve with access for conservationists and tourists?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) For the past three years the Public Works Department, on behalf of the Western Australian Wildlife Authority, has been carrying out experimental work aimed at improving the conservational value of the Chittering Lake nature reserve. The results to date have been encouraging and experimental research is continuing.
- (2) It is too early to say.
- (3) and (4) Not yet determined.
- (5) The district wildlife officer includes this area in normal patrols. There are also honorary wildlife officers who report on it from time to time.
- (6) Chittering Lake is included in Reserve 29538 set aside for the "Conservation of Flora" in the *Government Gazette* of 13th December, 1968. The reserve was

vested in the Western Australian Wildlife Authority in an order signed on 7th July, 1971.

(7) No.

(8) Inquiries are being made to ascertain the persons responsible and under what authority they acted.

(9) None at present. Nature reserves are not normally developed for people use, but the public has the right of access by foot into any part of the reserve at the present time.

9. GOLDMINING

Kalgoorlie State Battery

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has his department received complaints in recent years regarding a dust problem emanating from the State Battery in Kalgoorlie?

(2) If "Yes" what action will be taken to rectify the situation?

(3) If "No" is he satisfied that adequate control measures are being adopted re dust emission?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) Relatively few.

(2) Endeavouring to keep people off the dumps to prevent the surface crust from being broken and thus encourage the growth of natural vegetation.

(3) Not applicable.

10. KALGOORLIE REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Improvements: Recommendation

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Has the Minister yet received a recommendation from the Hospitals Development Programme Committee concerning the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital?

(2) If so, can he please advise when a decision will be made?

(3) If the answer to (1) is "No" when does the Minister expect the recommendation?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) and (2) No.

(3) This depends upon investigations being carried out by the committee. A recommendation could not be expected for several weeks, and the member will be advised when further information is available.

11. RAILWAY STATIONS

Concrete Bricks for Construction

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

With reference to his answer to part (2) of question 16 on 6th May, 1976, and referring to the quality and durability of building bricks, would he please inquire and advise whether Australian National Railways (Commonwealth Railways) have seen fit to use concrete bricks in the construction of station buildings (beside heavy haulage railway lines) erected by that body on both the Trans and Alice Springs lines in recent years?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Westrail has no information available concerning the use of concrete bricks by Australian National Railways. However, neither the strength nor quality of concrete bricks has been questioned.

The requirement for bricks for the Kalgoorlie station platform was one of aesthetics and the necessity to be architecturally sympathetic with materials used in the existing old building and future landscaping proposals.

12. KALGOORLIE RAILWAY PLATFORM

Bricks for Upgrading

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) With reference to his answer to question 16 of 6th May, 1976—

(a) how does he reconcile his answer "Yes" to part (1) of that question that prior consideration was given by Westrail to the use of concrete bricks produced at Boulder, with the fact that at no time prior to 6th May 1976, was the local producing company approached by Westrail with a view to the possible supply of bricks for the platform project; and

(b) that during the afternoon of 6th May last the secretary of the company was contacted by an officer of Westrail's district engineer's office at Kalgoorlie inquiring as to what type of bricks were produced by the company?

(2) On what date or dates did the bricks ordered by Westrail from the metropolitan area to be used on the platform project land in Kalgoorlie?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The information will be forwarded to the member as soon as possible. The officer concerned is in the country and cannot be contacted today.

13. POLICE

Laverton Royal Commission: Action

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Premier:

- (1) What action has his Government initiated following receipt of the Laverton Royal Commission report?
- (2) If no action has been taken, what steps are being considered?

Mr O'Neil (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

As previously announced, both the Minister for Community Welfare and the Minister for Police have been instructed by Cabinet to make a thorough study of the report, and to make recommendations as to action which should be taken in addition to action already taken following the Sydall report, and the Laverton Joint Study report.

As part of this study, the Commissioner of Police, as is proper in the circumstances, has instituted enquiries into alleged offences committed by police officers at Skull Creek.

The Government expects a report from the two Ministers at an early date.

14. POLICE

Laverton Royal Commission: Discussion on Findings

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

Will he advise what decisions were arrived at following discussions between himself and the Commissioner of Police in Perth last week, in connection with the Skull Creek incidents?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

It was agreed that the Commissioner of Police should commence an inquiry into the possible charges against police officers named in the report of the Laverton Royal Commission.

15. DECENTRALISATION

Geraldton Region: Election Promises

Mr CARR, to the Premier:

With regard to his election promise in March, 1974, to decentralise and regionalise State Government decision making—

- (1) When does he propose to implement this promise as far as the Geraldton region is concerned?
- (2) Will he explain how his proposals for regional decision making will operate in the Geraldton region?

Mr O'Neil (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

The intention, as promised, is to establish all the proposed regional offices before next March.

The proposals will operate in accordance with the policy that I announced in March, 1974.

A copy can be made available to the member if he so wishes.

16. MOTOR VEHICLE LICENCES

Pensioners: Income Eligibility

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) Is the State basic wage of \$48.50 per week still the income factor used as a basis for deciding whether an invalid pensioner is entitled to a reduced or half rate motor vehicle licence?
- (2) If so, and in view of the current pension rate which would automatically exclude a married couple, is not this figure unrealistic?
- (3) Will he give consideration to raising the figure to at least the minimum adult male wage of \$82.50 per week?
- (4) If so, when can a decision be expected?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) There have been considerable increases in social service benefits since the base figure was established and therefore it is considered that the figure is not unrealistic.
- (3) and (4) Variation of the formula was recently considered, but it was decided that this should not be varied.

17. FOCAL UNIVERSAL ACTIVITIES

Nature

Mr DAVIES to the Premier:

- (1) Did he see a report in the *Sunday Independent* of 15th May, 1976, page 3, where an executive of Focal Universal claimed that he "and members of the State Government were fully aware of Focal's activities"?
- (2) Is this correct as far as he is concerned?
- (3) If so, can he advise the nature of Focal's activities as he knows them and whether there is any concern regarding same?

Mr O'Neil (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

- (1) to (3) No.

18. FOCAL UNIVERSAL ACTIVITIES

Investigation

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the Minister correctly reported in the *Sunday Independent* of 16th May, 1976, as saying the Public Health Department was investigating the activities of Focal Universal?
- (2) If so, what prompted the investigations?
- (3) Who are making inquiries?
- (4) When is it expected these will be completed?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) to (4) No.

19. HAIRDRESSERS

Registration: Alteration

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Did he read the Press statement made by the president of the Master Hairdressers Association on page 16 of *The West Australian* of Friday, 14th May?
- (2) Does he agree with the article?
- (3) (a) Does he intend to make any alterations to the system of qualifications and registration of ladies and gents hairdressers;
(b) if "Yes" what alteration?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I do not agree with all of the statements made in the article.
- (3) (a) and (b) Discussions have been held with representatives from the hairdressing industry. The

Hairdressers Registration Act is currently being examined with a view to possible amendment but no final decision has been reached at this stage.

20. MANDURAH SCHOOL

Improvements

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it the Government's intention to continue with their proposal to carry out improvements at the Mundaring Primary School even though there is determined opposition to the using of funds in this way by the Mundaring community?
- (2) Have tenders been called for the proposed improvements?
- (3) Has a contract yet been let?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) The matter has not been finalised.
- (2) and (3) No.

21. SWAN VIEW HIGH SCHOOL

Tenders for Construction

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Minister recall answering my question 13 of 30th March, this year, just six weeks ago, in regard to the calling of tenders and construction of Swan View High School?
- (2) Does the Minister realise that in the period of only seven weeks calling of tenders for the school has already fallen behind schedule?
- (3) (a) Does the Minister still claim that construction of the school will commence early in June;
(b) if not when does he anticipate construction will commence?
- (4) Does the Minister believe the school building will be ready to accept students on the first school day in 1977?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) to (4) Tenders were called on 24th April and will close on 1st June. Construction should start shortly after this date and the building is scheduled for opening on 7th February, 1977.

22. **TOWN PLANNING**
Swan Valley: Study

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Has the Town Planning Department undertaken a study of the Swan Valley?
- (2) If "Yes" when was the study undertaken and has it been completed?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The study was commenced in 1975 and is nearing completion.

23. **LEEDERVILLE TECHNICAL COLLEGE**
Accommodation

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the existing staff accommodation in the architectural and building studies department of the Leederville Technical College is totally inadequate to meet the recommended floor area requirements and that the 29 staff members are expected to cram themselves into a floor area of 113 m square when the normal area required is at least 239 m square?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the Furniture Trades and Interior Design staff at the Leederville Technical College are at present inadequately accommodated and that use must be made of temporary buildings some of which are on school ground which is required for demonstration and practical purposes for the building trade apprentices?
- (3) Is the Minister aware that the carpentry and joinery trades department require new classrooms to replace the inadequate and temporary pavilion built in 1972 by pre-apprentice carpenters and joiners.
- (4) If the Minister is aware of these very serious accommodation problems, could he inform the House as to what steps are being taken to make adequate accommodation available?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The furniture and design staff are accommodated in a well designed adequately furnished temporary building which was constructed as a training project for building trade apprentices. Site space for practical training for apprentices has not been seriously affected.

(3) Yes.

- (4) Accommodation can only be provided when finance becomes available for the purpose.

24. **TAXI PLATES**
Sale

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many taxi owners have made their plates available for purchase in the last four months?
- (2) What cost has been incurred to operate the Taxi Control board during—
 - (a) 1974-75; and
 - (b) 1975-76 financial years?
- (3) (a) Were taxi drivers given prior notice of the Taxi-cars (Coordination and Control) Act Amendment Bill at present before the House;
 - (b) if so, when and in what form?
- (4) (a) Did the board receive opposition to the proposed amendments;
 - (b) if so, from whom?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Transfers of taxi car licences approved by the board from 1st January, 1976, to 30th April, 1976, number 45.
- (2) (a) 1974-75, \$118 472;
 - (b) 1975-76, \$127 625 estimated.
- (3) (a) and (b) Not known. On 12th January, 1976, the board at which the three industry members were present resolved to seek the introduction of the present amendments before the House. There exists a joint responsibility between operators in the taxi industry and the three industry members of the board in keeping each other informed of any problems within the industry and any board decisions.
- (4) (a) and (b) At the time the above decision was made I had no knowledge of any opposition to the proposed amendments.

25. **TRANSPORT**
Bunbury Airport: Upgrading

Mr McIVER, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Premier or Minister for Transport promised the Member for Bunbury that the State Government would contribute \$20 000 to the upgrading of the Bunbury airport?
- (2) If "Yes" on what date did the Premier or the Minister for Transport first make this promise?

- (3) Is this promise to be honoured?
- (4) If not, why not?
- (5) If the promise is to be honoured, when will the funds be allocated and from what source?
- (6) If the promise is to be honoured, when will work commence?
- (7) Has the Premier seen press statements by the Member for Bunbury that the Bunbury Town Council was at fault in this matter and would he comment on the Member's statements?

Mr O'Neill (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

- (1) to (6) No.
- (7) No.

26. DAIRYING

Production Control

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has any organisation or body suggested firm proposals for production control within the dairy industry, and, if so, what body?
- (2) If "Yes"—
 - (a) at what level of production is it suggested milk and butter be fixed in each State in Australia;
 - (b) would the allocation of further market milk quotas in June be effected if such proposals were implemented?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) No firm proposals have been discussed at a meeting involving the Commonwealth and the States.
- (2) Not applicable.

27. DAIRYING

Milk Quotas: Additional Issue

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) When is it expected that further market milk quotas will be issued to Western Australian producers?
- (2) Will one of the criteria of eligibility to receive a market milk quota be that a producer must have a farm with an area of not less than 100 hectares?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) The allocation of new market milk quotas is to be considered by the Authority at a meeting scheduled to be held during June, 1976.
- (2) Area of land is only one of a number of bases or principles on which the Authority determines applications for market milk quotas.

28. HEALTH EDUCATION COUNCIL

Appointments

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have all appointments been made to the Health Education Council following legislative amendments last year?
- (2) If not, what vacancies still exist and what is the cause of the delay?
- (3) Can the Minister supply a copy of the membership of the Health Education Council as presently constituted please?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Awaiting Trades and Labor Council nomination.
- (3) Member; Deputy Member; Nominator.
 Dr J. C. McNulty; Dr L. J. Holman; ex officio.
 Mr H. Loudon; nil; ex officio.
 Mr D. Coates; nil; ex officio.
 Dr J. Woolcott; nil; ex officio.
 Mrs P. Giles; nil; W.A. Council of State Schools.
 Mrs C. Martin; Miss S. Halsey; Perth Newspapers.
 Mr H. Strickland; Mr F. O'Mahony; Local Government Association.
 Prof W. McDonald; Dr M. Hobbs; University of Western Australia.
 Mr J. Deacon; Miss K. Baird; Australian Red Cross.
 Mr W. Lucas; nil; Minister for Health.

29.

HEALTH

Detoxification Unit

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) What progress has been made regarding establishment of a detoxification unit in this State?
- (2) What is the cost involved and from what sources have they been met?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority has recently acquired a property in Collin Street, West Perth, as a primary recovery centre and which is currently in process of being commissioned. More intensive detoxification is currently being and will continue to be carried out by the teaching hospitals.

- (2) Purchase price—\$220 000. Commissioning and renovations estimated at \$100 000. The whole of the cost will be met from the State's General Loan Fund.

30. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES *Shift Penalty Allowances*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) What was the decision of the Government on 14th August, 1972 in respect of allowances for shift penalties for Government employees whilst absent on workers' compensation?
- (2) Has this decision been varied?
- (3) If so, by whom, and on what dates and for what reasons?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) That allowance for shift penalties be made in the "make-up" pay of shift workers employed by the Government when absent on workers' compensation.
- (2) and (3) The provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Act No. 76 of 1975 operative from 11th November, 1975, which specifically excludes payment of shift penalties to workers on workers' compensation, has been applied to Government workers since that date.

31. *This question was postponed.*

32. RETRAINING AND RELOCATION OF WORKERS SCHEMES *Lists*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Did not my question 1 of Thursday, 6th May, 1976 specifically request the retraining schemes initiated by him and introduced since 7th April, 1974?
- (2) Does he still maintain that the answer to part (1) of my question is still correct?
- (3) How many displaced workers were assisted by relocation schemes initiated by him at Kalgoorlie and Mt. Magnet as claimed in answer to part (2) of question 1 on 6th May, 1976?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) Retraining courses referred to commenced through circumstances in industry which required the quick training of tradesmen in certain categories. Negotiations between industry, unions of employers and workers, technical education, Commonwealth Government and State Government occurred in 1973 and

the first course was conducted early in 1974. The courses specified in my answer of 6th May, 1976, were conducted since 7th April, 1974.

- (3) Some 500 workers at the Kalgoorlie gold mines and of those some 200 moved into nickel mining, the remainder with the exception of about 50, left the area and these were also assisted by the Commonwealth Employment Services to be placed in employment. At Mt. Magnet 40 notices of dismissal were issued and 20 of these workers required assistance to find other employment.

33. TRADE PRACTICES COMMITTEE *Submission*

Mr HARMAN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Further to my question 3 on Thursday, 6th May, 1976, can he advise whether a submission has been made to the Trade Practices Committee established by the Australian Government?
- (2) (a) If so, will he table the submission;
(b) if not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) and (b) One of the terms on which submissions were sought by the Trade Practices Review Committee was that they would be treated on a basis confidential to the Committee. In these circumstances it would not be appropriate for the submission to be tabled at this stage.

34. WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL *Clause 13(e) (iii): Purpose*

Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In respect of clause 13 (e) (iii) on page 9 of the Bill for an Act to amend the Western Australian Tertiary Education Commission Act, 1970-72—

- (a) is it the intention of the Government to introduce fees for classes or courses, examinations or academic awards conferred at either of the universities or WAIT or at any of the colleges of advanced education;
- (b) if not, will the Minister indicate the purpose of this clause?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (a) There are no plans to re-introduce fees in tertiary education institutions.
- (b) Advice to governing authorities of tertiary education institutions concerning fee matters is a retention of an existing function of the Tertiary Education Commission. The Government was advised to retain this function for the new Commission so that in the unlikely event of changes in national policies on fees, then further amendments to the Act to restore the function would be unnecessary.

35. NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Needs Basis Assistance

Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

- (1) What State Government assistance is given to non-Government schools on a "needs basis"?
- (2) What criteria are applied in the determination of "needs"?
- (3) Who determines the needs of particular non-Government schools?

Mr O'Neil (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

- (1) to (3) State Government assistance to non-Government schools is determined on a per capita basis.

For children attending these schools, various forms of assistance are available on a "needs" basis.

36. MENTAL HEALTH

Ross Memorial Hospital: Acquisition

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the purchase of Ross Memorial Hospital been finalised?
- (2) If so, what was the cost and how was it made up, i.e., building, fittings, goodwill, etc.?
- (3) What alterations are proposed?
- (4) What is the estimated cost of such alterations?
- (5) What new fittings, equipment, etc., will be required?
- (6) What is the estimated cost of such equipment?
- (7) (a) Will the Australian Government meet any of the costs involved in the project as a whole; and
(b) if so, how much?
- (8) How many patients will be accommodated at the hospital?

- (9) Will they all be profoundly retarded?
- (10) What staff, if any, has been recruited for the hospital?
- (11) Will the hospital retain the same name?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) \$260 000, made up of—
Land and buildings, \$204 400;
Plant and equipment, \$22 600;
Goodwill, \$33 000.
- (3) Modifications include alterations to bathrooms and the installation of high level baths. Some floor coverings are to be replaced and it is necessary to provide oil space heaters to day areas. Temperature controlled hot water services will be provided and outdoor landscaping undertaken.
- (4) Work is proceeding but a firm estimate is not yet available. Provision has been made to cover costs up to \$50 000.
- (5) Heaters, stove, freezer, window treatments, some kitchen and gardening equipment.
- (6) \$8 950.
- (7) (a) and (b) No.
- (8) 32.
- (9) Yes.
- (10) 5 trained nurses from Tresillian will transfer and 5 trained nurses who were former Ross Memorial Hospital staff have been offered positions.
14 nursing aides or assistants from Tresillian will transfer and 2 nursing assistants from Ross Memorial Hospital have been engaged.
3 nursing assistants who live in the area have been engaged.
6 nursing assistants from Ross Memorial Hospital have been offered positions.
1 cook and 1 domestic staff from Tresillian will transfer.
A gardener has been appointed.
A further position on the domestic staff has been offered to an applicant.
- (11) Not yet determined.

37. STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE *Motor Vehicle Accidents*

Mr McPHARLIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) How many claims were made on the State Government Insurance Office for motor car accidents for the period 1st July, 1974 to 30th June, 1975?

- (2) How many were for total claims, i.e., for complete wrecks?
- (3) How many were for repairs?
- (4) What was the average cost of repairs?
- (5) If possible, please give figures for a period from 1st July, 1975 to 30th March, 1976?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) to (5) The State Government Insurance Office is operating in competition with other insurance companies and it has always been the policy not to disclose information of this nature which could be of assistance to its competitors.

38. TRAFFIC

Drivers' Extraordinary Licences: Conditions

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Traffic:

Relevant to the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) and his second reading speech thereon—

- (1) What evidence is to hand to show that the conditions imposed by courts when granting extraordinary licences have been lawfully imposed and that the extraordinary licences were lawfully granted?
- (2) (a) Have there been any appeals during the last two years against the granting of any extraordinary licences?
- (b) if so, with what result?
- (3) (a) Have there been any appeals during the last two years against the nature of the conditions imposed on extraordinary licences?
- (b) if "Yes" with what result?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Extraordinary licences are only granted upon production of the Order of the Court and in conformity with section 76 of the Road Traffic Act; there is no evidence to the contrary.
- (2) (a) No.
- (b) Not applicable.
- (3) (a) No.
- (b) Not applicable.

39. DAIRY INDUSTRY ADJUSTMENT SCHEME

Additional Funds

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Will any further funds be made available under the dairy industry adjustment scheme?

