

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 4 September 1980

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (7): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. The Bank of Adelaide (Merger) Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Treasurer), and read a first time.
2. Slaughter of Calves Restriction Act Repeal Bill.
3. Rural Reconstruction and Rural Adjustment Schemes Amendment Bill.
4. Stallions Act Repeal Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Old (Minister for Agriculture), and read a first time.
5. Liquefied Petroleum Gas Subsidy Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Fuel and Energy), and read a first time.
6. Railways Discontinuance Bill.
7. Acts Amendment (Motor Vehicle Pools) Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Mr Rushton (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 3 September.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [11.10 a.m.]: Like the members who have spoken before me in this debate, I want to place on record my congratulations to those members who have been elected to this place for the first time. I hope they enjoy their stay in politics as much as I have.

This Parliament is always called together at the commencement of each session by the Clerk of the Parliament, who advises us that we have been summoned to appear before the Governor in another place to hear him officially address the Parliament and to declare the session open under the Standing Orders and the Acts relating to Parliament. In the address to Parliament the Governor is required to outline his reasons for the Parliament being called together for the despatch of business. In each of the seven years I have

attended these addresses by the Governor I have noted that the time allocated by him in his remarks to Parliament, in the main part, has been not so much to give reasons for our having been called together but to give a summary of the economic position of the State and a very brief résumé of the actions taken by the previous Government. My understanding of the whole situation of Parliament's being assembled for the opening session is to outline the reasons that the Parliament should sit rather than to give a glorious account of the past and an indication of the economy of the State.

This year we saw a precedent established when the Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity, after we had returned to this Chamber, to continue the Address-in-Reply debate for a very brief period to outline to this House what he saw as one of the most important matters in the eyes of his party. It is my view that that precedent should be continued.

This action gives some sort of balance to the opening of Parliament. Up to this time, the opening has been completely dominated by the Government side of the House. This year, for the first time, we saw a member of the Opposition rise and make some comment from the other side of the House. Provided such comments are confined to a period of something like 10 to 15 minutes, I see no reason at all that this precedent should not be continued. If members believe that the length of time taken for the opening of Parliament is likely to cause some of our guests and visitors to become a little restive, I recommend strongly to the Premier and the Government that they do something about shortening the Governor's address. I see no need at all for the Governor's opening address to be used for the purpose of glorifying past actions of the Government or giving an account of the economy of Western Australia.

I have always been primarily concerned with the welfare of rural people whom I represent. It is common knowledge to just about everyone that the population of rural Western Australia, whilst not increasing, has remained static. The reason for this perhaps has been that the western coast of the State has been able to attract sufficient people to compensate for the losses in population in the traditional rural areas of Western Australia. The population exodus from these areas causes great problems for the people who remain there.

I am aware that most of the population exodus has been created by a rationalisation of the agricultural industry and that there is very little Governments can do about that. We all have to accept technological change and certainly

primary producers must do so if they wish to remain competitive in a world market. However, there are some matters of Government policy which have a direct effect upon the welfare of rural people. I shall deal with these matters because it is in these areas that the Government could take action which would alleviate some of the problems of rural people.

One of the problems is the very high cost of living in country areas compared with that for people living in the metropolitan area. In 1975, this Government amended a motion put before this House by the member for Geraldton which called for a Royal Commission to inquire into the cost of living in country areas. This Parliament amended that call for a Royal Commission to a call for a public inquiry, which was held.

The report of that inquiry indicated that the cost of living in rural areas was, in some cases, up to 16 per cent higher than the cost of living in the metropolitan area. Any person who has a choice as to where he will live must take into consideration what it will cost in the different areas. The Government should look very closely at those areas of its policy which contribute to the very high cost of living in rural areas.

One of the major contributing factors is transport charges. Government policies have increased transport charges enormously. Members will recall that the State fuel levy was introduced into this House in May last year. We in the National Party have maintained that the levy has always placed an unfair burden on country people. It can very easily be shown that the 20 per cent of the State's population living in rural areas pay 48 per cent of the State fuel levy. That in itself is discriminatory. We were opposed to the introduction of the levy for that purpose. Further, we opposed those clauses in the Bill which would allow the Government of this State, without reference to this House, to increase the rate of the levy and to increase the licence fees of vehicles.

Mr Rushton: Could you substantiate that percentage as a disability for country people?

Mr COWAN: I do not have the figures with me, but I will be happy to provide them to the Minister, although I would have thought his department had the competence to do so.

Mr Rushton: My figures do not line up with yours.

Mr COWAN: That certainly would not be the first time that has happened. The Minister will recall that he had difficulties with figures when the Bill to which I have referred was introduced into this House.

Mr Rushton: You are inaccurate again. If you want to keep going with that inaccuracy you will condemn yourself.

Mr COWAN: Perhaps by way of interjection the Minister could tell me whether or not he had to revise the figures for the distillate fuel levy when the Bill was before the House.

Mr Rushton: Yes; and be good enough to recognise the fact that they were based on the Commonwealth Statistician's figures. You cannot get away with that.

Mr COWAN: The member for Warren is quite correct; mathematics is not the Minister's strong point, nor is it the strong point of the Transport Commission which obviously provided the figures.

Mr H. D. Evans: Don't forget the Water Board. It is not too good either.

Mr COWAN: I would be quite happy to provide the Minister with figures which relate to the rural population of Western Australia which represents 20 per cent of the total population of the State. I would also be happy to provide the Minister with figures showing that the rural population of Western Australia contributes up to 48 per cent of the State fuel levy.

Heavy vehicle licence fees and the State fuel levy were increased on 1 July this year. We objected very strongly to the Government being able to increase those taxes or charges—call them what one will—by regulation, because we believed that the Government would use that levy and the ability to increase licence fees as a revenue-earning system; and that is what has happened.

The petrol levy increased by 44 per cent and the heavy vehicle licence fees increased by 25 per cent. That is nowhere in keeping with the annual CPI figures, and I do not believe any Government can justify increases of that proportion.

We have always opposed very strongly government by regulation. The type of Government we have experienced in regard to increases in heavy vehicle licence fees and the State fuel levy is a clear indication why all members in this place should oppose strongly any clause in legislation which provides for the Government of the day to make regulations over which we have very little control.

Mr Rushton: What part of the road programme would you like taken off?

Mr COWAN: I shall come to that matter at a later stage.

Mr H. D. Evans: Armadale.

Mr COWAN: Other transport charges bring about a considerable impost on rural people. Members will know that there has been a great

deal of controversy over the matter of long-haul grain freight charges. I have always been amazed by the rather staunch support which has been offered by members of the agricultural industry to the parties that comprise the present Government. It is very rare that one can convince farmers and other primary producers to move away from their traditional forms of political support. I can assure the Government that, if it does not reverse its intention to increase grain freight charges by the amount intended, it will, for the first time, give farmers enough ammunition to perhaps start thinking very seriously about changing their political affiliations.

Mr McIver: They should have done it years ago.

Mr H. D. Evans: They did, and it was the only bit of progress they have ever had.

Mr Old: They did it once and they regretted it straightaway.

Mr COWAN: I should like to keep this debate on a State level.

In June of this year, the Government made the announcement that it intended to increase grain freight charges in long-haul areas as from 1 July. That statement contradicted the Government's rather glossy magazine which, by some coincidence, happened to be released in January of this year, just prior to the State election. There was a statement in that magazine which indicated that grain freight charges would increase on 1 November.

Mr Rushton: Read it in its full context, and you might be accurate.

Mr COWAN: I think I am far more accurate than the Minister for Transport. One of his greatest problems is his inaccuracy.

The Farmers' Union decided it would organise a series of public meetings to make it very clear to the Minister for Transport that the people it represents were not prepared to accept this heavy-handed type of treatment. The union put forward some very strong arguments and those arguments caused members of the Australian Wheat Board in Western Australia to make the decision that they would not pay an increase in grain freight charges until 1 November.

I am aware there are some doubts about the legality of such a decision. Had a bill been presented by Westrail to the Australian Wheat Board, I am quite sure it would have been required to pay the increased amount. However, in its wisdom, the Government decided it would defer grain freight rate increases until 1 November.

Mr Rushton: It related to grain in bins.

Mr COWAN: Who will deliver very much grain in Western Australia prior to 1 November, before the new season? Of course, it had to relate to grain in bins.

Mr Rushton: You might have a few silos on your farm.

Mr H. D. Evans: What percentage of the harvest would that possibly be?