(2) If "Yes"—

- (a) what further amount is being made available to the scheme;
- (b) will previously unsuccessful applicants who made other arrangements to finance conversion into bulk milk production be eligible for any such additional funds made available to the scheme for disbursement on a concessional rate of interest?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) The Commonwealth Government is providing an additional \$2 million on an Australia-wide basis up to 30th June, 1976.
Funds allocated for carry-on finance are to be matched by State Governments on a \$1 for \$1 basis.
- (b) At last Friday's Agricultural Council meeting the Minister for Primary Industry advised that the additional funds would not be available for the purchase of bulk tanks.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

Chairman: Cottesloe Town Council Elections

Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of an article and two letters in the Fremantle section of *The West Australian*, Thursday, the 13th May, referring to local government elections and candidates in Cottesloe?
- (2) The Chairman of the SHC is quoted in the article and is the author of the first published letter. Does the Minister feel it is appropriate that the commission chairman should be involved in Press controversy over a local issue which, because it necessarily involves other State Government agencies such as MRD and EPA, could easily be misinterpreted as being the chairman representing the commission's viewpoint in an issue which has already become very controversial?
- (3) Can the Minister advise the House of his department's policy on its senior officers using the influence of their positions to obtain media coverage for matters which while subject and open to misinterpretation as such are not in any way connected with departmental business?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) I thank the member for Rockingham for some notice of the question. I was able to secure a copy of the Press release to which he referred. I do not see that the State Housing Commission has any point of view at all in the West Coast Highway situation, and also I do not see that the letter from Mr MacKenzie, in his capacity as President of the Cottesloe Community Association of Ratepayers, expresses any opinion relevant to the Housing Commission. In fact, as I read the letter, it only queries a point and gives no opinion. Further, I do not see that the fact that the news item which accompanies the letter and which identifies Mr MacKenzie as the Chairman of the State Housing Commission has any relevance, any more than it identifies a Mr Hornel as a public relations officer.
- (3) This part of the question was adequately answered by the Premier in *Hansard* on page 580 on the 14th April, 1976.

2.

DAIRYING

Milk Quotas: Additional Issue

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

My question arises out of question 27 on today's notice paper, the second part of which reads—

- (2) Will one of the criteria of eligibility to receive a market-milk quota be that a producer must have a farm with an area of not less than 100 hectares?

The Minister replied by saying that area of land is only one of the bases or principles on which the authority determines applications for market-milk quotas. We are perfectly aware that area of land is a principle or basis of criteria, but the question was whether an area of not less than 100 hectares is applicable. Could the Minister elaborate on his answer?

Mr OLD replied:

I apologise for that oversight. I feel that it is applicable but I would have to check and make sure. I think that is correct, and I shall let the honourable member know tomorrow.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Morawa: Grievance

MR TUBBY (Greenough) [4.57 p.m.]: My grievance is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Education. During the term of the Brand Government a need was established for an agricultural school in the northern agricultural area. An area of 410 acres was bought adjacent to the Morawa Junior High School, as it then was; it is now the Morawa Senior High School. This area was fenced to Government standards and subdivided. Water and power were also laid on. An extensive four-stand shearing shed was constructed and was fitted for instructional purposes both in shearing and in wool handling. Extensive sheep yards were built and a circular dip was installed. At the time a nine-man advisory committee was appointed by the Minister for Education to advise on the establishment of this area and improvements to be carried out to prepare it for instructional purposes for students from the Morawa High School. This advisory committee set about raising considerable funds through cropping and share-farming arrangements in preparation for the opening of the school. It raised the sum of approximately \$40 000.

A Toyota school bus was purchased to convey children from the high school to the agricultural site and for general school purposes. My grievance is that at the moment several thousand dollars have been spent and this school site is not being used in any way for instruction. The course was discontinued during the term of the Tonkin Government which I believe acted on the advice contained in the Stern committee report on agricultural education which recommended the cutting back of agricultural instruction in schools.

However, I think since that period agricultural industries have proved that the gloom that existed at the time has not lasted, particularly in the wheatgrowing areas, for any great time.

This is typical of the farming industries. They have their ups and downs. At the time our committee was vitally concerned to think that this agricultural school would be discontinued at such an early stage after a considerable amount of money had been spent on it. As the site is so small and because of the extent of the improvements, it is an unattractive area to be sold. For such a small area it was overcapitalised.

The only way this school can be rejuvenated and operated satisfactorily to serve the area is by developing it into a residential agricultural school. During the small period when instructional courses were held it was obvious that not much progress would be made because the only children the school served were those who had access to it by school bus.

This agricultural school was established with a view to giving agricultural coverage to those living in an area bordered by Dalwallinu north through to Kalbarri and 100 miles in from the coast. That is an extensive area with widely diversified farming interests. It was felt that the site would be ideal for instruction in agricultural industries typical of the area.

There is a great need at this stage to continue with the development of this school because at present the nearest school is at Cunderdin, which is considerably to the south. In view of the number of agricultural schools scattered throughout the southern part of the State it is felt our area is sadly neglected.

Agricultural education should be available to all students who request it. Although perhaps some do not make the grade scholastically, the opportunity should be given to all to learn the practical side of farming because farm labourers who have had some training are well worth while and are far more useful than those with no training. Therefore all agricultural schools should cater for all students who apply for agricultural training.

No one school should be set aside to cater for students below standard scholastically. Practical agricultural subjects should be available to them in the curriculum of all agricultural schools. In view of the concern felt about the amount of money spent in the establishment of the school, I would like to hear the comments of the Minister representing the Minister for Education.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.03 p.m.]: May I first of all say that I could not agree more with the honourable member's remarks and I can understand his concern that these courses were discontinued at Morawa. I think it is fortuitous that he has raised this matter today because I am quite certain that as a consequence something will be done to ensure these courses are recommenced as quickly as possible.

I should indicate that the Morawa school is a district high school and not an agricultural school. The honourable member mentioned that a large area of land—he referred to 410 acres, but I think it is 422 acres—has been acquired adjacent to the school and it is on this land that the improvements of which he spoke have been established. The improvements include a large shed, a farm workshop, a shearing shed, and a Bedford truck. The property is fenced and has a good water supply.

As the honourable member mentioned, an advisory agricultural committee has been established, comprising local residents, and it has these facilities as a basis for any course. I do not know whether the member for Greenough is aware of the fact, but I can assure him that the department is concerned about the position. Mr

Waterhouse, a departmental officer, will be meeting the agricultural advisory committee on the 9th June to discuss the reintroduction of agricultural instruction using new courses devised by the Board of Secondary Education. At the moment it is anticipated that the courses will not commence until 1977, but I shall certainly convey what the honourable member has said to the Minister for Education in the hope that this intended plan of action can be expedited.

I can tell the honourable member that as far as my own department is concerned as rapidly as possible it is establishing a farm training scheme in Western Australia and anything along the lines he has suggested would have the support of the Government. The main thing is to expedite the present plan. I will do what I can to ensure the courses are reintroduced as soon as possible.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Relief: Grievance

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [5.06 p.m.]: My grievance concerns the plight of more than 20 000 people in Western Australia who are at present unemployed, and those who will shortly join the ranks of the unemployed, and the lack of action taken by this State Government in respect of unemployment in Western Australia. The public utterances by the Premier in the last two years have been excellent, but the action taken by him has been dismal.

Mr Grayden: That is not so. It is the other way around.

Mr HARMAN: Neither the Premier nor the Government has sought from the Australian Government sufficient funds to do something about unemployment in Western Australia. The Premier has not rearranged his State finances to bring forward labour intensive works programmes. The Premier has not introduced additional works to the programmes so that unemployment can be reduced in such areas as sewerage. He has not had any regard for the scheme introduced in South Australia, and sponsored by the South Australian Government, to locate employment for persons under the age of 21 years. In two years he has not consulted the trade unions and employers in Western Australia as a collective group to discuss productivity.

He has not taken any real positive action in respect of retraining schemes so that those who are unemployed can be retrained for some other occupation; and he has not, as has been done in Tasmania, established an *ad hoc* redundancy committee to make recommendations to the Government on the re-employment of persons made redundant. Members can deduce from what I have said that the Premier has not done very much at all for unemployment in Western Australia.

Mr A. R. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr HARMAN: I wonder whether the Premier is really concerned about the number of unemployed in Western Australia and the fact that it is anticipated that the number will increase. There has been no indication of any sort of survey of the manufacturing industries in Western Australia to ascertain some idea of the forward orders those industries have in the State.

Since the end of World War II most Governments have adopted a policy of full employment, but that long-term policy now seems to have been abolished. One wonders whether Liberal Governments have some strategy afoot to make sure there is a pool of unemployed in this State and in other Liberal States in Australia. Even the Australian Fraser Government does not seem to have a plan for some relief or for re-employment schemes for those who are unemployed. I ask members to contrast the lack of policy by the Fraser Government with the policies undertaken by the Whitlam Government.

Mr Sodeman: We have had the greatest unemployment since the depression and he did it.

Mr HARMAN: The Whitlam Government implemented schemes to provide relief for the unemployed and quite a number of shires in this State benefited by the introduction of the RED Scheme under the Whitlam Government.

Mr Sodeman: If he had stayed in Government there would be 500 000 more unemployed than there are.

Mr HARMAN: Members can come to the conclusion very rapidly that in respect of unemployment in this State the Court Government would be the worst Government on record, at least since the end of World War II. When this Government came to office in April, 1974, the number of unemployed began to increase and it has remained steady at round about 4 per cent of our work force. That suggests to me that there are some resources in Western Australia which are not being utilised; and there are two reasons for this. One is that the Government is not concerned about unemployment and the second is that there is a strategy afoot to maintain a pool of unemployed.

In conclusion I want to refer to some statements made by the Premier in 1972. Members may recall that one of these statements, made in this Chamber, was—

Give me six months and I will restore full employment.

He has had over two years and he still has not restored full employment. There were no qualifications attached to the remark. Everyone can understand what he said, which was—

Give me six months and I will restore full employment.

Mr Sodeman: If there had been no Whitlam he would have.

Mr HARMAN: Two years have passed and nothing has happened. I remind members of another statement the Premier made, again in 1972.

Mr Rushton: Are you grieving or laughing?

Mr HARMAN: He said—

Give leadership from the top which would stimulate men in the Public Service and the private industry to take the necessary action to get people back to work again.

The Premier said that there are people in the Public Service and men in industry who will stimulate employment if given leadership. I believe that is correct. There are people in the Public Service and in industry who would stimulate employment, but what they lack is leadership from the top and that is the very problem Western Australia is facing now and has faced for the last two years. There is no leadership from the top on re-employment and retraining to give people the opportunity to work.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute.

Mr HARMAN: I conclude my remarks on unemployment by condemning this Government as the worst Government since World War II.

Mr Sodeman: What is your solution?

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.15 p.m.]: May I say this: The member for Maylands has just made one statement and I will make another. The present State Government would be the best administered Government in the Commonwealth.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr H. D. Evans: The greatest robbers.

Mr GRAYDEN: I think the majority of people in Western Australia regard our Government as being the best in the Commonwealth.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr GRAYDEN: We have the best economic situation in Australia. The unemployment situation in Australia has been aggravated directly as a result of the policies of the previous Whitlam Labor Government.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Bateman: What rot!

Mr GRAYDEN: The result of that policy will not be solved within six months or within 12 months, but we are well on the way to a solution. It is an interesting point that at least in Western Australia we can see daylight as a consequence of the infamous Whitlam Government being deposed some months ago—fortunately for the people of Australia and, quite obviously, by the grace of God.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr Davies: Do you mean that God is a Liberal?

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Maylands, with his tongue in his cheek and in his most hypocritical way, has come forward and has had the temerity to talk about unemployment when we can remember his own former Federal Minister for Labor (Mr Cameron) saying that when unemployment, as a consequence of the Whitlam policy, reached 250 000 in Australia, he would resign.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: We reached the stage where people were starting to forecast 400 000 unemployed in Australia, and what did the former Minister, Mr Cameron, do? He locked himself in his office.

Mr Jamieson: So he should; he was safe there.

Mr GRAYDEN: He is no longer a Minister. How ludicrous of the member for Maylands to raise the issue of unemployment. The honourable member made a statement which was published in *The West Australian* recently, and the statement provided his solution to the unemployment problem. The article was headed, "Attack on Court over Jobs". The solution of the member for Maylands, who has spoken so learnedly—in his opinion—on the question of unemployment is set out in the article and I would ask members opposite to listen to his remarks because one day they may be in a comparable situation. Here we have the sage putting forward an argument. The article reads—

He had suggested seeking finance from the Commonwealth Government so that State finances could be rearranged to enable labour intensive projects to be brought forward.

I wonder how long it took the member for Maylands to arrive at that solution to the problem.

When Australia was going from bad to worse under the Whitlam Government we reached 100 000 unemployed; we reached 150 000 unemployed; we reached 200 000 unemployed; we reached 250 000 unemployed and then the figure headed towards 350 000, 400 000, and even 500 000. But did the member for Maylands put his solution to his own Government? Did he make recommendations along those lines to the then Commonwealth Government? Of course, he did not. He was hiding behind the door just as Mr Cameron was.

In Western Australia the situation is aggravated largely as a consequence of the policies espoused by the Labor Opposition. Excessive wage demands and industrial stoppages are encouraged actively by the policies pursued by the Opposition and

are causing unemployment. Yet the member for Maylands has the temerity to criticise this Government because of the level of unemployment.

Let us look at the situation which applies at Newmont in the Paterson Range, some 300 miles south-east of Port Hedland. Newmont, an overseas company, has spent several million dollars in providing a town and all sorts of facilities. It has spent several million dollars but at this particular time the unions in the area have asked for 10 per cent severance pay irrespective of how long the employees have worked in the area. For whatever reason they leave the area they want to receive 10 per cent of their pay. They have asked for a 25 per cent across-the-board wage increase, and all sorts of other concessions.

Mr Bateman: Good luck to them.

Mr GRAYDEN: After spending several million dollars Newmont has said that it cannot go on and, as a result, has appealed against the demands. Newmont has said that in spite of having spent several million dollars it is prepared to walk out of Australia because of the unreasonable and excessive wage demands. The same applies to other mining companies from throughout the world.

The State Government is going out of its way to try to promote industry in Western Australia and from overseas; yet we have this present outlook. How could any company possibly come to Western Australia when there is such industrial unrest and when there are such excessive wage demands, aided and abetted by Labor Governments throughout Australia? The Western Australian Government is scouring the world looking for projects which can be developed in Western Australia, and it should receive the co-operation of the Opposition, the TLC, and the union movement generally. Just recently the Premier indicated he was most anxious to have talks along those lines with the TLC.

Mr Jamieson: After we prodded him.

Mr GRAYDEN: Not at all. Six or nine months ago I was anxious to have similar talks. We called on members of the TLC, but the talks were not proceeded with for a number of reasons.

The SPEAKER: The Minister has two minutes.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Maylands has criticised the present Western Australian Government in respect of unemployment. I would like to inform him, in case he is not aware of it, that we have the second lowest incidence of unemployment in all the States of the Commonwealth. I have some data showing the facts regarding the proportion of the work force unemployed at the end of April, 1976. The present figure for Western Australia is 3.86 per cent.

Mr Skidmore: I know all about that.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Swan may know all about it, but the member for Maylands does not. Let us go further into these most significant figures. As I said, the percentage of the work force unemployed in Western Australia is 3.86. In New South Wales it is 4.80 per cent.

Mr Davies: It is improving in New South Wales; we are getting worse.

Mr GRAYDEN: In Victoria the figure is 3.95 per cent; in Queensland it is 5.11 per cent, and in Tasmania—under a Labor Government—it is 4.88 per cent. In Western Australia the figure is 3.86 per cent and in Tasmania it is 4.88 per cent. The average for Australia, generally, is 4.11 per cent and, I repeat again, in Western Australia it is 3.86 per cent—the second lowest State. However, the present Opposition criticises the Government for the situation in respect of unemployment.

I make a suggestion to the member for Maylands with respect to the situation in Tasmania where the unemployment figure is 4.88 per cent. I suggest he passes his solution on to the Government in Tasmania.

Mr Davies: And the Minister should write to Queensland with his solution.

Mr GRAYDEN: The solution could reduce the situation in Tasmania from 4.88 to the Western Australian level of 3.86 per cent. He should inform Tasmania that an approach should be made to the Commonwealth Government seeking finance so that State finances could be rearranged to enable labour intensive projects to be brought forward.

The SPEAKER: The Minister's time has expired.

Mr Jamieson: Pity!

ROCK LOBSTER INDUSTRY

Lancelin Area: Grievance

MR CRANE (Moore) [5.25 p.m.]: I have a grievance which I direct to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife and I request some action by him, although the matter does concern negotiation with the Federal Government.

I am concerned for the plight of the people involved in rock lobster fishing in the Lancelin area. I understand that the Navy has a gunnery range north of Lancelin in the Wedge Island area and the fishermen in the area have been told that at certain times it is designated as a prohibited area for fishermen.

We all know that the rock lobster industry is worth over \$20 million to Western Australia—much more than the beef industry at the moment, unfortunately. The directive from the Navy is of great concern to the people in the Lancelin area because it will disrupt their income from fishing. We know that fishermen usually

go out early in the mornings and they are back by about one o'clock in the afternoon. It has been suggested that by going out at 0500 hours and coming in at 1300 hours—to use the Navy terms—there would be no interference with the fishing of those concerned. Unfortunately, that is not so because fishermen have to set their pots and leave them in the water. Each pot is worth approximately \$40, depending on the type of floats used and the length of rope connected to the pot. If the Navy is to practise gunnery in the area damage will be caused to those pots and the livelihood of the fishermen will be interfered with, because float lines will be cut by propellers.

It is also known that a considerable number of squatters live in the area which will be affected, although the Minister for Local Government does not look upon the gunnery practise as an ideal way to move those people. However, it will be a problem to get them out of the area in time for gunnery practise.

The point I want to put to the Minister is that negotiations be taken up with the Federal Government to have the gunnery range moved to another area which would be less disadvantageous to the fishermen. It would not be difficult for the Navy to use another part of the coastline which is not so important to the fishing industry as is the area north of Lancelin.

I can recall that when I was associated with the Navy during the war years we often went to sea for a period of many weeks on end and I am sure that a short journey would not inconvenience the Navy very much.

If such an arrangement could not be made, perhaps it would be possible to point out to the Federal Government that the gunnery practise should be conducted during the period when fishing is not carried out—between August and November.

I reiterate that the people in the area are most concerned. I believe that we, as a State Government, should be equally concerned. The area is vital as regards export earnings, and we would be irresponsible if we did not take action on behalf of those fishermen to see what can be done to protect their livelihood.

Negotiations with the Commonwealth Government usually take considerable time so I raise this matter early in the hope that our Minister, in his usual manner, will act very quickly on behalf of the people concerned in an effort to protect the industry which is of vital importance to all of us.

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) [5.30 p.m.]: I would like to thank the member for Moore for raising this question. I had received early indication from the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife that the naval establishment in Western Australia

was considering the utilisation of the shore-based range north of Lancelin for practise purposes. However, my understanding was that such a proposal was not proceeding at the present time or in the near future.

When it was brought to my attention earlier that this was likely to occur, I asked why this site was chosen. Most of the reasons for the choice centred around the location of the area and the fact that it is situated not too far from the shore-based naval establishments in the Perth metropolitan region. Also, this area was relatively uninhabited from the landward side.

The fact that this practise would interfere with what the member for Moore has quite rightly suggested is an industry worth twice as much as the beef industry in the current year does not seem to have occurred to the authorities. May I assure him that when this matter was looked at previously, it was considered by the department that to shoot outside the fishing times—that is, during the afternoon—would not necessarily prevent any damage occurring to the lobster resources, and in fact, a considerable amount of upheaval may be caused to the habits of the rock lobsters. The fact that the fishermen themselves would not be within this area during those times was not necessarily a relevant point.

The question of shooting out of season was discussed also on the previous occasion. I understand at that time the department was told that various naval courses covering periods of several weeks' duration were to be held, but in no way did they correspond with the habits of the rock lobsters. May I assure the member for Moore that I will certainly take this up with the relevant authority to see whether a more suitable location and period of the year can be decided upon by both parties.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' HOUSING AUTHORITY

Rentals of Teachers: Grievance

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.32 p.m.]: The substance of the grievance I place before the House this evening is contained in a petition which I received this week from some 136 teachers, not only from my area but from adjacent areas as well. This petition refers to Government Employees' Housing Authority rentals, and therefore I direct the grievance to the Minister for Housing.

There are seven complaints in all, and the first one refers to the proposal to increase rents for all GEHA houses from 61 to 142 per cent. This proposal is outlined in detail in the *Western Teacher*, volume 5, No. 2, of the 11th March, 1976,

and it is to increase the rents on a set scale regardless of age, condition, or location of the various types of houses.

The new method of assessing the rental value of GEHA homes in the non-metropolitan areas disregards the advice of the Chief Valuer of the Taxation Department, and also, it does not require the authority to set rents on a fair basis. The new method requires comparison with the scales set out for State Housing Commission homes.

Secondly, the proposal makes no real distinction between the newer houses on which capital costs are still being recovered, and older houses on which capital costs were recovered many years ago. This is a valid point. A number of these houses are 50 to 70 years old, and their cost has been amortised over the period. Any rentals which have accrued from that time cannot be regarded as paying off a Government loan. It should be pointed out also that the money from the increased rents will not be used for upgrading the homes because it has been stated on several occasions that repairs and renovations will no longer be carried out to these older homes.