Mr COWAN: It would include a very small portion of the harvest. There may be some areas in the north of this State which might take off new season grain before 1 November; but I believe there is a cut-off delivery point between the agent and the buyer well before 1 November.

At these meetings many of the arguments put forward by farmers claiming that freight charges for grain were unjust revolved around the fact that they had used, as a basis, a comparison between grain freight charges and other bulk commodities. In every case the comparison between grain and other bulk commodities came out very much in favour of the bulk commodities.

I sometimes wonder why it is we have this situation. Grain happens to be the largest single revenue-earning commodity for Westrail and it pays an average of 3.631c per tonne kilometre. When that is compared with other commodities we see that salt is down to 1.3c per tonne kilometre; bauxite is 1.6c; alumina is 2.4c; wood chips are 2.9c; iron ore is 1.5c; and mineral sands are 2.75c. The only bulk commodity which gets anywhere near grain is gypsum with a figure of 3.37c.

It can be seen there is a reasonable argument there for Westrail to give some justification as to why it is that grain freight charges can be as much as 300 per cent higher than those for other bulk commodities.

If members look also at the volume of trade in relation to grain, as opposed to these other commodities, once again they would assume the Government had some reason to justify the very high costs imposed on grain. The Minister made no secret of the fact that the transport of grain is profitable to Westrail.

It is only fair that the Minister, through his officers in Westrail, could have at least gone to farmers and, rather than use a long series of words, said, "These are some of the costs that are accounted in the transport of grain. This is what it is costing us on a cents-per-tonne-kilometre basis. This is what we are charging you. Do you think it is reasonable?" However, we have never been given those figures.

I attended two of the four meetings which have been conducted and at one of those meetings the public were so disgusted that, right at the end of the meeting, one farmer—who I might add is a member of the Liberal Party—jumped to his feet and moved a motion of no confidence in the Government's transport policy and in the Minister.

Mr H. D. Evans: Should not the Minister resign on that basis?

Mr COWAN: That motion was passed. Another person, who I assume would also have been a supporter of the Minister or a member of the Liberal Party, told the chairman he had not been given an opportunity to vote against the motion. So, the chairman, in his fairness, put the motion again. He then called for those in favour and practically everyone in the room raised his hand. When he called for those against, seven people out of a meeting of 350 opposed the motion of no confidence.

Surely that would be a message to the Minister that his policy is wrong. It should also be a message to the Minister that farmers are no longer interested in receiving great lengths of rhetoric which mean absolutely nothing. The farmers want justification for Westrail's cost to transport grain. They want to be told how much profit Westrail is making out of it and they want to know that the charges for grain are fair and reasonable.

Mr Grewar: What business does that sort of thing?

Mr COWAN: I think every business that has a monopoly; every business that is Government-owned. In other words it is owned by the people and they have a right to be told because they are the people who use it. It is their commodities which are being transported. They want to know that the cost is not a cost that is subsidising every other commodity which is transported by Westrail.

Grain growers are already contributing to this State as taxpayers. We are contributing to the Consolidated Revenue Fund and money is being taken out of that fund to support Westrail. Why should we pay Westrail twice? The Government should give some justification for the cost of transporting grain.

Mr McIver: This farmer is a member of the Liberal Party—wouldn't that indicate he is a little unbalanced?

Mr COWAN: I do not think it does. He has a right to be a member of any political party. I do not know whether he is still a member of the Liberal Party. However, I was rather concerned

when this gentleman got to his feet because I knew he was a supporter of the Government and I wondered what he would say. As a matter of fact—regardless of the Minister's comments that I organised the meeting—I thought the farmer was perhaps intending to pass a vote of thanks to the Minister for attending the meeting. Instead, he made a statement that if there had been an event at the Olympics in sidestepping the Minister should have been sent along because he would have won a gold medal. That statement set the tone for what was to follow. The farmer then moved that there should be a vote of no confidence.

As I said, there were 350 people at that meeting. Not all of them voted but a vast majority did. Of those who voted against the motion, seven votes were recorded. That was seven out of approximately 200. Still rather bad odds!

Mr Rushton: You admitted they did not take the noes.

Mr COWAN: That is why the second vote was called and the number of noes was recorded.

Mr Stephens: He tried to save the Minister any embarrassment. That is why he did not take the noes.

Mr Rushton: The member has not commented upon one very popular discussion at that meeting. He has not talked about it.