Mr P. V. Jones: Who said that?

Mr H. D. EVANS: I feel it is only natural that the teachers feel they are being treated unfairly. Thirdly, the proposal negates any incentive for teachers to transfer to country areas with the concomitant increases in general living costs. I would like to quote a passage contained in the letter from the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia. The Education Department, in advising the GEHA on this matter, had this to say—

In the past a teacher knew that, for the most part, the disadvantages of country service were compensated for, in some measure, by a favourably subsidised rent. This was a factor on recruitment and later, affected by the decisions he made concerning his career.

Country service mitigates against home ownership. A teacher can purchase a home and rent it if transferred to the country, but the problems of maintaining a rented home as an absentee landlord makes this an unattractive proposition. In fact some teachers sell their homes when taking up country appointments.

A number of teachers, on transfer to the country, have been prepared to leave their family in the metropolitan area and live alone in an Authority house during the week, returning to Perth at the weekends. The increased rents will make this an impossible proposition.

The significant point about the concern of the department is that the department considers that without subsidised rentals it will be impossible to fill some country positions because teachers' will refuse to take up appointments.

Mr Sibson: We will see about that!

Mr H. D. EVANS: That is the stated view of the Education Department as submitted to GEHA.

The next points mentioned by the teachers to justify the petition are as follows—

- (4) In many cases the living space and design of older teachers' houses is inadequate for teachers' families.
- (5) In many cases the general standard of accommodation available to teachers is well below that for gone by moving to the country.
- (6) There are numerous examples of tardiness or lack of action on the part of the GEHA in maintaining accommodation satisfactorily. The Government's proposal to limit State Treasury input by an amount corresponding to the increases indicates that the situation is not likely to improve.

That is significant if it is true, because it means that the additional rentals accrued by GEHA will not necessarily become revenue which it can spend. It will go to offset the present Treasury expenditure. The next point reads—

- (7) Examples of unsatisfactory accommodation, maintenance and essential facilities are listed below.

Mr Speaker, you will appreciate from that statement that the variation in standards is not reflected in the amount of rental charged for GEHA homes. My grievance is not concerned so much with the newer homes as it is only fair that people renting these homes should help to meet the increased costs.

I will make a point of sending to the Minister a copy of the complaints listed in this petition and it will further amplify the points I raised. Time prohibits me from going into great detail. I will, however, refer to some of the complaints made. They are—

Shortage of water (rain water tanks used). Lack of shops, nearest centre 30 km.

Rental raised more than 100 per cent in late 1975. Appealed against and fixed at \$7.50. Proposed rate is now \$12.00. A rise of more than 50 per cent.

House more than 50 years old. Drinking water depends on water tanks. Principal responsible for cost of purchasing extra water.

Washing water comes from bore which has never been serviced in three years. House isolated, shopping facilities inadequate.

It goes on for a number of pages but unfortunately I cannot go through all the items.

I refer the matter to the Minister in the hope that he can elaborate on the policy he has adopted in this connection. I ask, firstly, why the across-the-board approach, using the comparison with the State Housing Commission only, is the basis of setting rentals; secondly, why the variation in standards was not reflected in the rentals; and thirdly, with regard to appeals, will the new rents be subject to appeal or has the Government any intention of changing the appeal rights and procedures?

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Housing) [5.41 p.m.]: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for raising the question of the Government Employees' Housing Authority because it provides me with an opportunity to correct some of the misconceptions under which he and those who have forwarded the petition to him appear to be labouring.

The Education Department certainly transmitted the opinions to which the honourable member referred, but the document in which they were transmitted—unless there has been a change of mind subsequently—simply expressed what was understood to be the opinion of the Teachers' Union, which was not necessarily the opinion of the Education Department. But certainly the points he raised were transmitted to me by the department as being what the department understood to be the opinions of the Teachers' Union.

Mr H. D. Evans: Did the department endorse that?

Mr P. V. JONES: Not in the document that was transmitted to me. It made me aware that this would be the attitude of the union.

The next point is that the Secretary of the Teachers' Union (Mr Lloyd) is a member of the authority. He is the tenants' representative on the authority and, on the information made available to me by the department, I was able to discuss these aspects with Mr Lloyd, not only in his capacity as a member of the authority—and I might add the authority unanimously made these recommendations to the Government—

Mr H. D. Evans: Did you say "unanimously"?

Mr P. V. JONES: The authority, as I am advised, unanimously recommended to the Government the changes which were made. However, during the time these recommendations were made Mr Lloyd was absent overseas and the tenants' representative on the authority during part of

the time the recommendations were being considered was an officer of the Police Department.

Mr H. D. Evans: This gives a slightly different interpretation to it.

Mr P. V. JONES: I subsequently invited Mr Lloyd and representatives of the Civil Service Association and the Police Union to meet me to discuss these points, which they did on two occasions.

I will outline very quickly what the authority has done. At the present time the authority has some 1 800 dwellings in the State and in this financial year something like \$5.5 million will be spent on the construction of new dwellings, \$55 000 on land, and in the vicinity of \$500 000 on maintenance and upgrading.

The rentals have been restructured to take account of several factors: first of all, the fact that the authority was unable to continue providing increased accommodation at the rate at which it was being sought by the various Government departments it services—in fact it was falling behind. In addition, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said, there was a need to maintain an annual allocation for replacement, maintenance, and upgrading because there are many old dwellings which were taken over from the previous Public Works Department scheme.

The subsidy at the present time is something like \$2.2 million, or between \$20 and \$23 a week for each of the authority's units. It is not anticipated that the new rental structure will reduce the Government subsidy because there will be a requirement to meet the increasing demands which are being made on the authority. In addition, it is not considered the subsidy provided by the Treasury will fall because of the need to allow for the inflation factor in the building industry.

I asked the authority to consider the level of the Treasury subsidy and it advised me it is not likely to be reduced in any way whatsoever. Far from the increased revenue which might result from rental increases not being available to the authority, it most certainly will be available and will continue to be provided within the framework of the authority's finances, as the annual report reveals.

In relation to the rent review which has been made and the further reviews proposed, it was suggested they are related to Housing Commission rentals. That is not so. To paraphrase the relevant regulation, it states that the authority shall establish a rental having regard to various items, one of which is comparable Housing Commission rentals in the non-metropolitan area, and another of which is the age and condition of the dwelling. So far from determining a rental which is neither negotiable nor appealable, the rental will, as the regulation states, have regard for the age and condition of the dwelling.

Many dwellings will fall within that category. The rental of many dwellings in the south-west of the State is something like \$5 a week because of their age. Most of them are older houses which were inherited from the Public Works Department and are now occupied by employees of the Education Department.

Mr H. D. Evans: Does the procedure for appeal against rental still remain?

Mr P. V. JONES: Yes. The authority originally recommended that the right of appeal be removed but I did not accept the recommendation. The right of appeal has been retained.

I conclude by mentioning two factors. Not only will the subsidy remain but also the actual contribution by the Government has been increased, because we have rebated the \$5 a week furniture charge, which has now been absorbed within the authority's finances and by the Government as an additional subsidy.

Mr H. D. Evans: Was it not \$2?

Mr P. V. JONES: No. It was \$5 in the north-west.

The other aspect is that Housing Commission rentals in the nonmetropolitan area are approximately 15 to 18 per cent of average weekly earnings. In the revised scale, when it becomes fully operable—which will not be until the 1st January, 1978—the rental will be 12.6 per cent of the salary of a first-class police constable. If his salary did not increase, in 1978 he would be paying approximately 12½ per cent by way of rental, which is lower than the rental for welfare housing. For a teacher in a nonpromotional position, the average of male and female salaries is approximately \$10 000 per annum, and the rental such a teacher will be paying will also be approximately 12½ per cent of the average weekly earnings. In addition to that, a police constable receives an annual rental subsidy of \$110 from his own department. Far from people who occupy dwellings made available under the Government scheme being penalised, they receive generous assistance.

Mr H. D. Evans: With the appeal provisions, fluctuations in rental according to the standard of the housing can remain.

Mr P. V. JONES: I will answer that privately. The point is that the appeal provision will remain.

The SPEAKER: Grievances have been noted.

ACTS AMENDMENT (PORT AND MARINE REGULATIONS) BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Ridge (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

FINANCIAL AGREEMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Neil (Minister for Works), and read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [5.51 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Financial Agreement (Amendment) Bill to be introduced and passed through all its stages in one day.

This motion is specific to the Bill which has just been read a first time, and the second reading of which has been made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House. I desire to impress on members that the suspension of so much of the Standing Orders as is necessary to enable the Bill to pass through all stages in one day is specific to that Bill, and at the request of the Treasurer I have discussed this matter with the Leader of the Opposition.

I am advised that this Bill must be passed in a similar form by all the States and the Commonwealth in order to ratify an amendment to the Commonwealth and the States financial agreement. I understand it relates to the Commonwealth assuming some responsibility in respect of the State debt. We trust the Opposition will give the Bill a speedy passage when it is discussed, because it is my understanding that if it is not passed by the 30th June the State will miss out to the amount of some \$5.5 million.

Whilst I am on my feet, I think it might be as well for me to indicate to members that the Premier has indicated that when he returns this evening, he will discuss with the Leader of the Opposition matters related to the legislation on the notice paper. As a result of that consultation it may be that Standing Orders will be suspended or an agreement may be reached for Standing Orders to be suspended in respect of some other Bills in order that we may meet a target date on which we all hope the House might adjourn for the break.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 4).

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Local Government), and read a first time.

2. Bulk Handling Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.

BILLS (5): THIRD READING

1. Rural Housing (Assistance) Bill.

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

2. Education Act Amendment Bill.

3. Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry), and transmitted to the Council.

4. Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Bill.

5. Agriculture Protection Board Act Amendment Bill.

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

INDUSTRY

Workers Participation Research and Advisory Unit: Motion

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [5.58 p.m.]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately establish a Workers Participation Research and Advisory Unit to examine all aspects of workers participation and promote its acceptance by all concerned.

This motion seeks to do two things. Firstly it seeks to have the House express an opinion that the Government should immediately establish a research and advisory unit to examine all aspects of worker participation; and, secondly, it seeks that the research and advisory unit should promote the acceptance of worker participation by all concerned.

I have found some difficulty in arriving at a suitable definition of "workers participation". It has been referred to under several headings, and a great deal depends on the point of view of the persons involved in determining the definition. A view has been expressed that we already have worker participation in the form of the Government and the trade union movement, and that workers are able to participate through the trade union movement, which has a relationship to the Government of the day, in the determination of wages, conditions of employment, and associated matters. However, that is not really the type of worker participation I envisage should be permitted; I believe we can go much further than that.

The second definition is what is known as "joint consultation" which provides for workers and management to act together on a board or committee in a purely advisory capacity, informing their particular factory of the changes or new schemes which are desired.

Another definition of "worker participation" provides for workers and management to work together on a decision-making board; this board would make decisions relating to productivity, new investment and safety requirements at the place of employment.

A further definition is referred to as workers' control; this is where the workers actually control the factory where they are employed. They operate under a workers' council, which employs the managerial staff to ensure that the decisions of the workers' council are carried out.

Finally, there is another definition of "workers participation" called self-management, which is an extension of workers' control of individual factories to a system of self-management of the whole of the industrial manufacturing sector. This leads to the actual management of the economy and the country by the workers, and this is when we achieve a form of socialism.

Despite all the different definitions of "workers participation" what it really means is that the worker will have some say in the decision-making process at his place of employment. If we concentrate on that broad definition, the arguments I am about to make will have greater clarity.

To put this argument in its proper perspective, we should take our minds back in history some 300 years, just prior to the Industrial Revolution. The workers were emerging from the feudal system and in the main were employed as agricultural workers or as craftsmen. In those days, the craftsmen were able to manufacture an object mostly by hand, so they had a fairly close relationship to whatever they were producing.

However, with the advent of the Industrial Revolution a change took place; in the industrialised countries, workers were brought into towns, which quickly grew; they were employed in a factory-type environment, with large numbers of people working very closely together in intolerable conditions, performing tasks to which they had no real, personal relationship.

Even at that time, shortly after the commencement of the Industrial Revolution, noted sociologists and economists of the day commented upon the alienation that was occurring between the worker and the product due to mass production. This alienation has continued to the present day.

In most of the major industrial countries of the world, studies have been undertaken into the quality of working life in an attempt to overcome this problem, and I should like to quote one or two observations from these reports.

A number of studies have been undertaken in the United Kingdom, and examined the following themes: Efficiency at work; satisfaction at work; the connection between satisfaction and efficiency; the influence of environmental factors, and particularly work technology on the quality of working life; and, the development of thought in social science and public expectation in regard to these items.

That study found that efficiency and satisfaction are interrelated in such a way that neither can be achieved exclusively for any extensive period. The report stated that the immediate effects of work technology were economic and organisational, leading to psychological and sociological impacts. The study referred to the variety of modern work systems which produced stresses, such as uniform pacing of a production line, repetitiveness leading to monotony, triviality and meaninglessness in work, large impersonal structures, working arrangements and relations, and objects which seemed distant and unreal to the worker.

A fairly large scale inquiry was undertaken in the United States into the quality of working life. That inquiry referred to workers being dissatisfied with the quality of their working lives, with dull, repetitive and seemingly meaningless tasks offering little challenge or autonomy, and causing discontent amongst workers at all levels.

In Australia recently an inquiry was undertaken into the quality of working life and although I do not have the report, I believe it is available. I am quoting from a newspaper article which commented upon this report. That report indicated that 41 per cent of workers aged 55 years and over are apathetic about their jobs. It indicates that apathy exists in all age groups but to a lesser degree as the age goes down and is the cause for persons to remain unemployed and for those employed to overindulge in "sickies" and become discontented in their work. The report asserts that apathy among older workers is due "to failure to involve people in making decisions affecting their working lives" and "blames modern advertising for reinforcing feelings among many people that they have failed in life and are second-class citizens".

Those are only a few of the reports. There are numerous reports from major industrial countries all indicating this alienation amongst workers as a result of the failure of management to include workers in the decision-making processes of their work place.

As a result of this alienation and dehumanisation of workers there has been, particularly since the end of World War II, a trend in these industrial nations towards worker participation; and a great deal of material has been written on the investigations and experiments and the success of those experiments in the European countries, to some extent in America, and to some extent in England. These are readily available for members to read on inquiry at libraries.

I do not intend to go very deeply into the history of worker participation in these countries but I should mention some action that has been taken in some of them. Firstly, it is of some interest to note that in France recently an opinion survey was taken and the people were asked to name the single most important reform they wanted from the new Government. Thirty per cent of those surveyed picked the heading "Democratisation of the company". There has been quite a lot of worker participation in France in recent years. In fact in 1968 there were a number of direct company takeovers by the workers and a system of actual workers' control operated from those moves.

In Germany the beginning of worker participation can be traced to as far back as 1848 when German workers first formulated a demand to be consulted in management decisions. But it was not until after World War II that Germany finally enacted laws which provided for workers to be represented by half the directors on a supervisory board of the major industries—that is, the coal and steel industries—and for a third of the places in the other industries to be taken by workers' representatives. These supervisory boards correspond roughly to the boards of directors of the US corporations.

This legislation has been referred to as co-determination legislation and of course some changes have been made since the early 1950s when the legislation was originally enacted. That particular system has not really changed a great deal and it is obviously one which suits the German people.

In Norway the system is an improvement on the German system. The beginnings of the Norwegian system were a series of experiments in worker participation in some of the major industrial firms in that country; and gradually it became accepted by all concerned, including the trade union movement, and has now become a legislative practice in that country.

In Sweden initially worker participation was frowned upon by the Swedish LO, the major trade union movement in that country. The movement said at the time that it would not have anything to do

with the concept of worker participation, but because of the demand by the workers in that country following examples in Norway and Germany, the unions changed their attitude completely and are now one of the promoters, together with management, of worker participation in Sweden.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr HARMAN: Prior to the tea suspension I was summarising the experiences of the major industrial countries of Europe in respect of the changes which have occurred and the legislation which has been enacted in order to promote worker participation. One thing I want to stress in relation to legislation which followed those changes is that there was always an active involvement by the trade union movement in those countries in the discussions and changes which took place.

We should consider two other aspects when studying the experiences of the countries of western Europe. Firstly, there seem to be two attitudes developing. Some of the capitalists in those countries adopt the attitude that worker participation means the thin end of the wedge and permits the change to ultimate socialism. Other capitalists hold the view that worker participation is a most vital ingredient of industrial activity necessary in order to further promote capitalism.

The same attitudes are adopted by some trade unions. Some trade unions in those countries see worker participation as a move by the capitalists and management to achieve a greater productivity and to manipulate workers, while other trade unionists see worker participation as a correct role for the unions to adopt because it means the humanisation of workers and gives them a meaningful opportunity to make decisions in respect of their work place.

It does not seem that the cause of worker participation in England has advanced as fast as it has in the European countries close to it. In America the emphasis seems to be on promoting humanisation of the worker rather than on promoting a system under which workers gain some sort of management participation in the various industries.

When we look at the experiences of industrialised western nations of Europe and at England and America and we consider the reports which have been made on the quality of working life in those countries, it becomes quite apparent that there is great concern in those countries for management and unions to adopt a realistic policy in respect of worker participation. As I have said, in some countries legislation has been enacted for this purpose.

Turning now to the experience in Australia, we should ask ourselves certain questions and one is: What sort of research is required in our industries in

Australia in order that the concept of worker participation can be further explored?

I want to deal with an inquiry which was conducted in an American firm by a group of sociologists and economists. It was conducted into a project known as the Bolivar project and concerned a factory in Tennessee, USA, which makes automobile parts. It is a coincidence I suppose that the factory is called Harman International Industries, but the person in that instance, Mr Sidney Harman, decided that he ought to do something about worker participation — about involving workers in his plant. He was concerned that his workers might become a standardised replaceable part. He realised that workers in his factory were developing hostility. They were becoming depressed, and as a result the whole activity of the work force was stifled. He was anxious that some new principles should be introduced in the factory in order to involve the workers and gain for them a form of job satisfaction.

So he proposed to the trade union concerned with that particular factory that the union and management should get together and engage a firm of consultants in order to do something about worker participation. The purpose of the joint management-labour work improvement programme which was devised was to make work better and more satisfying for all employees, both those on a salary and those employed on an hourly rate, while maintaining the necessary productivity for job security.

The document explaining the agreement states—

The purpose is not—

This point is emphasised in the document—

—to increase productivity. If increased productivity is a by-product of the program, ways of rewarding the employees for increased productivity will become legitimate matters for inclusion in the program.

The research group agreed on four principles; that is, security, equity, democracy, and an objective it termed "individuation".

The definition of security dealt with job security, health, and safety. Equity referred to fair rules, regulations, and compensation, and to overcoming discrimination because of race, sex, or age. Democracy in the project was defined by the participants as "giving each worker more opportunities to have a say in the decisions that affect his life, including his work life".

The principle of "individuation" expressed the goal of stimulating the fullest possible development of each individual's creative potential.

The group went on to survey the attitudes of the workers who made up the work force in that particular factory and it found that the work force fell into six groups; that is, the unionists, the dutiful craftsmen, the receptive craftsmen, the sociables, the farmer-workers, and the ambitious.

If members wish to read the article I will make it available to them. When we think about it we realise that those definitions could well apply to most of the work force in our industries in Australia.

At the time the article was written the experiment had not been completed so I am not aware of the degree of success of the operation at the factory, but I am endeavouring to establish the results. However, what I have said indicates the type of research and surveys undertaken in a particular organisation.

Turning to Australia, I am relying to some extent on the report of the manufacturing industries group led by Sir Gordon Jackson and comprising some notable persons in Australia. This group recently conducted an inquiry into the manufacturing industry in Australia and I wish to quote three sections from its report. Firstly, the green paper said—

For ten years the rate of growth in labour productivity of Australian manufacturing has been far below that achieved in Japan, France and Germany, and marginally below Britain and Canada.

The report continues—

Our studies of the human condition in factories indicate serious and deep-seated problems. For most of the workforce, the quality of worklife falls drastically short of what people would like. The rising expectations, education and standard of living of most workers contrast starkly with remote and centralised decision making that considers them as inanimate 'resources' or 'labour'. Industry is heavily concentrated in major cities. The problems of overcrowding spill over into worklife. Alienation and frustration are evidenced by unrest, absenteeism, high turnover, and in-different quality of product.

I am quoting a most recent report on manufacturing industries in Australia, and the final portion I wish to read is as follows—

The tasks of middle managers are becoming more complex and demanding, but training for management is inadequate, particularly training to cope with change. Managers, as well as workers on the shop floor, are frustrated by inability to translate aspirations into achievement.

Those three quotes indicate quite clearly in a general way the situation existing in Australia. Obviously an alienation exists amongst the workers and equally obviously there are signs that productivity in Australia has decreased in the last 10 years and is now below that of some of our trading countries, some of which I referred to earlier. Finally, it is obvious that there is a lack of management expertise in Australia and a lack of opportunity for managers to be trained so that they can cope with change.

In the report mention is made of some of the physical working conditions, as follows—

Some plants' conditions are very good with strict attention paid to such matters as plant layout, safety, noise, smells, temperature, lighting, cleanliness and facilities. Others are dirty, unpleasant and unsafe.

The report goes on to illustrate some of the contrasts in the various manufacturing industries. On page 82 the difference between the conditions in the oil industry and in some of the metal industries is demonstrated. It suggests to me that everything is not rosy in some of the manufacturing industries in Australia.

We are in a position where we should be considering all the aspects of worker participation. It is obviously a concept which is gaining ground in Europe, Britain and America. It is a relatively new concept in Australia but we should be finding out as much as possible about it. I am not by any means suggesting we should import the arrangements which are being made in the countries to which I have referred. I would prefer that in Australia we took cognizance of what is happening elsewhere and, as leaders, discussed the concept to try to find out more about it. We should be endeavouring to generate in the trade union movement, the managerial section, and among the workers the concepts which are existent in other countries so that any thrust at all in this direction would come from the workers themselves and, by some process of participation in their own work place, they would be able to formulate and put forward ideas as to how they would like the concept to be put into practice in Australia.

It may well be that in some factories the workers opt only for an advisory role. In other factories they may opt for some kind of management role wherein, together with management, they can make decisions about productivity, safety, investment, and so on. There may be a move in some cases in the future for workers actually to take over an industry in a situation where management decided to close down a plant. There was some evidence of this in New South Wales 18 months or two years ago when the workers were able to take over a mine and carry on the production of copper.

The whole purpose in bringing this motion forward tonight is to generate discussion of this new concept in the Parliament of Western Australia, to put before members briefly the history of the concept in other countries, and to awaken them to the prospect that what has occurred in other countries will certainly be translated into this country; but how it will develop is a matter for Australians to decide.

The Australian Labor Party has already adopted a policy on worker participation which is to be found on page 39 of its Platform, Constitution, and Rules—a document which is readily available to members. The policy commences by saying—

Labor recognises the world-wide trend towards effective participation by employees in the management of corporations and government enterprises. These developments take many forms, including board level representation of employees, management-employee committees, joint consultation on a wide range of issues, restructuring of corporations and Government enterprises to maximise employees' initiatives and redesign of jobs to widen the area of workers' decision-making at the production level. Labor believes that one of the roles of Government in Australia must be to spearhead legitimate attempts at promoting a greater degree of industrial democracy by encouraging these changes.

Mr Sibson: Why don't the workers just put up their money in the first place and start their own businesses?

Mr HARMAN: I am putting forward tonight the policy of the Australian Labor Party. I am providing an opportunity for this Parliament to examine the whole issue. But I want to make this point quite clear: When we talk about worker participation in Australia and in Western Australia we should not ignore the role of the trade union movement. As one of the major institutions of this country, it would need to be consulted; and I would not be a party to any kind of worker participation where workers were being manipulated by management in order to suit the needs of management.

We must have some regard for the fact that the worker is not a replaceable part; he is a human being with all kinds of aspirations, hopes, and expectations. He does not like working in a factory which is dirty and noisy and which does not have the proper facilities in which to work. He does not like being bossed around. He prefers to have some say in the decisions which are made in the work place. It has been said workers are not interested in this matter and that they do not want to be involved in decision making. Those are very general statements and one would

need to be able to prove beyond doubt that that is the case. I suggest it is not possible to do so.

One of the problems is that so far workers have not been provided with the techniques of being involved. That is one of the functions I would see a research and advisory group performing. Having carried out the research, having looked around, and having seen what is happening—and there is a great deal of material on the subject—I think it would be possible to start experimenting in Western Australia, with the co-operation of private enterprise. We should certainly start to experiment in some of our Government departments to see what arrangements can be made to provide this technique for the worker to become interested in the decision making in his own work place. We must remember that the worker spends a third of his life in his work place, and if we can do something to promote a greater feeling of security, happiness, and involvement, perhaps we will unlock some latent creative ability which would improve our whole way of life.

Mr Bertram: And provide incentive.

Mr HARMAN: It is very hard to explain what could happen as a result of the implementation of such a scheme because it would certainly unlock some of the aspirations and genius which are possessed by some people but which they have not had the opportunity to utilise.

I suggest this is probably the first motion I have moved in this House which has some chance of being carried by the Parliament. I am sure members of Parliament will support me. I am not asking for anything which is contrary to the policy of the Government. If the Government is really concerned about the workers in this State, surely it would be anxious to do something along these lines.

For some time now the South Australian Government has had a research and advisory unit operating, and I think there is a Government-sponsored unit in New South Wales. In Western Australia, even though we may have people who are looking at the material available from other countries, so far no separate section has been set up to devote itself exclusively to the concept of worker participation. I am hoping that as a result of the debate on this motion the Government will be convinced that in the total interests of Western Australia it would be a very wise decision to install a separate research and advisory unit which could promote and activate discussion in industry and among the trade unions and workers so that the concept can be further generated.

I want to quote what has been said by two people. The first is the Premier of South Australia. I am not suggesting we should have everybody under a system of worker participation by next Monday

morning; we would have to feel our way in such a system. This is the contention of the Premier of South Australia—

It is the Government's view that we must develop policies here which will allow a sensible and responsible resolution of conflicts by a process of synthesis, of putting the conflicting interests in an organisation in such a position that there is obvious benefit to all sectors through a resolution of the conflicts, and where the need for resolution can be better understood and provided for.

Finally, I refer to a statement made by Mr Clyde Cameron, when he was the Australian Minister for Labor, on the 25th June, 1974. He said—

However, we have now reached the stage when workers and their representatives are demanding that management assess new technology and methods of work according to their "human pay off" as well as their pay off in economic efficiency. In the past we have too often allowed technology to dictate the nature of work. The time has come for a new approach. We need to consider whether it is possible to alter work and production methods so as to increase job satisfaction among employees.

I hope this motion will do just that in Western Australia, and that in the years to come we can look back with a great deal of pleasure because we have initiated in Western Australia a new concept which is designed to improve the happiness and security and the life of the working people of this State.

Mr BERTRAM: I formally second the motion.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [7.59 p.m.] : May I say first of all that the member for Maylands has made a very plausible speech, but I suggest when one looks at the facts associated with what he was speaking about one will inevitably come to the conclusion that the speech was nothing but a lame apology. Towards the end of his speech he gave us the policy of the Labor Party, and then he talked in terms of not being in favour of worker participation if it meant manipulation on the part of the employer, etc. These were the sentiments he expressed, and when one looks at the facts what he said constitutes a lame apology and makes it quite obvious that although on the surface his speech sounds plausible, in fact exactly the opposite is the case.

Mr Bertram: Apology to whom?

Mr GRAYDEN: It is a very lame apology—

Mr Bertram: To whom?

Mr GRAYDEN: —because what he said is really another manifestation of a very familiar pattern as far as the member for Maylands is concerned.

He has it both ways. He thinks he gains some kudos for adopting a certain line, and at the same time he and the people he represents take exactly the opposite line. The member for Maylands has espoused the cause of worker participation, something we as a Government have been actively pursuing ever since we came to office. Later I will tell members how we have been pursuing this.

The member for Maylands is simply saying, "Oh yes, we should have more worker participation." He has tried to gain kudos in this way, and at the same time he and the members who sit behind him are actively opposing worker participation.

Mr Skidmore: Which one? There are two of us here.

Mr GRAYDEN: Let us look at the statements which have been made. The member for Maylands, in an effort to gain public kudos, made a statement in *The West Australian* the other day. In that newspaper it was reported that the Western Australian Opposition called on the State Government to investigate all aspects of worker participation in industry. The article states that the member for Maylands said that Western Australia could not afford to isolate itself from international trends towards worker participation.

Mr Bertram: That's very good stuff.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is rather interesting to hear that interjection because the member for Maylands and the members who are attempting to interject are completely out of step with union thought on this particular matter.

Mr Skidmore: That leaves me in, because I have not interjected.

Mr GRAYDEN: I will illustrate the sort of statement made by top trade unionists in Australia. Let us take Joe Owens, the former Secretary of the Australian Builders' Labourers Federation of New South Wales. I have here an extract taken from the University of New South Wales publication *Alumni*.

Mr Davies: Dated 1908?

Mr GRAYDEN: The article was written as a result of a symposium which was conducted at the university in 1974. Members opposite would know how many members this union has. The former secretary of it said—

Worker participation quite frankly is a sop . . .

Listen and we will see where members opposite stand on the question of worker participation; we will see where the member for Maylands stands in respect of it; we will see that he is out of step if he

really espouses these thoughts; and we will also see that he speaks with two tongues on many issues, and this is one of them.

Mr Skidmore: Are you suggesting that Joe Owens is the leader of all the workers in Australia?

Mr GRAYDEN: This is what he had to say—

Worker participation quite frankly is a sop. It is clearly proved in West Germany that worker participation is designed to contain the Unions, to make them effective within the capitalist system existing there and that move is beginning to emerge in Australia where many Union leaders do not want to see Unions "run wild", as some of them refer to it, and certainly the employers are very much together on this question of participation.

That was said by Joe Owens, the former Secretary of the Australian Builders' Labourers Federation.

Mr Skidmore: That is a New South Wales union of course; do you realise that?

Mr Harman: When did he say that?

Mr GRAYDEN: At a symposium conducted at the University of New South Wales in 1974.

Mr Skidmore: That is the New South Wales branch of the union.

Mr GRAYDEN: All right. Let us proceed further. I have here the remarks of another top Australian unionist who was brought to Western Australia. I should imagine by the Trades and Labor Council, but certainly by the unions. He appeared on television here and made numerous statements. Let us see what he had to say in respect of worker participation on the Australian scene. He said—

"I want to indicate quite clearly that the aim of the Trade Union Movement to acquire political and economic power remains, now as it did at the beginning, the principal objective of trade unionism.

I totally reject the concept of worker participation because it is little short of management inspired for the achievement of management objectives. In my view, greater worker involvement should be achieved by worker interference and intervention through independent trade union organisations rather than by participation."

Mr Skidmore: Who is it?

Mr GRAYDEN: It is Mr John Halfpenny, the State Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union—certainly one of the most powerful unions in Australia. I think that union has something like 170 000 members.

Mr Skidmore: How many?

Mr GRAYDEN: I said 170 000.

Mr Skidmore: He is not in charge of that many.

Mr GRAYDEN: I said the union has that many members.

Mr Skidmore: Well, that is all right.

Mr GRAYDEN: This is a great union, but what did its leader say about worker participation, which the member for Maylands is espousing here for the consumption of the public? Again we see the hypocrisy of the utterances of members opposite. Mr Halfpenny said that he totally rejected the concept of worker participation because it is little short of management inspired for the achievement of management objectives. He said in his view worker involvement should be achieved by worker interference and worker intervention through independent trade union organisations, rather than through participation.

I could have obtained 1 000 statements of this kind, but I quote only two because I do not wish to take up the time of the House. I quote them to illustrate that the trade union movement is so opposed to the full concept of worker participation as referred to by the member for Maylands that it is virtually unpardonable for the member even to broach the subject.

However, we have been roving fairly far afield and looking at the Australian scene to see what top union leaders feel in this respect. Let us now come a little closer to home. Recently the Governor (Sir Wallace Kyle) made a statement on this matter. His statement was published in *The West Australian*, and as a consequence I was asked for my views. The newspaper printed my views as follows—

The Minister for Labour and Industry, Mr Grayden, and the Opposition spokesman on labour matters, Mr J. J. Harman, welcomed Sir Wallace's views.

Mr Grayden said that the Governor's attitude to worker participation, printed in the journal of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, was strictly in line with Government policy.

"There is a tremendous need for more worker participation," Mr Grayden said.

"We strongly support it and we are trying to encourage it wherever possible. We hope that employers everywhere will take heed of the Governor's message."

Mr Grayden said that the main advantages from increased industrial democracy were a reduction in industrial unrest and increased worker satisfaction, particularly for workers involved in monotonous tasks.

That was on the 22nd April, well before the member for Maylands decided to go ahead with his motion. At the same time the Secretary of the Trades and Labor

Council of Western Australia made a statement also in response to Sir Wallace Kyle's remarks. Everyone in this House knows that the Trades and Labor Council represents the vast majority of the unions in this State. Here we have the secretary of that council stating his views, and the following is the report to be found in the same issue of the newspaper—

The secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, Mr Peter Cook, said that Sir Wallace seemed to be proposing a vague system that aimed at breaking down the negotiating position of unions.

The representatives of workers had to be elected through the union movement.

Mr Cook said: "We would have strong reservations about any employer-sponsored system of worker participation, because employers have yet to show any real desire to introduce industrial democracy in the work force.

"The ultimate question is whether workers are asked to assist the productivity objectives of management or whether they really do have a say in the way in which their work place is organised and the profits of their labour are dispersed."

Here we have before the House a motion moved by a member of the Opposition who is ostensibly in favour of increased worker participation. On the other hand we have the Governor of Western Australia innocently making a statement that he thought worker participation was a good thing; and we have also the comments made by various people, one of whom is the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, who said the council would have strong reservations about any employer-sponsored system. He also said that Sir Wallace seemed to be proposing a vague system that aimed at breaking down the negotiating position of unions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat for a moment. I want to remind the Minister, as I remind the House, that it is not appropriate to use the Governor's name or anything he says when advancing arguments in debate. I have listened for some time, but I believe the Minister ought to refrain from pursuing that line further.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr GRAYDEN: Thank you, Sir. I am sorry; that did not occur to me.

Mr Bertram: It has knocked your argument around.

Mr GRAYDEN: No, there is no need for me to mention his name.

Mr Jamieson: You are not going to read it again are you?

Mr GRAYDEN: Perhaps it might be better if I did, because I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition has absorbed the meaning of it. We are confronted with a rather ridiculous situation because we have before us a motion which reads—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately establish a Workers Participation Research and Advisory Unit to examine all aspects of workers participation and promote its acceptance by all concerned.

Mr Bertram: Can you understand that?

Mr GRAYDEN: Yes. On the one hand we have that motion; on the other hand we have the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council—and that council represents a great many unions in this State, and is the fountain of knowledge as far as members opposite are concerned—expressing reservation in the strictest terms about worker participation. In those circumstances, just where do members opposite stand? Do they not, as I said earlier, speak with two tongues on this issue? What will happen when they go to the next meeting of the Trades and Labor Council, or the next executive meeting?

Mr Laurance: They are not allowed to talk.

Mr GRAYDEN: What will they say to this person who holds such an influential position in the TLC? Will they make a lame apology, as the member for Maylands has made in respect of this motion, for what they have said in the State Parliament? Or is this the forum in which they express views for public consumption; and, having expressed them here, do they hurry to Trades Hall and reject everything they have said?

The member for Maylands speaks with two tongues on this issue. He does it repeatedly. He did it in respect of employment this morning. He has done it on issue after issue; and this is a classic example. I should like to know where some of the members of the Opposition stand.

Mr Skidmore: Sit down and give us the opportunity.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Swan has had a lifetime associated with the trade union movement.

Mr Skidmore: And very proud of it too.

Mr GRAYDEN: He is highly respected by his fellows: I have pleasure in conceding that because I have great respect for him also. I want to know where this member stands on this issue.

Mr Skidmore: Sit down and I will tell you.

Mr GRAYDEN: Is he with the member for Maylands or is he with the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council?

Mr Skidmore: I might go down the middle.

Mr GRAYDEN: Does he align himself with the former Secretary of the Australian Builders' Labourers Federation? Does he align himself with Mr John Halfpenny, the Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union? Does he align himself with the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council? Or does he align himself with the statement by the member for Maylands?

Mr Skidmore: You will find out if you sit down.

Mr GRAYDEN: He is not prepared to say. What can he say? If he said that he did not support worker participation, what would be the result? It is rather a ludicrous situation. We have the member for Mt. Hawthorn. Where does he stand? He must support one or the other. Is he for workers' compensation?

Mr Hartrey: Yes, we are.

Mr GRAYDEN: I should have said "workers participation". I want to find out whether the member for Mt. Hawthorn endorses the views of the trade union leaders of which we have spoken or whether he supports the views of the member for Maylands. Where does he stand? Is he prepared to tell us?

Mr Bertram: Certainly.

Mr GRAYDEN: Where does he stand?

Mr Bertram: Right here.

Mr GRAYDEN: That is the sort of evasive answer one would expect. In one's wildest moments of imagination one would not expect the member for Mt. Hawthorn to commit himself on this matter because members of the Opposition are speaking with two tongues on the issue, one for public consumption and one of course for trade union supporters. That is the situation; it is as simple as that. The member for Mt. Hawthorn is sitting there virtually mute and is not prepared to say whether he supports the views which have been expressed. He is not prepared to do it by way of interjection. He needs to give a straight "Yes" or "No" answer.

Unfortunately the member for Ascot is not here tonight. I am most curious to hear what his views will be in respect of this matter. They would be most enlightening. I imagine that he would possibly go along with some of the comments that have been made by Mr Joe Owens. I imagine he would go along with some of the comments made by Mr John Halfpenny. I imagine he would go along with the comments of Mr Peter Cook. The member for Ascot, who unfortunately is not here to say "Yes" or "No", would be supporting those comments and not the comments of the member for Maylands.

Mr Thompson: That is perhaps why he is not here.

Mr GRAYDEN: That is a possible reason. Quite a number of the members of the Opposition are missing and it may well be because they have a conscience and are appalled that the member for Maylands should introduce something of this kind when they know full well the attitude of the trade unions on the issue.

Where is the member for Balga? I would be pleased to hear his views because I think he would support those of the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, the views of the trade unionists to whom I have referred and the views of many others who have expressed similar opinions. Unfortunately very few members of the Opposition are here.

The member for Morley is not here when an important issue such as this is being discussed. The members to whom I wish to direct my remarks are unfortunately away. Are they away as a consequence of the fact that the member for Maylands has raised this issue? It would almost seem so. What would the member for Morley have to say in respect of the comments of Mr John Halfpenny, Mr Joe Owens and Mr Peter Cook?

The member for Collie is another who has been engaged in the trade union movement for 30 years or even more, but the point is that he is not here either on this all-important issue of worker participation.

Mr Bertram: Where is the member for Pilbara?

Mr GRAYDEN: Where is the member for Rockingham? I would be most interested to hear what his views are. Unfortunately all the members to whom I wish to talk on this issue are not here. It would seem that they have suffered remorse at the thought of this motion, because the trade union movement by and large is opposed to worker participation, certainly in the form that was expressed by the member for Maylands. They are absent for that reason, and that is why I think the member for Maylands is out of step with the trade union movement, and I repeat that he is speaking with two tongues.

I regret that some of these members are not here because it would have been most interesting to hear their views, had they been prepared to give them. I doubt that they would have been prepared to do so because the member for Mt. Hawthorn and the member for Swan refused to indicate in any way whether they were supporting the views—

Mr Skidmore: Fair go! I told you to sit down and I would tell you.

Mr GRAYDEN: Does the member support the views of Peter Cook or Joe Owens?

Mr Skidmore: Sit down and I will tell you.

Mr GRAYDEN: He has the opportunity to do it now, but of course he will not do it.

Mr Bertram: Where is the member for Bunbury?

Mr GRAYDEN: In view of the fact that all the members who are supposed to be concerned about this matter are away—

Point of Order

Mr BATEMAN: I raise a point of order. Is the Minister talking to the motion? I do not think he is.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: I rule that the Minister is speaking to the motion. Order! This is not supposed to be a house of entertainment. I rule that the Minister is within his rights.

Debate Resumed

Mr GRAYDEN: Worker participation can take many forms. A type of co-determination has been developed in Germany and it has been said that that suits the German temperament, but it would be wholly unsuitable in Australia. Since it first came into office the Government has been actively pursuing methods which will reduce industrial unrest and lead to greater work satisfaction for individuals engaged particularly in monotonous jobs.

Mr H. D. Evans: You would not even appoint unionists to the Midland Junction Abattoir Board.

Mr GRAYDEN: What an extraordinary comment from the member for Warren! Quite obviously the Labor Opposition has been hibernating for the last two years on the question of worker participation. There are all sorts of animals that hibernate. There are bears in north Italy and snakes in Australia and now the members of the Labor Party have joined the ranks of those creatures which hibernate. For two years they have been hibernating on the question of worker participation. Because of this it is probably quite true, as the member for Maylands has said, that he is completely unaware of anything that has been taking place in respect of worker participation. I tell him, because he would not be aware of it although he was a Minister in the previous Government, that talks on this question have been taking place between State and Commonwealth leaders for the last four years. I mention that purely as background.