Mr COWAN: The meeting was arranged to allow farmers to put their views to the Minister about the proposals to increase grain freight charges. That was the purpose for which the meeting was called.

Mr Rushton: That is not the basis on which the meeting was arranged.

Mr COWAN: The meeting was called for that purpose. The chairman stated that fact at the commencement of the meeting and he then invited members of the Farmers' Union and myself to outline the parameters around which we would base our argument—that was, that some justification should be given to farmers for the increases.

The Minister has been talking to farmers for at least two months now but they have not yet been told one fact with regard to the Westrail costs.

Mr Rushton: Don't you read the papers?

Mr COWAN: I have read the papers. I have spoken to the Farmers' Union and as far as the members are concerned it is just a straightout old political ploy.

United, the Farmers' Union is doing a good job to place the Minister in a position where he does

not have popular public support. However, the Minister has divided the Farmers' Union so that it has only one or two representatives on the new freight funding committee. This is a political ploy which has been used for years and the Farmers' Union can see it for what it is.

I would have no great objection to a 20 per cent increase in grain rail freights if it could be justified. Later I wish to advise the House of the effect the increases have on the wheat producing community in the outer areas. I would have no objection to this price if it could be justified but when Westrail, through one of its marketing officers, writes to shire councils and says it is in a position to transport blue metal from Perth to a shire for a price which varies from 10 to 25 per cent below grain freight rates—

Mr Rushton: Out of season.

Mr COWAN: —out of season—it cannot be justified. Do we receive any out of season compensation in transporting grain? No.

Mr Rushton: You have been offered a truck arrangement.

Mr COWAN: I will refer to that matter later. These shires were offered a rate for the transport of blue metal from Kewdale to their shires at a price varying from 10 to 25 per cent below the cost of transporting grain. That in itself was bad enough but when one read the content of the letter, it was apparent Westrail undertook to transport blue metal from the Gosnells quarry to Kewdale as well as placing it in rail trucks at an estimated rate of at least \$2.50 a tonne.

Westrail then stated it would also transfer the blue metal, once it had arrived at its point of destination, from the rail truck to the shire vehicles. I know I can hire the equipment for a dollar a tonne. So that is \$3.50 a tonne which we can subtract from the cost of transporting blue metal and then we have the rail freight cost.

Westrail made an offer to transport blue metal—a small commodity in terms of tonnage and bulk—for between \$7.50 and \$10 a tonne. How can Westrail offer to transport that material for that price when the transport rate for grain starts at around \$13 a tonne? When talking of grain, we are not talking of 100-tonne lots we are talking in figures of around 20 000 and 30 000 tonnes from each siding—in fact, full trainloads when the season is on.

These are the sorts of arguments farmers are putting forward. They say that other bulk commodities are cheaper to transport than grain. Westrail can offer a competitive price for deregulated commodities yet we have a situation where we will have a 20 per cent increase in grain

freight rates, and the Government is not prepared to justify that increase.

I ask members: How can they believe that people in the country will continue to give their support to Governments which arbitrarily make a decision and then give no justification for that decision?

Mr Rushton: Are you going to give us an indication of the other cost increases of farmers in those areas, such as machinery fuel, super and Wheat Board costs?

Mr COWAN: I will talk about fuel if the Minister likes. I think it would be most appropriate to talk about fuel. It is a very inflationary cost for the rural industry.

Mr Rushton: What about machinery costs which are higher?

Mr COWAN: Those costs do not relate to this Government; they are the responsibility of the Federal Government which, with its world parity pricing policy, has a serious effect on the rural industry.

Mr H. D. Evans: The same political spectrum did that.

Mr COWAN: That is right; a very political move.

Mr MacKinnon: Do you support that policy?

Mr COWAN: I have no support for the policy. All the world parity pricing policy does is give the Federal Government an extremely high amount of revenue and it gives multinational companies an extremely high income for new oil. I would be very pleased to see that policy kept in force, provided the Federal Government gave the people of this State, and indeed the people of this country, some of the benefits derived from its tax on oil. We do not see any sign of that profit. Why cannot some of that tax money—the wind-fall to the Federal Government—be returned to the people?

Mr MacKinnon: You supported the policy.

Mr COWAN: I do not support the policy. If the policy is to continue—and I have no doubt it will—we should see where the money is being spent.

Mr MacKinnon: That is a different argument.

Mr COWAN: It is not different. If the policy is to continue let us see something returned to the people who pay the tax. The Federal Government is receiving large sums of money as a result of oil taxes and we should see some return to the people.

Sir Charles Court: You are overlooking the fact that there has been a \$600 million reduction in income taxes from 1 July made possible because

of the money from oil. An additional \$500 million has been made available for defence because of the oil money. Are you ignoring those facts?

Mr Davies: The Federal Government took off the surcharge.

Sir Charles Court: That is a mere \$1 100 million advantage to the taxpayers!

Mr Davies: That is only the surcharge which the Federal Government earlier promised would be removed. Do not give us that rubbish.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order! The member for Merredin will resume his seat. The member for Merredin is endeavouring to make his address to this Assembly, and he has been interrupted by cross-Chamber interjections from the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier. I ask members to observe the rights of the member for Merredin, and allow him to make his address to the Chair.

Mr McIver: He is doing a good job, too.

Sir Charles Court: I wish he would stick to the facts.

Mr COWAN: The Federal Government has maintained the world parity pricing system on two bases. Firstly, there must be some effort towards conservation and, secondly, exploration must be encouraged. The escalation in the price of oil has made everybody conscious of conservation. I am not competent to judge the consciousness of a need for conservation, and I do not think anybody else in this House is competent to do that. However, certainly the income derived by the companies as a result of the price of new oil is not all spent on exploration.

Mr MacKinnon: Should they not be allowed to make profits?

Mr COWAN: I did not refer to profits. I said the extra money accruing to the oil companies as a result of the new oil prices is not all spent on exploration. The reason given for allowing the oil companies to make such a large profit from new oil was that the profit should be spent on exploration. That has not happened.

Mr MacKinnon: Would you pass a law forcing the oil companies to spend money on exploration?

Mr McIver: It is the greatest national scandal in this country.

Mr COWAN: I would have a situation where the oil companies would be recouped for the cost of any exploration they carried out. At the moment the oil companies reap all the profits and nobody is in a position to tell them what exploration work should be carried out.

Sir Charles Court: I think you have your facts wrong. You would be wise to do some research.

Mr COWAN: I have done some research and I advise the Premier there is no way in the world that the large profits which go to the oil companies, from new oil, are being spent on exploration. The profits far exceed the amount spent on exploration.

Sir Charles Court: I think it is about time you did some research in the interests of understanding what is happening to the new oil money. Without the present policy petroleum exploration and development in Australia could not proceed, and would not proceed. I am amazed that you are opposing the import parity pricing for oil. You are opposing the future of the energy policy of Australia, including the needs of the farmers who are very big users of liquid fuel.

Mr COWAN: If the Premier would listen, I happen to be a farmer and my fuel costs have increased by 120 per cent over the past 12 months. The Premier is trying to tell me I am not aware of high energy costs.

Sir Charles Court: We are all aware of the high cost, and we are determined to do something about it and at the same time ensure future liquid fuel supplies.

Mr COWAN: I am trying to say the policy of the Federal Government is having a highly inflationary effect on the farmers, and inflation kills the farmers when it comes to the export market. The Federal Government is responsible for that policy. I am opposed to the policy because it is killing off the farmers at a far faster rate than would otherwise apply.

Sir Charles Court: You are talking a lot of rubbish. You should be advocating the present policy in the interests of ensuring future liquid fuel supplies for farmers.

Mr COWAN: The Premier can write me a letter. I will tell members what the alternative should be. The Federal Government has the Prices Justification Tribunal and the Trade Practices Commission operating in Australia. If the Federal Government wanted to do something towards making sure that its energy policies were not inflationary it would direct the Prices Justification Tribunal to determine a realistic wholesale price for fuel.

Mr Blaikie: How would that be done?

Mr COWAN: The tribunal would determine the price of fuel at the refinery gate. At the moment the PJT, within its rules, has to determine the wholesale distribution price and it takes into account retail factors. One of those

factors is the development and construction of retail sites and outlets. That is not a wholesale cost; it is a retail cost. The tribunal also takes into account advertising and marketing costs, and I would say they were retail costs.