Ever since this Government came to office the Department of Labour and Industry has been avidly monitoring any developments in Australia and the rest of the world and has been actively promoting and encouraging worker participation. Two years ago at my direction the department examined the possibility of setting up a special committee which would devote itself to worker participation. When we looked at the expertise in the department and saw how closely it was associated with industry, we abandoned the idea. At this late stage the member for Maylands puts forward a move that we examined two years ago.

Mr Harman: What was wrong with the expertise?

Mr Hartrey: What has the Government done about it?

Mr GRAYDEN: Members are quite obviously unaware that private enterprise almost everywhere is actively pursuing worker participation at a very high level and is implementing that participation wherever possible.

Mr Bertram: Does the Premier support it?

Mr GRAYDEN: We support it. We do not merely talk about it; we do something about it. I am absolutely amazed that the member for Maylands is obviously unaware of the developments that have taken place. He is unaware of the extent to which we were monitoring systems throughout the world, which we would introduce at the drop of a hat if we thought they were advantageous.

I have mentioned private industry where worker participation has been virtually universally employed. The iron ore companies in the north-west are a classic example of worker participation. In the iron ore companies there is considerable participation by workers in management decisions affecting the work force in matters of wages, disputes, shift times, rostering and so on. Worker participation is being invoked in decisions which affect the welfare of the workers. At the same time industrial agreements have been made to provide better industrial relations for conciliation and arbitration procedures. The iron ore industry in the north has industrial agreements which are based on the concept of worker participation; but the member for Maylands knows nothing about it. The members of the Opposition apparently know nothing about it. The members of the Opposition have been hibernating for two years because they are unaware of the extent of worker participation in the iron ore industry.

That is just one facet of industry in Western Australia. Worker participation was introduced in Chamberlains a couple of years ago. It has been introduced in Harts and Rumbles. It has been introduced in virtually all forms of private enterprise in Western Australia.

Let us have a look at the State situation. The State can participate only to a point. Let us see what we have done as far as Western Australia is concerned.

In the public sector Western Australia has actively encouraged worker participation, and no doubt this is a well-established principle in the composition of boards and committees which were established under various Statutes of Parliament.

The member for Maylands has talked about worker participation taking many forms. This is one very real form of

worker participation. Let us look at some of the ways in which this is evident. Worker participation is evident in legislation affecting port authorities; it is evident in the State Housing Commission, because we have worker representation on the commission; it is evident in the State Energy Commission; it is evident in the Workers' Compensation Board; and it is evident in the Department of Labour and Industry. Worker representation is recognised over a wide number of policy-making bodies.

Worker participation is evident in the Apprentices Advisory Council of Western Australia, and in the apprenticeship trade boards. The member for Maylands has emphasised that worker participation takes several forms. I am now telling him how this Government and previous Governments have implemented worker participation in Western Australia, but apparently the honourable member is completely unaware of it.

To continue with worker participation, this is evident in the Consumer Affairs Council; the Health Safety Advisory Board; the Machinery Safety Advisory Board; and the Hairdressers' Registration Board.

Those are only some of the policy-making organisations on which there is worker participation at the Government level. So, we have worker participation in all forms of industry in Western Australia. We have it in the Government, in the manner I have described; and we have in the Department of Labour and Industry officers who are watching worker participation throughout the world and would be keen to set up committees or anything like that at the drop of a hat if they considered it to be advantageous.

Two years ago at my request those officers looked into the question of setting up some sort of committee to monitor worker participation. They rejected the proposal, because they considered they had the expertise and were more competent to do this work. I cannot therefore accept the proposition for the formation of the committee proposed in the motion for a number of reasons. Firstly, many unions do not want worker participation and would be loath to form such a committee, and a number of employer organisations do not want to be involved in a committee on worker participation. So we have a refusal from both sides. Unions should not be forced to have worker participation. However, a number of unions desire worker control, but not worker participation.

Worker participation should be allowed to evolve through management-worker negotiations. The evolutionary process will be more acceptable to the parties, without forcing them to accept it. This should be a self-generating process.

I have mentioned that worker participation is in force in a number of establishments already, without the need for legislation. I emphasise again that worker participation must be allowed to evolve between the parties. It is for these reasons that I reject completely the proposal in the motion to establish such a committee.

I want to assure the member for Maylands that, despite his coming out of hibernation after two years and realising some of the things that are taking place in Western Australia in respect of worker participation, the matter is really under control. As far as the Government is concerned I want to tell the honourable member there is nothing we will not do to promote and encourage the type of worker participation to which I have referred, because we want to do everything possible to reduce industrial unrest. As a primary objective we want to increase job satisfaction, particularly in the case of monotonous jobs.

It is for those reasons that I dismiss out of hand the comments made by the member for Maylands. I regret that in his hibernation he has overlooked what has taken place. I hope he will not be too disappointed, but I assure him that if he wants any further information on worker participation I will be glad to supply it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Skidmore.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR TAYLOR (Cockburn) [8.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Though no reference is made to it in the Australian Constitution, local government is a vital part of our community organisation. It has regulated and established functions and an integral place as a partner alongside the Australian and the State Governments. It is the Government which is closest to the people and the one with which people feel most able to communicate, and from which they receive the most immediate and tangible response.

Its involvement in the functional processes of our society has over the last 30 years increased at a greater rate and to a greater extent than that of either the Australian or State Governments, a trend generally condoned and certainly not discouraged by the actions of its two larger partners. In fact, the three years of the Whitlam Administration in Canberra saw an unprecedented burgeoning of such involvement by local government in the social, cultural, and recreational welfare of their residents and a consequential growth in activity at grass-roots level.

Local government has been described, rightly, as constitutionally "a creature of the States". However, recent efforts by

both the former Whitlam Government and by local government itself, have sought to give it some recognition, some rights and some degree of autonomy. Since local government is a creature of the States it is to the States that we must look for any changes or improvements to the operations, functions and powers of local authorities. In other words, within this State it is this Parliament which has the responsibility to satisfy itself that its Local Government Act does all that is necessary to allow the vigorous and healthy functioning of the local government bodies within its boundaries.

This Parliament is the only body which can upgrade and update that Act to allow local government to be better able to fulfill the needs and aspirations of those it is empowered to serve.

I believe that all parties represented in this Parliament would reaffirm their belief that local government has a necessary role to play in social organisation, that its importance springs from the immediate, direct contact it enjoys with the community, and the opportunity that is afforded through local government for citizens to participate in decisions affecting them and their community.

It is because the Opposition believes that all those present within this Chamber wholeheartedly accept the aforementioned philosophy that I now move the acceptance of this Bill which contains amendments to electoral procedure and the system of voting for local government elections.

It must be recognised that any system of government and any tier of government within that system must serve the needs of all the people within the system and, therefore, by corollary it follows that it must be representative of all the people in the system. This is not the case with the Local Government Act as it now stands. As members would know, there are residents of communities who are not able directly to participate in elections for their local representatives, while there are others who have a voice in the election of a local representative, though they do not reside within that community. In this latter instance, it is plain that many years ago the framers of the original Act intended that local government representatives be elected to represent property as much as to represent people.

This philosophy is surely unacceptable in this, the twentieth century, and in a nation which prides itself on its democratic institutions.

Currently, the Act also provides for plural voting, a concept so discredited and outmoded that it was discarded in the State elections by some Australian States over a century ago.

As members would know, even amongst local authorities there are different arrangements with regard to the number of

votes which may be controlled by one person. Surely there must be very few societies which tolerate a situation where it is possible for one person to cast a total of eight votes in an election, as is the case, for example, in mayoral contests within the City of Perth.

What an anomaly it must appear to educated and articulate citizens of this country to be advised that though they may, under some circumstances, vote for a councillor to represent them, they may not be entitled to vote in the same council in a deed poll.

All in all, it would seem that within local government, which prides itself on and expounds the philosophy of community involvement and grass-roots participation, in a State which describes itself as vigorous and progressive, in a country believed by its Governments and its people to be a model for the world of democratic institutions, when there is a need to reform the electoral and voting systems of local government that need should be met—especially when all it means is that the voting and electoral systems of one tier government are being brought into line with those of the other two tiers of government.

In accord with the philosophies I have expressed, this Bill proposes three basic changes to the electoral and voting systems.

Firstly, section 45 (1) of the Act says that a person is eligible to be registered on the electoral roll of a municipality as an elector of the municipality if—

- (a) he has attained the age of 18 years;
- (b) he is a natural born or naturalised British subject; and
- (c) he is the owner or occupier of ratable land in the district of the municipality.

Proposed paragraphs (a) and (b) are acceptable, though I have personal reservations with respect to (b) and would not object to some amendment to it, but a change is necessary to paragraph (c).

This Bill, therefore, proposes the repeal of section 45 and its re-enactment in another form.

A new paragraph (c) is added which states that a person is eligible to be registered as an elector of a municipality, if he resides in the district of the municipality and is on the electoral roll compiled under the provisions of the Electoral Act, 1907. The clause has the effect of allowing any person who is on the electoral roll under the State Electoral Act to be able to vote in elections for the municipality in which he lives. At the same time it deletes 12 further paragraphs which set out how various people and bodies corporate may exercise a vote in local authority elections.

As a consequence of the re-enactment of section 45, amendments of a minor nature are proposed to sections 46, 47, 59, 66 and 80; while sections 81 to 84 are repealed in their entirety.

Effectively this amendment removes the ownership of property as a qualification to vote. It also removes plural voting. A Government which some years ago, under the Premiership of Sir David Brand, removed the property qualification for voting for members of the Legislative Council should see the wisdom in this proposition and support it.

The second substantive amendment the Bill proposes is to change the system of voting at elections. Presently, section 119 (1) (f) describes the system of voting as "the preferential system". The Bill proposes to amend section 119 by substituting a provision which reads—

The system of voting at elections held under this Act is that prescribed in this subsection as the first-past-the-post system.

In support of this, section 120 is repealed and re-enacted in a form which sets out the principles which describe the first-past-the-post system.

One can hear, though not necessarily accept, argument against first-past-the-post in the case of State or Federal elections—where the issues and the parties are well defined, well publicised, well known, well understood, and easily identifiable. But the first-past-the-post system has real relevance in a local government election where there are seldom parties and where the issues and policies of the candidate will be less well defined and certainly much less well publicised. In voting for councillors very few electors will have more than one choice—one person they want to vote for one position. In local government elections people are most unlikely to have any down-the-line preferences between the other candidates.

Thus, with the present preferential system there is a grave risk of the will of the electors being severely distorted.

Section 121 is repealed and re-enacted in a form which allows for more than one vote to be cast where there is more than one vacancy to be filled; that is, where there are two, three, four, or more vacancies to be filled. Then an elector may exercise a right to place one or more crosses against the names of candidates, provided the elector does not vote for more candidates than there are vacancies to be filled.

The other change to section 121 is that the vote shall be recorded by marking a cross against the name or names of the candidates, rather than as at present by writing the numbers 1, 2, 3, and so on, next to the names of the candidates which numbers are added together to form totals which then determine the candidate or candidates elected.

Sections 124 and 127 are amended to give effect to the principles outlined in sections 120 and 121.

One or two further points need to be made. Members will readily see the advantages of having all people eligible to vote at State elections also eligible to vote at a local authority election.

I leave members with the following thoughts—

It could well be possible for an elector changing his place of residence to fill in only one card to alter his enrolment for Federal, State and local government elections.

Computerisation would allow for ready identification and preparation of electoral rolls for local authorities, as well as for State and Federal elections. There would be a resultant saving in cost to all concerned and, at the same time, provide local authorities with a constantly up-to-date electoral roll for their areas.

All people would know they had a right to vote and this might well reduce the apathy the community shows in local government elections. It might also assist in reducing the confusion which arises about the right to vote. Here I refer to an item in the "News of the North" under the heading "Shires Differ on Vote for Single Men". The article shows that some confusion exists among the various local authorities in the Pilbara about the right to vote of hundreds of single men living in single men's quarters in that area. The article is well worth perusing, if only because it indicates the confusion there is about the interpretation of some sections of the Local Government Act.

In conclusion, it is perhaps worth reminding members that a major portion of local government finances is now derived from sources other than rates. These sources are likely to continue to grow.

Obviously it is only right that those citizens who contribute through taxation, either directly or indirectly, should have a voice in the way their funds are managed and spent.

The achievement of a real, rather than an illusionary, democracy in local government is necessary if local government is to realise its potential in a modern society and if it is to serve the communities it represents effectively.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Local Government).

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [8.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

It was recently stated that the longer inequities and anomalies persist the more the confidence of the people in the parliamentary system will diminish. Those inequities and anomalies referred to were with respect to the voting position in the State of Western Australia.

This Bill, which I am introducing at this moment, is a most important one. Indeed its introduction is one of historical significance and because that is so it is important to record that this measure is being presented, and has been introduced, by the Opposition—by the Australian Labor Party—and as the shadow Minister for Justice it is my privilege to introduce the measure.

The Australian Labor Party, in Opposition, is the alternative Government and it is our task and obligation—which the Opposition proposes and long since has fulfilled—to let the people know where we stand so that when we become the Government the people will have to a significant extent some knowledge of the legislation which we will bring before them and so that we shall have a mandate to do the things which we do when in Government—not in power, merely in office.

As you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, we have never had power in the State of Western Australia since 1829; we have only been in office. In 38 elections we have suffered 38 losses—draw your own conclusions. Since 1890 there have been 40 years when Labor has been in Government in this State—roughly half the time we have had responsible Government—but we have never yet succeeded in controlling the upper House.

It is remotely possible that we could under the present state of affairs succeed in the upper House, but the possibility is so remote that it is not a practical consideration. The editorial writer of *The West Australian* well knows and realises that that is so and it was because of that fact he made the statement with which I commenced my remarks.

In addition to being here speaking on behalf of the Australian Labor Party Opposition, I am also privileged—and I have been so privileged for many years—to represent over 16 000 people who make up the electorate of Mt. Hawthorn. Those people, as I shall point out shortly, in the circumstances obtaining in this State—which this Bill seeks to rectify—are rated fifteenth-raters; not fifth-raters, or tenth-raters, but fifteenth rate citizens. Those people have been condemned to that situation for many years. The electors of Mt. Hawthorn are not the only people to be down rated; the people in the electorates of Scarborough, Karrinyup, Toodyay, and many others are in the same situation. This Bill seeks to save them from that situation.

As I have said, this is an historical occasion for a number of reasons. It is the first time ever, or in recent years, that an attempt has been made to give the people—that is, all of the people of Western Australia—a one-vote-one-value situation; that is to say, it is the first time that all Western Australian voters will have an equal say in deciding who shall govern the State and in the election of their parliamentary representatives. It will be the first time that an attempt has been made to eliminate the rating of voters, to which I have already referred, down to as low as fifteenth-raters as occurs with some people in the electorates which I have mentioned and in many other electorates.

It is the first time in State politics, since responsible Government in this State, that the whole State will have been treated as one whole and not as a segmented electorate. That is an exceptionally important virtue of this Bill and it excludes, of course, two or three referendums which have been held within this State.

The introduction of this measure represents the first time during this Parliament that a fundamental review of electoral matters affecting all Western Australians directly has been attempted.

It is the first time an attempt has been made for this State to join other comparable countries, including the United States of America with its electoral laws which provide equality for all people irrespective of their geographical location and irrespective of their positions or lack of positions or means or lack of means.

I could go on and list many of the aspects which this Bill will give to this State for the first time, and to which this State is entitled.

It is because of those things which I have outlined that if this Bill, and the two accompanying Bills which can be seen on the notice paper—namely, the Constitution Acts Amendment Bill and the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill—become law, for the first time—the very first time by modern standards—this State as a State will reflect to the world—and it is a small world these days—something resembling electoral justice; something resembling a democracy as the ordinary person in the street understands it.

This measure will give to this State and the people of this Parliament the dignity, maturity, leadership, and pride which they are entitled to and from which no Government has the right to bar them.

I make clear at this stage something which I suppose is obvious enough, but it will preclude further argument. It is understood that one-vote-one-value is not capable of absolute attainment. It can, however, be substantially achieved. The measure also will not achieve the ultimate in democracy. Recent events have made it abundantly apparent to all responsible people—not only lawyers but

people in the street, the people we represent in the Opposition—that one-vote-one-value is not the ultimate in democracy and to think it is is an absurdity. So long as a mere handful of nonelected people or appointed people can make or break Governments, irrespective of the established will of the people, we will not have democracy.

This Bill is merely a step forward, and unfortunately, one must confess that it is an extremely belated step forward. I referred earlier to the people who control the media and who have the competence and the capacity which they exercise from time to time to remove Governments and to see which Governments are elected. Of course, the appointed people to whom I refer are people such as Governors and Governors-General.

As members know, the campaign for electoral justice in Western Australia was initiated by the Australian Labor Party—the progressive party, as distinct from the conservative and reactionary parties of this State. Members will be pleased to know that the campaign is going well; it has gained momentum. As I have indicated, and as members are also aware, it seems to me the Editor of *The West Australian* goes along with certain of the reforms which are so essential to give us something resembling electoral justice. The editorial is dated the 29th March, 1976, and it says—

Council weighting should be no greater than exists for Assembly seats—and both should be broken down.

The editorial referred to a weighting of two-to-one, but really it is a weighting of three-to-one, five-to-one or even more. In some cases this weighting affects thousands of Western Australians. We are not fiddling around with a mere handful of our citizens; we are dealing with many Western Australian people who have pride, dignity, the right to elect Governments and to decide who will represent them. In another part of the editorial we see the following—

The present system of weighting votes might have been appropriate many years ago. Today it is loaded with anomalies and inequities.

Remember this appeared in the editorial of *The West Australian*! The editorial continues—

It badly needs to be corrected—and not by the device of increasing the size of the Parliament which is the way the Court government has gone about boundary changing.

So the campaign for one-vote-one-value is being supported. One needs only to read the Press to see the support which is coming from all directions. In the State of Western Australia, where its people have a concept of what is fair and reasonable, what is equality, and what is equity,

would members not expect those people to write in to express their views? Assuming this present Bill could possibly be defeated, because of the public support for electoral reform, proportional representation legislation will be passed by this Parliament because the conservative forces will resist only to a certain point. When the pressure becomes heavy enough, even those forces relent. Right throughout history that has always been the case—there is nothing new about it.

The fight ultimately will be won, but it will be a long battle. Let us make it abundantly clear that we on this side of the House do not introduce this legislation to achieve an unfair advantage. If members sitting opposite work out their sums, they will see that the measure would not give the Opposition an advantage. What it does do is to go very close to achieving equality—nothing more than a fair go for all Western Australians.

I do not think one needs to be too righteous to comment that it is nothing less than a tragedy that such obvious reforms should take so long to achieve. This has happened throughout history. We have an obligation in this place, whether we like it or not, to do something about reforms when the time is ripe and right. That is what we are attempting to do with this Bill and the accompanying Bills.

Mr Sodeman: Are you advocating that regardless of the size of an electorate?

Mr O'Neill: You haven't explained the Bill yet.

Mr BERTRAM: We have had regard for the size of electorates. As to what is in the Bill, that is very evident if one merely turns over one or two pages.

Mr O'Neill: You have made one reference to proportional representation but you have not told us what is in the Bill.

Mr BERTRAM: This is a Bill which largely tells its own story, and it was for this reason that it was placed on the notice paper before the Bill to amend the Constitution Act.

Mr O'Neill: I thought you were supposed to explain it.

Mr Taylor: It must have given you some food for thought already.

Mr O'Neill: He has mentioned proportional representation once.

Mr BERTRAM: Coming back to my theme, we may provoke, procrastinate, and just by sheer inefficiency and neglect—and the Minister is culpable in these areas—we can fall down on the job we ought to do to be worthy of our salt. The tragedy is that in certain sections of the community our laws are well known. The people concerned know how poor they are and how far they fall short of equality. People who have such knowledge can persuade Governments and others towards certain courses but refrain from doing so in order to feather their own nests.

I would like to cite the example of the reform contained last year in the amendment to the Constitution Act which gave clergymen and ministers of religion the right, for the first time in this State, to become members of Parliament. In other words this gave them equality, nothing more nor less, with all the other people of the State in this matter. It took at least three attempts over a period exceeding 25 years to achieve that reform. Let us assume that when Mrs Cardell-Oliver—as I think she then was—introduced a Bill to achieve that purpose something like 25 years ago, the time was not ripe for such a shattering amendment. Even assuming that, the time has been ripe for many years, yet it was only last year that the amendment was carried by this Parliament. That reflects very little credit on this place.

One of the objects of this Bill is to reflect greater credit on the Parliament. We know the position here is unfair, even if some of the folk outside, because of busyness, ignorance, or apathy, do not really know it. We have the knowledge, or, if we like to express it in legal terms, we have notice of it, and therefore we have an obligation to do something about it. Of course, what was really a minor amendment to the Constitution Act was introduced by the Opposition, the Australian Labor Party, and not by the Government.

Now there are those who believe that reforms of the kind envisaged by this Bill—that is to say, reforms of a fundamental nature—should be initiated by the Government of the day and all the members of the Opposition subscribe to that viewpoint. We believe that such reforms are Government business—if they are not, then they should be. What Government, I ask, has ever been elected in Western Australia except for the purpose of achieving objectives of that type? This present Government, as you are well aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, and as are all members in this Chamber and in another place, was elected on the promise that it would put things right.

Mr Rushton: It has certainly done that.

Mr BERTRAM: That promise had the unmistakable ring about it that it would apply to matters of a fundamental nature and not merely superficial ones.

Mr Hartrey: I wouldn't say too much about that promise. That promise has never been fulfilled in any respect.

Mr BERTRAM: I will have to disagree with my colleague because I propose to talk about this matter at length in the next few months. It may be said that the Court Government did not really mean its promise, and its lack of performance points to that probability. However, the promise was made, and it was accepted by many people—certainly not all of them but sufficient to require the Government to deliver the goods. It has not done this so

far. The people have had the Court Government since 1974—and members will know what I mean by the word “had”—and look at the record it has set. It has increased taxes and charges—by whatever name they are called—and the Government has saddled all the people of the State with these increases.

Mr Sibson: What about postage and telephone charges?

Mr BERTRAM: One could talk about this Government in many ways—its mal-performance, secrecy, humbug, and procrastination. However, this is not the time to do so, nor do I have the time to do so. It is appropriate however to mention in relation to a measure of this kind that the Government, aided and abetted by the Country Party, as presently operating here, has made more than four excursions into the Constitution Act and electoral legislation. I doubt whether, on any one of those occasions, the Government had sought or obtained any specific mandate from the people. What I think we should properly ask is: What were these excursions in aid of or whom were they in aid of?

Mr O’Neil: We do not have a mandate to support this Bill either—do you think we ought to defeat it?

Mr BERTRAM: I have already pointed out that most certainly the Government has a mandate to support it. The question is: Were these various excursions performed for the advancement and betterment of the people or for some other purpose? Some of them clearly were proper pieces of legislation, but let us look at three of them. Firstly, we saw the amendment to the Constitution Act to increase the Ministry by the appointment of a Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet. Where was the mandate for that?

Mr O’Neil: Where was the Ministry increased in that?

Mr BERTRAM: That is a good technical point.

Mr O’Neil: My word!

Mr BERTRAM: I accept that the Ministry was not really increased, but for all practical purposes it was.

How did that amendment to the law assist the people? It was designed and tailor-made for the benefit of one person and, quite typically, the Government refrained from telling us for whom it was designed.

Mr O’Neil: Would a Government of your colour abolish the position?

Mr BERTRAM: I will go into that in a minute. There was no mandate for the Government to take this action, and it was designed for one person. We were not told who it was, but that did not matter; usually the Government does not tell us.

In this case, all members knew whose benefit it was for, and that was for whose benefit in fact it transpired to be. I refer of course to the member for Scarborough. The donor was the Government of Western Australia, through the pockets of the taxpayers of Western Australia. That was the first excursion into the Constitution, and the Electoral Districts Act. The Government put that as a priority above a Bill of this kind.

Let us have a look at the second excursion, because this manifests the position in which the Government stands and the position into which the Opposition is forced. The second excursion in effect was to meet the Deputy Premier’s objection and sought to increase the Ministry a second time.

Mr O’Neil: How can we increase it a second time when you admitted we did not increase it a first time?

Mr BERTRAM: If the Minister for Works listens, he will understand.

Mr O’Neil: I have been listening for 20 minutes, and I have not understood a word yet! You have not said a thing about the Bill.

Mr BERTRAM: I do not see why the Minister should condemn himself; I am not going to. I simply ask: Where and when, if ever, did the Government ask for or receive a mandate to do that? The Government when in Opposition said it would put things right and the inescapable inference from that was that it would put things right with the machine as it was—not build a completely new automobile to do a higher speed, not picking up jobs for the boys in the process.

I regret to mention the third excursion, but it is highly relevant to my remarks. I refer to the occasion when the Government introduced Bills to amend the electoral boundaries last year. Members will recall how the Premier, with a display of showmanship which even Houdini could not have emulated, unfolded a map over yonder in this place; members will recall the crooked line signifying the boundary of the metropolitan area.

Mr Sibson: Where would you have drawn the line?

Mr BERTRAM: If the member for Bunbury had listened, he would know. What right did the Government have to tamper with the rigged boundaries as they then existed, and to re-rig them? It had no mandate to take such action.

As I have already mentioned, in this regard I have the illustrious support of the editorial of *The West Australian* of the 29th March. As members will be very well aware, that newspaper is not the type of publication generally recognised as one which supports our side of the political spectrum.

Mr Sibson: That knocks your theory a little, does it not?

Mr BERTRAM: I would have thought it added greater weight to my theory and, if the member for Bunbury reflects upon it for a moment, he will come to the same conclusion.

All these instances of tampering with the Constitution and the Electoral Districts Act were headlined and aggravated once again by something which happened earlier this session. The Opposition moved an amendment to the Address-in-Reply relating to the principle of one-vote-one-value for the purpose of having a worthwhile debate on the matter.

A number of Opposition members took part in the debate, but members will recall that not one member from the Government side spoke—or was permitted to speak—to our amendment. I do not know whether they were refused permission; that is for people who know a little about this place and the people in it to make a determination. Down came the authoritarian list of force and by the oppression of numbers the amendment was swept out. That was a manifestation of irresponsible Parliaments, if ever an example was to be seen.

So, there we have the sequence of events through this Parliament, where the Government has not faced up, delivered the goods and governed. I mention those points because as I have already said Bills of a fundamental nature affecting such things as the votes of people should be introduced by Governments, and not by the Opposition. Since the Government has neglected, failed and refused to do so, the Opposition brings in this Bill and the ones which will follow.

The reasons the conservative forces act in this way are very well known, but it is appropriate once again to put them on the record. They have a vested interest in the maintenance of the status quo.

Mr Sibson: In the interests of the people.

Mr BERTRAM: That is why they are called conservatives—they are people conserving everything as it is. They say, "We are happy, so blow you Jack" or, as the Premier would say, "Blow you, Joe". The Premier always likes me to remind him of his affection for the people out in the streets, and I thought this to be an appropriate occasion to do so.

The conservatives have a vested interest in the retention of power which has never slipped from their grasp since 1829. We have been here nearly 150 years, and power has always ultimately rested in their hands.

Then there are the individual conservatives lined up opposite who, though pretending to have a conscience on such monumental issues as liquor legislation and daylight saving, suddenly lose their conscience on the fundamental issue of

electoral justice. I would hope this conscience and free vote concept may be given fair and plenty of play in respect of this Bill. There are many other categories of people who resist this sort of change, but I do not propose to go into the details at this stage.

The great alleged defence of the opposition to this measure is the one of geographic disadvantage, and remoteness—remoteness of the people from the centre, which is to say the city. Substantially, that is a sham and a superficial defence. Having made that statement, let me provide some facts to support it.

Mr Sodeman: Obviously, you have not taken much notice of the comments of Arthur Bickerton, Harry Strickland and Arthur Moir.

Mr BERTRAM: I do not know who all those people are. Perhaps if the honourable member would speak more clearly I would be able to answer his interjection.

Mr Sodeman: They were previous Labor members of Parliament.

Sir Charles Court: Not only were they previous Labor members; they were also Labor Ministers.

Mr BERTRAM: And very excellent ones, too, now that I recall them; I appreciate the assistance of members opposite. The Premier, like the media, is always full of praise for our Ministers when they are out of office or dead, but never before.

Mr Young: I remember statements you made last year about Killen, and now you think he is a hero.

Mr BERTRAM: In connection with this alleged defence of the electoral boundaries—namely, that it is for the benefit of people who live in the country and the mining areas, and those who are in certain respects at a disadvantage because of remoteness—I put these questions: Was the concern of the Government for the people in the country manifested when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition a short while ago was trying to assist the people in the country by drawing the Government's attention to a typographical error in a measure before the House, and which any respectable forum would have permitted him to amend? No; he was not permitted to amend it, and his efforts to do something for the people in remote circumstances in the rural areas were frustrated. Members opposite remember that instance only too well.

Mr O'Neil: Something similar happened the other night.

Mr BERTRAM: That was the measure of the concern shown by the conservatives who lined up opposite to frustrate an attempt made on behalf of people in remote areas.

Where is the concern of the Government for the people in the country seen in its continuing suppression of the SGIO report,

which we discussed here the other day? The Government has one standard there, one standard for voting, a different standard when a legitimate attempt is made in this House to do something for the country people and another standard when it comes to its attitude to the electoral districts and malapportionment.

Is the concern of the Government for the people in the country to be seen when it introduces legislation one day and, for all practical purposes, requires it to be debated the next? For example, when a Bill of this nature comes before the House which requires some consideration from the people affected—say, the Kimberley—how can I be expected in only 24 hours to obtain instructions from them as to their attitude towards the Bill?

The Government is not concerned with people who live in remote areas. The Government has a double standard, a double-tongued approach, of which the Minister for Labour and Industry was speaking earlier today.

Is the concern of the Government for the people in the country to be seen when it increases the number of members in the Parliament by six, and gives not one of those six seats to the people in the remote areas?

Mr Sibson: You are contradicting yourself now because your intention is to cut down their representation.

Mr BERTRAM: I do not propose to cut down their representation.

Mr Sibson: That is what you are trying to do.

Mr BERTRAM: Has the honourable member read the Bill?

Mr O'Neill: You have not explained one word about your Bill, and it proposes to amend the parent Act!

Sir Charles Court: What about letting the Parliament know what is in it?

Mr BERTRAM: The Premier now is trying to fix to me his own demeanour in this place—that of secrecy—but it will not work.

Mr O'Neill: Well, tell us what is in the Bill!

Mr BERTRAM: Members opposite are well aware that this Bill relates to proportional representation. People in remote areas will have not one member, not two members but—

Mr O'Neill: That is the first time you have said what is the purpose of the Bill.

Mr BERTRAM: The Minister is a little impatient tonight. Perhaps he is tired because of the actions of the Minister for Labour and Industry, who paraded himself around the Chamber earlier today.

Mr Sibson: At least the audience were interested in that.

Mr BERTRAM: His contribution was great! It is an old trick for interjectors to interject for the purpose of causing the speaker to get off the track and forget the good points he is making.

Sir Charles Court: Is that why you interject so often?

Mr BERTRAM: I do not propose to abandon the good points because of a puerile interjection

Mr O'Neill: You have not dealt with the Bill.

Mr BERTRAM: Where was the concern of the Government when it created six extra seats—four in the Assembly and two in another place—last year in a coalition Government comprising some members of the National Country Party? That is a party which is supposed to be representing remote areas but it is not entitled to one of those extra seats. In that respect there is one standard, and there is another standard for voting.

Is the concern of the Government for people in remote areas the same as its airline policy, when it prevented TAA from introducing a better and an extra service in the north? When I was up there recently I was deluged with complaints about this matter. There was no concern by the Government about the people in remote areas, but allegedly it has extraordinary concern for the rights of the people in the north when it comes to voting. It adopts a double standard, or a two-tongue standard as the Minister said. I prefer to regard it as a double standard as that would be more meaningful.

Is the concern of the Government for the people in the country seen by the split with the Country Party and the substitution of the true Country Party men by the interpolaters? Is the concern of the Government for the people in the country evidenced by the refusal of the Government for the appointment of a Royal Commission, as proposed by the member for Geraldton, which was designed to get to grips with many problems in remote and country areas?

Mr Sodeman: He said that if a Royal Commission were agreed to it would not assist. He said State and Federal Governments could not assist very much.

Mr BERTRAM: As I recall it, that motion was designed, among other things, to inquire into and to do something about excessive prices of goods and services in the north and in country areas. There is something wrong with their arithmetic where one shopkeeper sells an article for \$10 more than the shopkeeper down the street for the same article. When I was up north recently somebody explained to me the secret of her success in business; and this woman was engaged in the business of selling dresses. She said her secret

was that she did not charge her customers the freight cost, and she convinced herself that she did not.

Mr Laurance: Is that in the Bill?

Mr BERTRAM: What about the huge price of liquor at Kununurra? The Premier is aware of that huge cost. Furthermore, there is lack of air-conditioning in the schools and public buildings in remote areas. What has the Premier done about that? In 1976 little children up north are literally being fried in the classrooms. There is one standard in that regard, and another standard for voting. That is the alleged advance we have been hearing about. There is a lack of adequate staff in various centres from Derby to Wyndham, and in Government institutions of one sort or another. There is a lack of housing for that staff; and there is a lack of good roads, and so on, and so forth.

Mr Laurance: This is an excellent case for representation of the country so as to get over those difficulties.

Mr BERTRAM: This is a case for better Government by better representation. As I have established, the alleged concern of the Government about the country and remote areas is substantially another sham.

Mr Sodeman: It is genuine. There is no better alternative. The member for Geraldton invited that to be done.

Mr BERTRAM: It seems that the member for Pilbara is satisfied that the people in the Pilbara electorate should have their votes substantially diluted compared with the votes of people in adjacent electorates. If the member for Pilbara is content he should tell those people about that in the next few months so that they will know where he stands. He should not tell them something else.

Sir Charles Court: You should realise that if we on this side were not paying you the courtesy of listening you would not have a quorum.

Mr BERTRAM: That does not distress me.

Sir Charles Court: It should.

Mr BERTRAM: The Premier should realise that in the mother of Parliaments the members are not set up in the Chamber like little nigger boys.

Mr O'Neill: Tell us what is in the Bill.

Mr BERTRAM: The honourable member should not be putting forward such pettifogging comments.

Mr O'Neill: Tell us in simple terms what the Bill contains, and tell us the short title for a start.

Mr BERTRAM: We on this side of the House and many other people are aware of the difficulties encountered as a result of remoteness and similar circumstances. We are also aware of the facilities that

are available, thanks to the technological advances in 1976, which were not available in 1906 and which were not dreamt of at that time. We believe that members should be given added facilities and that in this regard there should be no stinting.

On that point the important thing to remember is that voting primarily has to do with the selection of Governments and with the selection of parliamentary representatives. It is true that the parish pumping and other work in the electorate is important, but such work does not take precedence over the real point of voting; namely, the selection and election of Governments and of parliamentary representatives.

Furthermore, let us remember that under the Bill before us the upper House will still have 32 members. However, instead of having 16 provinces—it was 15 provinces but the 1975 Bill increased it to 16 provinces—there will be one province, and that will be for the State of Western Australia, just as in a sense we have in Senate elections. That is for the whole State. So, in a sense the people in the north will have 32 representatives in the upper House and not two representatives.

Mr Shalders: Will those members have unrestricted travel to any part of the State?

Mr Jamieson: Will the member for Murray restrict them?

Mr Shalders: It is not my view.

Mr Jamieson: It is a matter of Government decision, and not implemented by legislation.

Mr Shalders: I understand that every senator in this State has unrestricted travel.

Mr Jamieson: That is by Government decision and not by legislation.

Mr BERTRAM: The member for Stirling has expressed views similar to those expressed by *The West Australian*. He is a supporter of proportional representation of a kind.

Mr Stephens: Not on a State-wide basis.

Mr BERTRAM: That is correct. We have heard this being circulated in different parts of the State at different times. Proportional representation for the upper House will surely come, but it may take some time before we get to the stage of having one province only, unless the Bill before us is passed in the form in which it has been presented.

After the transitional stage, each three years 16 members of the upper House will be elected for six years, as is provided under the present law. The voting in the Bill is designed to be of the optional preference variety. Instead of voting for individual persons, the voters will be required to vote for groups of persons; in other words, they will be asked to vote for teams, thus eliminating the need currently applicable to the Senate to vote

for huge numbers of candidates on the one ballot paper. As we know from experience this is too complicated, and it also makes for too many informal votes being cast. Furthermore it causes the introduction of bogus parties at election times. The experience of such a proportional system of voting, as proposed in the Bill and which is very similar to the law introduced by Mr Don Dunstan in South Australia, has been very good and the informal votes cast in that State have been very small in number. One might even say the informal votes in South Australia have been at an acceptable low level.

The groups to which I have referred may be made up of political parties and of such other persons as desire to coalesce for this purpose. It proposes that casual vacancies in the Legislative Council will not be filled through by-elections and the replacement will serve the balance of the term of the member being replaced. Each group will be identified by a letter of the alphabet in the order which each group decides upon by notifying the appropriate person.

Mr O'Neil: You said that vacancies would not be filled through by-elections.

Mr BERTRAM: That is right.

Mr O'Neil: How will they be filled?

Mr BERTRAM: I will deal with that aspect in a moment. The groups will be listed horizontally on the ballot paper, and the position of each group will be determined by lot. Groups comprising two or more persons will be positioned to the left, and groups comprising a single candidate will be positioned to the right. All that follows the South Australian procedure.

The method to be followed in the scrutiny of votes is set out clearly in the Bill. Once the first preferences have been counted, each group which has gained less than the prescribed number of votes is excluded and each of the ballot papers will be distributed according to the preferences of the groups which have achieved the prescribed number of votes.

What is to be the prescribed number? It is half the number obtained by dividing the number of first preferences cast by the number of candidates to be elected, and adding one to the resultant quotient.

The returning officer then determines the quota for that election and that is done by dividing the total of the first preference votes that have been received by all the continuing groups by one more than the number of candidates to be elected and adding one to that quota. As each quota is achieved, a member of the group is elected in the order that such person appears in that group.

If the number of candidates to be elected do not obtain a quota a member of the group for the next largest fraction of a quota is elected.

The point raised by the Deputy Premier is one on which I will touch in one of the other Bills, but, briefly, the position is that under proportional representation the only way vacancies can be filled is by the two Houses of Parliament sitting at a joint session. If the House is not sitting, then it is done by the Governor and, of course, when the vacancy is filled by the Governor that appointment has to be confirmed or otherwise shortly after the commencement of the next sitting of the Parliament.

Mr Jamieson: In this case it would be the next person listed on the original ballot paper, I take it.

Mr BERTRAM: I think that may well be so.

Mr O'Neil: That is not adopting the Tasmanian system of a recount.

Mr Jamieson: No.

Mr BERTRAM: In closing, I want to underline the real fairness of this Bill. It is not a Bill which has been doctored, tailored, organised, sponsored, or anything else for the purpose of giving to the ALP an unfair advantage. It is not designed for that purpose at all. A little bit of arithmetic will indicate that, and perhaps at a later stage in the debate—in reply—I will demonstrate that fairly adequately to all members.

We are a society which believes in equality. We are an egalitarian society or, more correctly, we are heading in that direction. I see nothing particularly wrong with that, but, consistent with that type of concept, so our voting should be equal.

I have on previous occasions in debates here on related subjects quoted some of the extraordinarily fine words of the then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the USA about the need for equality in voting and, as I have said earlier, the fact that people should not be mixed up and measured according to their colour, creed, means, or lack of means, or any other thing. They are people no matter where they reside or who they are, and that concept is portrayed fairly and squarely in this Bill.

It is worth while remembering, is it not, that the Don Dunstan legislation to which I referred was ultimately supported not only by the Liberal Movement, but also by the Liberal Party, so-called, in South Australia? Therefore those on the Government side here who are a little timid—as by tradition conservatives always are—can take some heart from that situation; namely, that in South Australia their brethren have supported a Bill which in so many respects is identical to the Bill before us tonight.

As I have said, it is a shame that it should be 1976, no less, that we set about bringing in this measure which is long overdue. It should have been introduced a

decade or more ago. I do hope that members opposite will spare us all the rigmarole about what a Labor Government did in 1901 and what a Labor Government, led by a Premier long since dead, did in 1933, with electoral boundaries. We are talking about 1976 and we on this side of the House do not wish to be trammelled by other people's out-of-date concepts, which, at that time, might well have been appropriate. They are not appropriate now.

There is no reason for us to condemn our State any longer in the eyes of the world, and the purpose of this Bill is worthy. There is no hidden or secret intention about it at all and for these reasons I commend it to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr O'Neill (Minister for Works).

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [9.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a companion Bill to the Electoral Act Amendment Bill. It constitutes the whole State into one single electorate; that is to say, one province. It provides that in 1977, 17 members will be elected to replace the 15 who are retiring. On the 21st May, 1980, 16 will retire; that is, the 15 elected in 1974 and the one elected last in 1977. Thereafter 16 will be elected every three years as the present laws require.