If the Federal Government were to direct the PJT to determine the wholesale price of fuel at the refinery gate, everybody would be aware of that price. The only other costs involved would be transport and marketing expenses. It would be a simple matter for petroleum retailers to hire tankers to transport the fuel to their premises, where the fuel would be retailed at a certain mark-up.

The Federal Government has said it will introduce legislation to protect the independent petrol retailers, but I do not think that is the answer. If the Federal Government told the PJT to determine a true wholesale price at the refinery gate it would not be necessary to introduce legislation to protect independent retailers. At the moment the PJT determines a price when the oil companies make a submission to it. The companies are then able to retail petrol through their own outlets at up to 3c a litre below the recommended wholesale distribution price determined by a Government body. Surely that is wrong. On top of that, if one is a *bona fide* customer, one is able to get the same discount. I know that is a fact because I receive the discount. To my way of thinking, the price set by the PJT is not a wholesale price.

Mr Blaikie: Have you put your policy to the Federal Government?

Mr COWAN: I must admit I have not forwarded a submission to the Federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs. However, I have stated our party policy. If members care to read the objectives of our party they will see that what I have said is part of our policy.

Mr Blaikie: Don't you think it is rather hollow to mouth words if you are not prepared to carry them into actions?

Mr COWAN: I can assure the member for Vasse that is our stated policy.

Mr Blaikie: What are you doing about it?

Mr COWAN: When we win the new seat of O'Connor, our Federal member will have pleasure in presenting our policy in the Federal Parliament. There are some doubts about the constitutional validity of the legislation which the Federal Government intends to introduce in relation to independent retail sales outlets.

A section of the Constitution of Australia states that the Federal Government will have no control

over trade between or within States. It is my bet that if the Federal Government tries to introduce this legislation and it hurts the oil companies too much, the constitutional validity of the legislation will be challenged.

It is my view that the Prices Justification Tribunal should be directed by the Federal Government to declare a refinery gate wholesale price. It should allow anybody to become involved in transport and retailing, including the oil companies. We would then need only some overview of the industry by the Trade Practices Commission. I thought that was why that commission was set up. I think that would be a simpler policy and better than all of the talk and carry-on by the Federal Government at the present time.

I must say that while I am opposed to the world parity price policy because of its inflationary effect, I have been told that if the Federal Government were to declare a more accurate wholesale price, the price of fuel would drop by as much as 20 per cent.

Mr MacKinnon: That will not encourage conservation.

Mr COWAN: What level of prices does one have to pay before it can be determined it will have the effect of conserving fuel? If I am paying 20, 40, or 35c a litre—

Mr MacKinnon: What happens in 10 years' time when we do have to pay world parity prices?

Mr COWAN: We are paying world parity prices now, which go either to the Government in taxes or to the oil companies.

Mr MacKinnon: No, not now.

Mr COWAN: Of course it does.

Sir Charles Court: I am afraid the honourable member needs to do a lot more study before he gets himself into this.

Mr COWAN: I think the Premier wants to stop taking it for granted that people in rural areas will vote for his party.

Sir Charles Court: If you keep on as you are going, you will make it very easy for us to disabuse their minds about your party.

Mr COWAN: People in outer areas cannot be treated as second-class citizens, and that is what the Premier and his Federal colleagues are doing.

I wish to raise one other matter regarding a policy we brought in in the State election campaign in February this year. I refer to pay-roll tax. The National Party believes very strongly that pay-roll tax should be abolished and has

advocated that it be abolished or replaced over a period of 10 years.

Mr MacKinnon: Replaced with what?

Mr COWAN: I took out some figures on pay-roll tax and discovered that 30 per cent of it is paid by the Government itself. If we are receiving revenue of \$168 million a year into Consolidated Revenue from pay-roll tax, it would go down to just over \$100 million if the Government did not pay its own tax. In trying to abolish the tax over a 10-year period, we will be looking at reducing Consolidated Revenue by \$12 million a year. In a Budget of something like \$1 500 million or \$1 600 million, surely some adjustment could be made. Hopefully we will not see the Government spending \$2 million on projects like Noonkanbah. There is a saving of \$2 million straightaway. I think it would be quite in order for the Government to look very closely at ways to reduce pay-roll tax.

MR HODGE (Melville) [11.55 a.m.]: I intend to mention in my Address-in-Reply speech three particular subjects which I think are important. One matter affects my own electorate and the other matters are of general importance to the State.