Casual vacancies in the Legislative Council will be filled by joint sittings of both Houses, as intimated a few moments ago. If Parliament is not in session, they will be filled by the Governor subject to confirmation or otherwise by the Parliament within a given limited time. If a vacancy occurs between the 1st January and the 21st May in the year in which that seat will have been vacated by the effluxion of time, that vacant seat by this Bill is deemed not to be a casual vacancy but one vacated by the effluxion of time.

If after this Act becomes law a seat is vacated other than by effluxion of time, and there is not sufficient time in which to hold an election to fill it—that is, between the time the vacancy occurs and the coming into operation of the Act—then if the retiring member's term ends in 1977 his or her place will be filled at the next general election or if his or her term ends in 1980 then his or her place will be filled by the Parliament. If Parliament is not in session, the place will be filled by the Governor, subject to confirmation or otherwise by the Parliament within a given limited time.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr O'Neill (Minister for Works).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MR TAYLOR (Cockburn) [9.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks to amend the Local Government Act in one particular only—by a slight amendment to section 161 entitling all municipal employees to long service leave after serving a continuous period of satisfactory service with any number of local government authorities. This is in contrast to the present situation where the continuous service must be with the one employing authority.

It is a measure which is available to local government employees in other States of Australia; has been sought in this State for a number of years; has been promised by at least one Minister for Local Government, but at this stage has still not been provided. I believe that local government employees should wait no longer to obtain this benefit.

Despite a lengthening history of efforts to have the situation rectified, local government employees claim that they are deprived of the right in long service leave now common to their counterparts elsewhere. Having chosen their careers, employees in local government must simultaneously accept that their progress in that field is largely contingent on their willingness to seek transfers as they become more qualified and experienced. Yet, as the Act now stands, to do so calls for sacrifice of their entitlement to long service leave which is currently not portable between authorities. I understand there are instances where members with many years of service in the public interest have never enjoyed such leave, and others who now never will before retirement.

I know it will be recognised by all members that in pursuing a local government career, an employee must move from one local government employer to another in order to gain a more diversified experience in the operations of local government, and to obtain promotion. It is possible to gain experience and promotion by remaining in some municipalities, but these are the exception, and specialists, such as building surveyors, health surveyors, engineers, and shire clerks, generally speaking, have no avenue for advancement other than by moving.

A survey conducted during 1972 by an association representing municipal officers, showed that 59 per cent of all officers in local government had been employed by more than one municipality and of these 28 per cent had been employed by three or more municipalities. Whilst this mobility is advantageous to the officers in

the advancement of their careers, it must also be of great advantage to local government in Western Australia as it puts a broad wealth of experience at the disposal of councils. In fact, local authorities assist in promoting this mobility by regularly advertising for, and accepting in their employment, officers who have a wide range of experience, experience which they could have obtained only by mobility.

The above survey covered officers ranging from almost no service to those with over 40 years of service to local government. Leaving aside those with less than 10 years' service, who would not normally be eligible for long service leave, of the remainder, 52 per cent were not then eligible for long service leave. It was found that it was not uncommon for officers with more than 20 years' continuous service to local government to have had no long service leave and many of these would have to serve a further six or seven years with their current employer before becoming eligible. It must be agreed that this situation is not equitable.

There is substantial precedent for the acceptance of the amendment now put forward in this Bill. Portability occurs in the municipal officers (Queensland) long service leave award, 1966; the municipal and shire councils administrative and clerical staff award New South Wales; the South Australian Local Government Act; and in December, 1974, the Victorian Government amended its Act to provide transferability within any municipality or Public Service in Victoria.

These decisions show that in these four States the concept of local government being a career industry is recognised in a positive manner. In the words of the South Australian Local Government Act, all four pieces of legislation provide that "where an employee of a council has previously been in employment of another council, that former employment is continuous with his present employment. Any period of that former employment in respect of which long service leave or payment in lieu thereof has not been received by the employee, shall be taken into account in assessing the long service leave or payment in lieu thereof, (if any) to which the employee may be entitled."

As mentioned previously, the representatives of employees can point to a long history of negotiations to have this measure implemented. Special efforts have now been made over a period of at least five years. In 1974 the then Minister for Local Government agreed to amend the Act to provide transferability and in fact wrote "... I have resolved after reference with the Local Government Association and the Country Shire Councils Association, to accede to your association's request. Accordingly, the proposal will be included in the proposed amendments of the Local Government Act later this

year." Only a change of Government shortly thereafter precluded this amendment being moved.

Mr Rushton: Are you sure of your facts?

Mr TAYLOR: Yes. I have a copy of the letter. I will pass a copy to the Minister if he likes, although he will find one on his file if he looks.

Approaches have been made to the present Minister from time to time over the past two years, but without a finite result, unless doing nothing is a finite result.

Other members of this House may have received correspondence from constituents of theirs, as I did, with respect to this matter. As employees of local government, the writers claimed it to be a recognised fact that for career opportunities and broad experience it was necessary for them to accept some transfer between authorities as a matter of course. Yet in doing so, they pointed out that they had to surrender their right to accrual of long service leave. They would have claimed in their correspondence to members that they considered it inequitable that although portability of entitlement exists elsewhere, long-standing efforts to obtain the same benefit in Western Australia had met with continuous obstruction and frustration.

Members now have the opportunity to remedy this situation. Two examples of the inequity referred to bear mentioning. The first, an officer employed by the Geraldton Council from 1963 to 1970, a period of seven years, transferred to the Shire of Exmouth to take up a senior position as assistant shire clerk, but in so doing forfeited his accrued long service leave entitlement; that is, seven years towards a 10-year qualifying period.

A second officer began his career in May, 1961, as junior clerk, Shire of Wyalkatchem, but in October, 1962, accepted promotion to senior clerk, Shire of Quairading. In May, 1964, some 19 months later, he accepted the position of assistant shire clerk, Shire of Nungarin, where he remained for 5½ years. He then moved into the more senior position of shire clerk supervisor, Shire of Marble Bar, for a further 2½ years. The said gentleman then accepted a lower appointment in order that he could complete studies towards higher qualifications in his chosen field and joined the Shire of Lake Grace as an assistant shire clerk before subsequently taking up a further appointment in the north. The officer concerned has now been in local government for 14 years and two months, and because long service leave is not transferable between local authorities, has never been entitled to receive any remuneration from any local authority, by way of either a gratuity or *pro rata* long service leave. Yet each local authority, other than the first, where he served for 16 months, would have received the benefit of previous

experience by appointing him to a promotional position within its service. In fact by advertising for staff for promotional positions the local authorities concerned must have expected to attract staff away from another authority.

As I mentioned, this amendment is short and to the point. It has apparently been found necessary or desirable in at least two other States to establish separate Acts wherein the various terms and conditions of portability, particularly with regard to the method of meeting contributions required of the various local authorities in which service has been provided, have been incorporated. However, I believe many of these features can be arranged by regulation.

In any case, I would in no way be offended if the Bill were not acceptable to the Government in its present form, provided there was a guarantee by the Government to replace this Bill with another which also accepted the principle of portability under similar conditions to those in other States.

I believe local government employees have a well established right to this condition of employment, and commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Local Government).

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [10.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is the third Bill which is required to bring about a form of proportional representation for the upper House—the Legislative Council—otherwise known as “the other place”, to accomplish something approaching electoral justice; in other words, the one-vote-one-value principle. The Bill constitutes the whole State as one province and not 16 segments, as the law now provides. We want a unified State.

Fraser, according to a recent pronouncement, wants co-operation where one helps the other and all help the country. This Bill is aimed in that direction. We, the Parliament, can provide the kind of leadership which Fraser says he wants.

Mr Rushton: Who is the “Fraser” you are referring to?

MR BERTRAM: If I may digress for a moment, it is interesting to note his remarks because they seem to be in complete conflict with the ethic of competition which is said to be espoused by the Government and which I am under the impression the Premier thinks he himself personifies. What Fraser had to say seems to contain an admission that the system of competition is not working out and we

must head for something a little superior. It appears from his words he is thinking in terms of co-operation, a somewhat more mature approach to a solution of the problems of mankind.

The Bill does not reduce the number of members. The law now provides for 32 members and the Bill makes no change to that situation. There will still be 32 members but they will represent one province. There will not be 32 members for 16 provinces. In effect, all 32 will represent not only the whole State but also each and every single person in it.

Mr Coyne: They will locate themselves in Perth and you will never see them out in the country.

MR BERTRAM: Any member, group of members, or party which neglects any people in any area will do so at its own risk, and that is fair enough. If the conservative people centre their representatives in Perth and neglect the people in the country, as they now do, the people in the country will tell them so through the ballot box with an equal vote from time to time. Quite clearly, parties would quickly seize upon the position. They would organise themselves and see to it that everybody got a fair deal, and the competition to which I referred would be on; but I think at least it would be a somewhat wholesome variety of competition.

Every person will have 32 members to whom to refer, not two members. There is nothing particularly new about that because, for the purpose of Senate elections, Western Australia is in effect one province. This is not a new departure. There is a precedent for this Parliament, if in fact it needs a precedent. In South Australia the Australian Labor Party Government, led by Don Dunstan, with the co-operation of the Liberal Movement and, I think ultimately and reluctantly, of the Liberal Party—the conservatives there—has achieved one-vote-one-value by the system envisaged in this and the accompanying Bills.

There is no reason of which I am aware that we in this Parliament should deprive the people of Western Australia of the benefits which are accruing currently to the people of South Australia under the Dunstan legislation to which I have referred. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr O’Neil (Minister for Works).

NUCLEAR PRODUCTS

Examining Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 12th May, on the following motion by Mr A. R. Tonkin—

That the House condemns the suggestion that Western Australia should be involved in the re-processing of nuclear fuel or that this State should

become a dumping ground for nuclear waste from overseas. The House is of this opinion because of—

(1) The extreme and often unquantifiable dangers to the people from such an industry including carcinogenesis and genetic mutations;

(2) The likelihood of the introduction of terrorist groups to Western Australia because of the value for their purposes of plutonium 239;

(3) The inability of technology to provide adequately for environmental safeguard.

The House further affirms that it will not be discharging its obligations to the safety and welfare of the public unless it establishes a committee to examine the consequences of such an industry and reports its findings to the Parliament and hence to the people at an early date.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [10.11 p.m.]: On the last occasion on which I spoke to this motion, I sought leave to continue my remarks at a later date, and I admit that I had a rather scanty knowledge of actually what was meant by reprocessing of the waste material which Japan sought to send to this country, and probably to Western Australia. I have been fortunate indeed as I was able to use the time at my disposal to bring myself reasonably up to date with most of the problems that have beset Britain's nuclear processors. Looking at their problems, we in this country certainly do not want those problems blessed upon us.

In London, a public meeting was called on the 15th January of this year to discuss whether or not British Nuclear Fuels Limited should seek further contracts for the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuels. The debate was addressed by the principal speaker, Mr Ailday, the Managing Director of British Nuclear Fuel Limited, Mr Peter Mummery, general manager of that company, and Mr Patterson of the Friends of the Earth Ltd. I will refer to the speakers later.

In the first instance I would like to read one small paragraph from Mr Ailday's opening address as this puts very simply the position regarding the treatment of these wastes as it affects those in England, and of course, the operations at the Windscale retreatment plant. He said—

Firstly, by overseas reprocessing we mean bringing into this country irradiated fuel elements for chemical treatment to separate and purify the contained uranium and plutonium from the radioactive fission products which have been formed during their period in the reactor.

I make no further comment because that paragraph—and do not forget this address was made to people who were not scientists or physicists but everyday people gathered together for this particular debate—by its sheer simplicity gives us a clear understanding of what the matter is all about. I will come back to that in a few minutes.

I would like to deal now with some of the remarks made by the Premier. During the earlier debate I said something to the Premier along the lines that he was so far away from the original motion that it was not even funny. Every time he gets up to speak to an issue, he comes back continually to the fact that the Opposition is attempting to stultify progress and that we do not want talks to take place or anything to do with those who wish to visit this country to talk about uranium processing, mining development, or nuclear energy.

Sir Charles Court: You understood me perfectly.

Mr SKIDMORE: I could not believe such hogwash could come from the Premier, because that had nothing whatever to do with the motion we are debating.

Sir Charles Court: I'll say it does—it has everything to do with it unfortunately.

Mr SKIDMORE: The motion states that we are concerned at the reprocessing of nuclear fuel in this country—that is what we are concerned with. At no time did we state we were opposed to uranium talks, and I will amplify that comment later because it is very pertinent as to whether or not we in this country, like the people in Britain such as those to whom I have referred including the General Manager of British Nuclear Fuels Limited, are aware of all the ramifications of this proposal. The general manager of that firm expressed strong doubts about whether or not his company is doing the right thing. So surely we are allowed to be concerned about the treatment of nuclear waste here.

By way of interjection Mr Barnett asked why this disposal plant should not be in Japan and the Premier replied—

The honourable member is just mouthing words he has taken out of the newspapers. No-one is talking about having a plant in Western Australia at this stage.

Sir Charles Court: No-one is talking about the waste being here.

Mr SKIDMORE: We are.

Sir Charles Court: Well, why do you want to make up these things?

Mr SKIDMORE: I would like to quote in brief from an article which appeared in the Press on the 2nd May. It reads—

Mr Tamaki told the Tokyo correspondent storage of fissionable waste in WA was one factor which would decide whether Japan brought the whole cycle-package to Australia.

Just let us pause to look at the significance of that remark. What the gentleman is saying in essence is that it is a package deal and he will talk to Australia, and in particular Western Australia, about uranium. What he said in no uncertain terms is that we accept reprocessing or we do not get anything.

Sir Charles Court: Who said that?

Mr SKIDMORE: That can be checked, if the Premier wishes to, by going to the unions concerned. He should check what 54 000 Japanese unionists said at their conference regarding the question of asking any nation to reprocess nuclear waste from Japan. I would like the Premier to see what these responsible people said about it. That should be well known to the Premier, or if it is not, it is about time he used some of that unlimited knowledge he challenged the member for Morley with the other night in regard to nuclear devices, power houses, and everything else.

Sir Charles Court: I never said I had unlimited knowledge.

Mr SKIDMORE: The Premier did say that; he said that when he was Minister for Industrial Development he gained a tremendous knowledge in this field because he wanted to do a good job in that portfolio.

Sir Charles Court: I emphasised on a laymen's level, which is different from the pose which the member for Morley adopts.

Mr SKIDMORE: So the Premier, knowing so much, has proved he knows so little when he objects to what we on this side of the House believe is a right and proper action. I do not want to dwell too long on the Premier's speech, because I feel it was of rather small consequence. He got a little up-tight at one time about the physicists of this State who expressed a contrary opinion to that of the Government on the matter of uranium processing. Of course, the Premier will always get up-tight if anyone opposes him, but we must look at the matter with a degree of concern when he challenges the physicists of this State and of this country. These people have played a major part in the research into uranium, not only in this country but also on the international scene. Some of these physicists have delivered papers at international conferences. They are well read, and well qualified to make statements about the reprocessing of this particular material.

During the debate there was an interjection by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as follows—

How do they feel about dumping nuclear waste? Have you asked them?

He was referring to physicists, who have readily given the answer and provided documentation. Then we go on to a remark made by the Premier which I wish to quote in full. It is not very long. He said—

So some of the great countries of the world—for instance France, which has a big concentration of people right in the midst of highly developed areas—are prepared to go along with the expansion of nuclear energy because they have sought to develop every other known source of energy, even if some of the expansion is not economic. These European countries want to make sure they are not held over a barrel by the Arabs or by anyone else in regard to energy.

What a statement to make! Those people have a highly industrialised country, and they live crammed into the cities of France. Naturally they do not want to have their nuclear testing done on their own doorstep; they chose an atoll in the Pacific Ocean so that the nuclear waste would not dirty their doorstep but would drift across Australia, and that is what happened.

Sir Charles Court: That is not what we are talking about now.

Mr SKIDMORE: Yes, it is what the Premier tried to drag across the trail when he tried to confuse people. He cannot have it both ways. If he wants to talk about nuclear fission but does not like the answers he receives, that is not my fault. I quote further from the Premier's speech as follows—

If that is what the Opposition wants, it should say so to the public in loud and clear terms: That it wants no Yeelirrie. If that is so, we will at least give members opposite the benefit of being honest about it. However, we for our part do want Yeelirrie on terms satisfactory to the State and to the nation.

I will leave the Premier's speech at this stage, and answer his problem regarding whether or not we should declare ourselves. I declare myself irrevocably and without question and say that I am prepared to accept any technological advance provided I can be satisfied that the dangers inherent in that advance are not of the nature of the dangers visited upon the people of Japan after atomic bombs were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima; because the radiation emitted then was the same type of radiation involved in this process of recovering nuclear waste. It is exactly the same radiation, and it causes the same genetic problems that the Japanese people have been faced with.

If I as a member of this place am not satisfied, then I do not want the development of uranium in Australia. Strangely enough, as I will illustrate soon, there are

many other people who share my concern; and they certainly would not be people to whom I would look for support of my ideology in the political arena in respect of the enrichment of uranium. I would like to refer to a small amount of documentation which is apt and to the point. I am sure most members would have received the document I have in my hand. It is called "Australia's Uranium Resources", and I feel it has recently been delivered or posted to all members of Parliament. I suggest those who want to know something about the matter should read this document because it sets out clearly and concisely in laymen's language the problems seen in the use of uranium for peaceful purposes—in this case nuclear power houses.

I will not tell members the author at the moment, because I feel that would be unfair. Perhaps later a member will ask me to name the author, and it would give me great pleasure to do so.

Referring to the debate held in January of this year in Britain, Mr Allday said—

Thirdly, the radioactive waste will eventually be returned to the customer. All our future contracts, including the 4000 te contract which we are negotiating with Japan, will have a clause giving us the option to return the fission products. This will be when we have developed a glassification process, which we confidently expect to have ready by the mid-1980s. However, if this does not prove practicable, another clause in the contract will give us the right not to reprocess the fuel at all but to return it to the customer.

That is a far cry from the hocus-pocus that has been served up to us by the Premier about the safeguards he feels sure will be provided by his Government in respect of the use of uranium, and the reprocessing of nuclear waste. Those are the comments of the Managing Director of Nuclear Fuels Limited, and Britain is one of the only nations that is reprocessing nuclear waste. To my knowledge no other nation in the world reprocesses this material.

The officials in England expressed grave doubts and have said, "Look, if this stuff is not satisfactory we will return it to you; but if we are able to reprocess it, you can still take back your damn waste because we don't want it."

Sir Charles Court: That is right; that is part of the programme.

Mr SKIDMORE: What did Mr Tamaki say he would do with the waste? He proposed that as Australia is a bounding place of great area, we could get rid of this waste in our country with no worry at all—I would suggest with no worry to Japan but certainly with worry to us in Western

Australia. When the people who are reprocessing nuclear waste in Britain expressed in public their doubts about this in January of this year, I wonder whether it is reasonable that we should take the waste?

I do not wish to make many quotes, but some are very pertinent. Mr Allday goes on to say—

There is, therefore, no question for this new business of permanent retention in this country of foreign radioactive waste, whether it be Japanese or anyone else's.

Again there is a clear and concise declaration of intention by the British Government not to undertake the reprocessing of waste and not to do what this honourable gentleman in Japan—who I understand is described as a right-wing reactionary member of the Japanese Parliament—wants to do; that is, to leave his dirty washing hanging in someone else's back yard, especially when that dirty washing has a half life of 25 000 years, as pointed out by the member for Morley. I do not wish to go into technical details, because I do not want to be placed in the same category as the member for Morley and classed as an expert on this matter. I am not an expert; I am reading from documentation of a seminar or debate which was held in Britain for working people.

In respect of ensuring that once radioactive material is treated it can be transported safely back to Japan, members must realise that Britain has said that unless Japan takes back the waste Britain will not reprocess it. As I understand it, Britain is processing its own nuclear waste from its own power houses, and it already has problems.

Sir Charles Court: They have a contract with Japan to process the waste and to return it to Japan.

Mr SKIDMORE: That is what they are talking about here. The article states—

Work on the glassification process is proceeding well and is being done in international collaboration particularly with the French and Germans. I am quite confident that we shall have an established process by the mid-1980s. It is an international problem and it must be solved. I am sure that it will be.

These are responsible people who have expressed concern; and yet the Premier feels that he can bring the Japanese people here for talks, and with the knowledge of what has occurred in Britain he still says we do not have much to worry about. We are told there is no need to worry, yet Britain has said, "Do not leave your waste here; take it with you." Apparently the Premier will be prepared to allow them to leave their waste behind; that is part of the package deal.

Sir Charles Court: Have not you heard what the Ambassador said and what Mr Tamaki said?

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not know everything that was said, but from the Press cuttings I have in my possession, nothing can justify the Government's stand on this issue.

Sir Charles Court: Do you not want them to come here?

Mr SKIDMORE: The Premier can interject all he likes, but I say categorically that there is nothing which provides the Premier with one ounce of hope that his thinking will be accepted by the public.

Sir Charles Court: Do you or do you not want these people to come and talk with us?

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not going to waste my time by replying to the Premier. If he reads *Hansard* he will see I have already said something about that matter.

Sir Charles Court: Just answer the question.

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not intend to answer the question again.

Sir Charles Court: Do you want them to come?

Mr SKIDMORE: I did the Premier the courtesy of not interjecting when he spoke, although I was tempted to; I would hope he extends me the same courtesy. I do not often ask for such courtesies from members because I could not care less whether a member interjects on me.

Mr Sodeman: You do not often extend such a courtesy.

Mr SKIDMORE: If members opposite want to learn something about the problem they should sit back and listen. If they do not want to listen let them hot-foot it out of the Chamber and read my remarks in *Hansard* later.

Mr Sodeman: Would you follow that practice the next time someone is speaking with whom you do not agree?

Mr SKIDMORE: There are some members in this place whom I do not recognise as being here and that member is one of them.

Mr Sodeman: Par for the course from the hypocrite!

Mr SKIDMORE: Much has been said about nuclear energy and its uses. Strangely enough, we find even in our State documentation on the use of nuclear energy prepared by the State Energy Commission of Western Australia.

I should like to quote from another publication relating to uranium, as it is very pertinent to my remarks. It is published by a group of companies in Australia, which I shall name in a moment. The first

passage is headed, "Transportation of radio-active material" and states as follows—

This is the movement of nuclear materials between the various operational stages of the fuel cycle. The transportation of radioactive materials is subject to strict criteria concerning the type and characteristics of the particular containers used, security arrangements, etc.

It goes on to comment that the nuclear fuel cycle is the reprocessing of the spent fuel to recover uranium and plutonium. The area of concern which at present is evidenced in the United States and Great Britain is that the safety and licensing issues, the environmental control, and the technological procedures have yet to be satisfactorily resolved in order to fully close the total fuel cycle.

What these uranium mining companies are saying is that they are deeply concerned with the question of total processing and the fact that they are unable to be sure of the safety of the processes currently used. However, we are not supposed to show any alarm. The article goes on to state—

In Australia the activities of member companies of the Uranium Producers' Forum is not expected, in the foreseeable future, to go beyond the first stage—that is, the production of "yellowcake".

The companies which show such concern are: Electrolytic Zinc Company of Australasia Limited; Noranda Australia Limited; Pancontinental Mining Limited; Peko Mines Limited; Queensland Mines Limited; and, the giant Western Mining Corporation Limited. All those companies are expressing some doubts about the processing methods currently in use.

Let me turn now to a comparison of the various ways of producing electrical energy.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has eight minutes remaining.

Mr SKIDMORE: Perhaps I can get an extension of time; they say that hope springs eternal in the human breast! I hope the Minister and others will consider this comparison very carefully, because it is tremendously interesting. It does not always back up what I say; I make no pretence that it does. It would be futile of me to extract only those statistics which supported my case.

The booklet provides a table of statistics for a 1 000 megawatt station at 75 per cent capacity. To equate that to something members will understand, I return to the 1975 report of the State Energy Commission which indicates that the average annual fuel consumption for Western Australia is in the region of 750 to 800 megawatts of generated electricity.

Do members realise that the thermal efficiency of coal is 38 per cent; residual fuel oil has a thermal efficiency of 39 per cent; natural gas, an efficiency of 38 per cent; and, nuclear fuel a thermal efficiency of 32 per cent?

The annual fuel consumption to produce this amount of generated power, in the case of coal would be 2.3 million tons, 10 million barrels in the case of residual fuel oil, 64 billion cubic feet in the case of natural gas, and 30 tons in the case of nuclear fuel.

The number of man-days lost through ill-health each year in the case of coal would be 600, while in the case of nuclear energy it would be 480. Figures are not supplied for the other two energy sources.

The use of nuclear fuel to produce 750 megawatts of generated power would result in 90 cubic feet of solidified, high-level radioactive waste concentrates, and 175 cubic feet of low-level radioactive waste concentrates.

So that members may visualise such a quantity of waste, in the case of the high-level radioactive waste concentrates it would represent a block three feet by three feet by 10 feet. Keep in mind that Japan and other countries have hundreds of these plants all over the world.

In the case of low-level radioactive waste concentrates the annual waste would equal a block approximately three feet by three feet by 20 feet. Therefore the total amount of radioactive waste to be disposed of annually as a result of producing 750 megawatts of generated power from nuclear fuel would equal a block of waste three feet by three feet by 30 feet. We do not want this sort of pollution in our backyard!

In the short time available to me I should like to refer to the report given to the Minister by his own State Energy Commission. I quote from page 52 of the report where the following appears—

The results of the investigations indicated that nuclear power stations have experienced rapid cost inflation in recent times. Expressed in 1975 dollars the 660 MW (e) reactor of the PWR design would cost \$332 million in Western Australia which corresponds to \$500 per KW. By comparison coal fired plant at Collie would cost approximately \$300 per KW.

Members should bear that in mind. To continue—

The nuclear project lead time would be 10 years which gives rise to very substantial interest charges during construction.

Naturally enough that would be so. To continue—

Based on 6 132 hours a year operation the nuclear generation costs would be 1.15 cents a kWh.

By comparison the cost of the amount of coal per kW is amazing; it is almost half the cost that would be incurred by using nuclear energy. It is \$300 per kW cheaper. By the figures produced by the Minister's own department the production cost of nuclear power will be \$500 per kW. But although we have an abundant supply of coal, which does not have radioactive waste associated with it, the Minister does not want coal and would rather have nuclear power. Those opposite are always whinging that they are getting into extreme difficulties with regard to cutting costs, and here is a glorious example of pandering to people.

Mr Mensaros: Who said we do not want to have it? That is what we planned for.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am looking at the question of undertaking this exercise of futility when the answer is in the report. The Minister may smile with his usual smugness but the questions I have raised are irrefutable. The document has been compiled by people who would not normally be in my court. I have not mentioned environmentalists or the Friends of the Earth but merely those people who produce, process and reprocess uranium and have expressed grave concern.

The motion that was moved by the member for Morley is right and just. It says that we should look very closely at the fact that this State may become a dumping ground for nuclear waste from overseas. I conclude by remarking that in Britain at least they have said to Japan, "Take your stinking waste back to your own country. We do not want it."

MR HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [10.43 p.m.]: I shall not ask for an extension of time in which to express my views on this subject. I shall be appreciably brief. I am humbly conscious of the fact that I am just a back-bench member of a State Parliament—a fairly remote State at that—of a Commonwealth which is itself remote from the big centres of population of this round world. I do not think anything I say tonight will be worth remembering. In fact the words of Abraham Lincoln might apply to us all, and particularly to me. He said—

Men will not greatly mark nor long remember what we say here.

At the same time this is a matter of such grave importance to our State and Commonwealth, to our posterity and to the world at large that I cannot let it go past without saying a word or two.

If I were to choose a motto for my speech I would say—

Fools should not play with edged tools!

One of the greatest catastrophes of the twentieth century has been the discovery of nuclear fission. In my humble submission it was discovered thousands of years

before mankind attained a standard of universal intelligence fit to handle it. It is a deadly dangerous thing and its dangers have been explained and demonstrated well enough in the last 30 years. It should not be in the hands of human beings in our present state of moral—I will not say progress, but retrogression. It should not be in the hands of greedy men who would sell the entire future of the world for immediate gain. Still less should it be in the hands of brutal men, tyrannical men, who would devise armaments of this type to annihilate not only their enemies but even themselves, little as they might anticipate the second result.

I feel this is far too serious a matter not to make some protest. Little importance though my protest may have, I make it in good faith. I do not want to see my State or country associated with the proliferation of nuclear fission for so-called peaceful purposes because it will not be used in the long run for peaceful purposes. It will be propagated for war purposes and for the destruction of human beings. It will have been especially adapted to that particular type of destruction when it bursts upon the world which it will certainly do in the next 20 years. Probably I should be glad that I will not then be around.

I wish only to say that we should not have this horrible thing in our State or in our country at all, and those who are stupid enough to try to make sordid money out of it will destroy themselves. They may destroy us in the holocaust also, but let not the blame be laid at our door.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Sodeman.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [10.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the principal Act so as to provide a degree of flexibility in relation to the representation of the Education Department on the Senate of the University of Western Australia.

At the present time both the Statutes governing the two universities in this State contain provision for the permanent head of the Education Department to be a member of each of the controlling senates with no provision for the nomination of a deputy or replacement. It has become obvious with the increasing responsibilities pertaining to the position of Director-General of Education that some flexibility is required.

The Bill seeks to provide this flexibility in relation to the Senate of the University of Western Australia by allowing the

Director-General of Education to nominate some other person to represent the Education Department on the senate. A similar provision is to be introduced to provide for greater flexibility in relation to the department's representation on the Senate of the Murdoch University.

The Bill is simple in nature and purpose, and I have pleasure in commending it to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Moller.

MURDOCH UNIVERSITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [10.49 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is similar to that of the Bill to amend the University of Western Australia Act in that the Government is seeking to introduce a degree of flexibility in relation to the membership of the Director-General of Education on the Murdoch University Senate.

As indicated during the second reading of the aforementioned Bill, the Murdoch University Act currently provides for the permanent head of the department to be a member of the university senate with no provision for the nomination of a deputy or replacement. This Bill seeks to enable the Director-General of Education to nominate some other person to represent the Education Department on the Senate should he so wish.

The Bill is simple in nature and purpose, and I have pleasure in commending it to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Moller.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [10.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The prime purpose of this Bill is to complement amendments contained in the Bill to amend the Justices Act, concerning committal proceedings, although the opportunity has also been taken to include an amendment to section 19 (6a) of the Criminal Code.

At present the provisions contained in that section are restricted in regard to dealing with a child or young person under the age of 18 years convicted of an offence punishable with imprisonment in that the conviction must be on indictment.

This section provides that as an alternative to imprisonment, the child may be ordered to be detained during the Governor's pleasure, or he may be committed to the care of the Department for Community Welfare.

There was a case in the Children's Court last year in which two children pleaded guilty to a number of serious charges, whereupon convictions were recorded and the children committed for sentence to the Supreme Court, pursuant to section 20 (3) (c) of the Child Welfare Act. In this instance there was no indictment to be presented to the Supreme Court, but merely a certificate signed by the magistrate evidencing the conviction, and committal for sentence.

By deletion of the words "on indictment" from the section, it will become available in all cases where children are committed for sentence to the Supreme Court or District Court.

In regard to committal proceedings, it is proposed that where a person has been committed for trial or sentence without a preliminary hearing, and has pleaded guilty to the offence, before the court passes sentence on him, the material facts of the case shall be stated aloud to the court by the Crown.

It is also provided that at the trial a written statement of an accused person is admissible as evidence if all the parties consent, and the trial judge is satisfied that the presence of such a witness is not necessary in the interests of justice.

The Bill provides for the Act to come into operation on a date to be proclaimed, and further provides that sections 4, 5 and 6 shall come into operation on the date on which the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1976, comes into operation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Moiler.

CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [10.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As previously indicated, this is a Bill to complement proposed amendments to the Justices Act concerning procedures to be adopted in committal proceedings.

It is intended to repeal and re-enact subsection (4) of section 20B to allow for the same procedures for preliminary hearings as in the Justices Act.

The Bill provides for the Act to come into operation on the date on which the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1976, comes into operation.

I think it is important for the benefit of the Opposition to indicate that the Bills listed on today's notice paper as Orders of the Day Nos. 36 and 37 and Nos. 14 and 15 are four related measures. The two former ones were introduced in this Chamber earlier, and the two latter ones have been introduced today. They fall into a group of four Bills which will be dealt with together with the Justices Act Amendment Bill being the principal one.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bertram.

FAMILY COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Minister for Works) [10.54 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Attention has been drawn to the fact that section 33 of the Family Court Act, 1975, relating to appeals in the non-Federal jurisdictions under that Act do not provide for the powers which may be exercised by the Family Court of Western Australia sitting on appeal from a court of summary jurisdiction, or by the Full Court of the Supreme Court sitting on an appeal from the Family Court of Western Australia.

Accordingly, an amendment has been prepared to section 33 to include a like provision to that contained in subsection (2) of section 94 of the Commonwealth Family Law Act. This will ensure that on appeal the Family Court of Western Australia or the Full Court of the Supreme Court, as the case may be, may affirm, reverse, or vary the decree the subject of the appeal, and may make such decree as in the opinion of the court ought to have been made in the first instance, or may order a rehearing on such terms and conditions as it thinks fit.

Advice has also been given that in subsection (1) of section 33 of the State Act it may not be clear that "decree" includes an order of the Family Court of Western Australia dismissing an appeal from a court of summary jurisdiction. Following discussion on the question of appeals when the Bill was being prepared for the State Family Court, it was assumed that in the non-Federal jurisdictions a matter could be heard by the court of summary jurisdiction from where an appeal lay to the Family Court of Western Australia, and after that court had given an order on the appeal, a further appeal would lie to the Full Court of the Supreme Court. It was the intention that a matter could be taken on appeal from the court of summary jurisdiction through the Family Court to the Full Court and not exhausted at the Family Court level. There could be some important matters involving, for

example, adoption or guardianship of children which would make it desirable in certain circumstances to have recourse to the Full Court of the Supreme Court. As there is some doubt as to whether this intention was carried into effect in the original Bill, an amendment is proposed to subsection (1) of section 33 to provide such recourse.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Bertram.

INDUSTRIAL LANDS (CSBP & FARMERS LTD.) AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR MENSAROS (Floreat—Minister for Industrial Development) [10.57 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Like its predecessor, the 1964 agreement between the Government and CSBP & Farmers Ltd. and BP Refinery (Kwinana) Pty. Ltd. which was ratified by the Industrial Lands (Kwinana) Agreement Act, 1964, this Bill to ratify a further agreement with CSBP & Farmers Ltd. is the culmination of a great deal of intensive effort over several years.

The 1964 agreement, as well as providing for a rearrangement of the boundaries of the Kwinana site of the BP refinery established under the 1952 Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo Iranian Oil Company Limited) Act, to provide for production of ammonia, made provision for acquisition and development of a site of 128 acres by CSBP & Farmers Ltd. for the production of nitrogenous and other fertilisers using the ammonia produced by BP.

This Kwinana site of 128 acres or 51.799 8 hectares, which has been fully serviced with both narrow and standard gauge railway and with wharf facilities for inward loading of bulk raw materials, has been developed by CSBP & Farmers Ltd. to the stage where further development to keep pace with demands for fertiliser require the provision of additional land.

Since the 1964 agreement however, certain other developments have taken place or are planned for this particular area at Kwinana. The Western Mining Corporation Limited nickel refinery has been established under the 1968 agreement with the State and is of major significance. Also there is the Co-operative Bulk Handling complex which includes special wharf facilities for bulk handling, in addition to facilities for CSBP's requirements.

Developments of this nature together with other proposals for shipment of bulk production indicated the necessity for careful planning with regard to the limited area of land in this locality and the Government, in March, 1972, approved in principle a master plan for outer harbour development on the Kwinana waterfront

submitted by the standing interdepartmental committee concerned with this important subject.

Because of Commonwealth proposals at that time for use of Garden Island as a facility for naval purposes the interdepartmental committee's master plan represented a major revision of a previous development plan adopted by the Government some six years earlier.

Of the 20 recommendations adopted by the Government in this master plan, two in particular directly affected the possibility of site expansion by CSBP, these being the reservation of all land—except "A"-class reserves bounded on the north by the CSBP works, on the east by the Kwinana coast railway, on the south by the CBH complex, and on the west by the ocean, for port operational purposes and the determination of a precise pattern of road and rail development in that area.

Determination of an essential feature of this road pattern led to discussions being undertaken with both CSBP & Farmers Ltd. and Western Mining Corporation Limited with the object of both of those concerns surrendering sufficient land to the State to enable new road access to be provided to serve the future bulk cargo storage and port operation area at Kwinana Beach.

The Western Mining Corporation agreed to surrender the whole of its option area 3 and part of its option area 2 under conditions prescribed in the Nickel Refinery (Western Mining Corporation Limited) Agreement Act, 1968, but CSBP took the opportunity of the approach made to it to point out its requirement for additional land to provide for its normal future expansion.

These requirements were in such conflict with the planned use of the land concerned for a port operational area in respect of the ultimate development of seven overseas bulk cargo jetty berths and the road access needs for such development that the then Premier set up a special committee to resolve these conflicting interests.

At the same time the Premier (the Hon. J. T. Tonkin) announced through the Press on the 14th December, 1972, that the Government proposed to provide additional land at Kwinana to augment the company's work site and provide for further expansion to serve farmers' future needs and in view of this undertaking by the Government the company would surrender its leases of its North Fremantle site to the Crown some 35 years earlier than those leases were due to expire.

Because of the complex nature of the problem to be resolved, the committee set up by the Premier referred the matter to a working party of specialist experienced officers, including a representative of CSBP.

That working party presented a report in June, 1974, which concluded that the requirements of the Fremantle Port Authority and CSBP & Farmers Ltd. were completely irreconcilable in their existing form, but that an effective compromise in another form could be achieved without one party or the other surrendering its vital interests.

That compromise is now reflected in the executed agreement set out in the schedule to the Bill before the House and sought to be ratified by the Bill.

The agreement provides for a rearrangement of existing services and for what appears to be a complex subdivision and consolidation of various parcels of land.

The rearrangement of services, which frees the land presently used for those services to enable acquisition by CSBP, together with other land, comprises relocation of road access, railway, water and power mains, telephone cables, certain facilities serving the Fremantle Port Authority's wharf next to CSBP and certain pipelines the property of Western Mining Corporation Limited conveying raw materials from the BP refinery to the Kwinana nickel refinery.

The whole of the cost of rearrangement of these services to standards and specifications equivalent to the standards and specifications of the existing services is to be met by CSBP as set out in the agreement.

All of the authorities concerned, including the Australian Telecommunications Commission and Western Mining Corporation Limited, have been consulted in this connection and have indicated approval to the proposed rearrangement.

The land involved in the transaction—the subdivision of which and its subsequent consolidation has been approved in principle by the Town Planning Department and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority—is currently registered in the names of the Crown, the Industrial Lands Development Authority, Crown land where roads to be closed are concerned, and there are some privately-owned residential lots in the Kwinana Village area which have been offered to the Government for acquisition, with one or two exceptions, in the continuous programme of acquisitions in this area.

Apart, therefore, from the acquisitions from private owners, which will all be at current market valuation on the same basis as previous acquisitions in this area, the land transactions involved are not as complex as appears at first sight.

As well as paying the cost of rearrangement of the various services involved, the company will also pay for all the land it is to acquire at a valuation of \$24 710 per hectare—\$10 000 per acre—or actual cost to the State where this is in excess of

that figure. It will also pay for land required for relocation of services on the same basis, but to be offset by the land already used for existing services.

Provision is made in the agreement for the additional land to be sold to the company to be consolidated into one lot in a plan or diagram of survey so that in the unlikely event of any proposal for subdivision in the future it would become subject to policy of the Town Planning Board or the Government at that time.

Such consolidation also implies that the provisions of the 1964 agreement will apply to the additional land and to prevent any misunderstanding in this connection, the agreement spells out the clauses of the old agreement which apply equally to the new land as well as specifically stating that the new agreement does not vary any of the provisions of the 1964 agreement.

There is no obligation in the agreement for the company to proceed with development on the additional land as the company has already expended some \$15 million on plant extensions to its existing site since the submission for extra land was made in 1972.

Additionally, this agreement honours the undertaking I have referred to given by the then Premier (the Hon. J. T. Tonkin) in 1972 for further land to be made available to the company and the company has honoured its undertaking to surrender its North Fremantle leases to the Crown some 35 years before actual expiry of those leases.

With regard to the question of environmental protection, this has been the subject of examination by the Environmental Protection Authority which has advised it does not foresee any environmental problem arising from the proposals and in any case the requirement under clause 14 of the agreement for the company to comply with the existing environment protection provisions ensures adequate safeguards.

In moving the second reading, Mr Speaker, I ask permission to table a copy of the plan referred to in the agreement which indicates the land concerned and the proposed rearrangement of road and railway services.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 240).

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

House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 20th May, 1976.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. A. F. Griffith) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.