The first matter is the Government's decision to purchase the Bicton Animal Quarantine Station site. I am particularly disgusted with the way the Government has handled these negotiations. I think it deserves strong criticism and that the way it has gone about negotiating this deal should be spelt out in this House. The negotiations to purchase that site have taken over four years. Since 1976 negotiations have been proceeding to buy one small patch of land at Bicton. Why did these negotiations take so long? Why were they conducted in such secrecy?

Sir Charles Court: There is no secrecy about it. There is no hurry about it. We cannot get the place until they transfer to another location.

Mr HODGE: I do not know why it took so long. After four years of top level discussions between two Governments, I expected a special deal was being negotiated. What has happened is that the State has been taken to the cleaners. Our friend Malcolm has ripped us off for our \$1 million for three hectares of land at Bicton, and that took four years to achieve.

Why such secrecy? I have asked 25 questions about the matter in four years, at the instigation of councillors and people who are vitally interested in the future of the State and who have been kept in the dark. I have been given evasive, vague, and in fact misleading answers to most of the questions. The Government did not show me

the courtesy of telling me what it had in mind, why the negotiations were taking so long, and what the terms and conditions were. I was given no information at all—just a smart-aleck answer to every question. The Melville City Council did not fare any better; it also was kept in the dark.

In this marvellous deal we are paying \$1.085 million for the land. Obviously, we have had to pay the full market value for it. That, of course, removes most of the options open to the State Government, the Melville City Council, or anyone else for the future use of the land. As we paid in excess of \$1 million for it, obviously it will not be put to the use which the council, the members of Parliament for the area, and all the residents want; that is, for the use of the public as public open space. That will not be possible when a price in excess of \$1 million has been paid.

I am very suspicious about this transaction. I think a deal has been made with a private developer. I am convinced of that. There are strong rumours going around the area—

Mr Young: Who started them?

Mr HODGE: I do not know who started them. They are reported to me frequently. My constituents are very concerned.

Mr MacKinnon: What is the name of the developer?

Mr HODGE: I thought the Honorary Minister may have known that. It would not surprise me if I woke up one morning and found the Premier had announced that a large developer had purchased the land for \$1.5 million and was going to subdivide it and sell it off for expensive high-density real estate development and make a few million on it.

Mr Young: You just said he bought it at market value—will this chap make a loss?

Mr HODGE: He bought it at market value, but even the Minister for Health should realise that if it is broken up into home lots with strata titles, a lot more money will be made than by selling the land as one block. I would have thought the Minister would know that.

Mr Bertram: The Minister is a high-powered accountant—he should know that.

Mr HODGE: I will tell the House a little later about the Minister's high-powered accountancy deals.

The Federal member of Parliament for that area, the three State members of Parliament, the Melville City Council, and several hundred constituents who have been in touch with me over the years, all believe that the site should be retained for use by people of the area. High-

density living is becoming more common in the City of Melville. In Bicton, Palmyra, and Melville itself, over recent years hundreds of homes have been demolished and building blocks amalgamated. Where two or three homes stood formerly, there are now 20 or 30 home units.

Mr Rushton: Medium density—I do not think it is high density.

Mr HODGE: Yes, medium density. However, many more people live there now than in previous years when houses were erected on quarter-acre and half-acre blocks. There will be increasing demands in the future for public open space. The Government had a unique opportunity to do a deal with the Federal Government on behalf of the residents of Melville and the residents of surrounding areas to provide public open space.

Mrs Craig: What sort of deal?

Mr HODGE: For instance, why could not the Government have negotiated a deal similar to the agreement reached in regard to Wireless Hill when the OTC terminated its use of that site? The Federal Government sold that land to the State Government for a modest sum on the understanding that the land would be handed over to the Melville City Council and kept for the use of the people of the district.

Mrs Craig: Even when the sale of the Woodman Point site was negotiated the Federal Government wanted the market price. As well as that, I gave a guarantee that it would be gazetted an "A"-class reserve. So the deals you talk about are not possible.

Mr HODGE: They are possible; I have just quoted an example.

Sir Charles Court: That is a long time ago. The Prime Minister has now laid down a policy, and the Federal Government has since laid down that all future sales must be on market values.

Mr HODGE: We are all told how tough and astute the Premier is, and so, with a Prime Minister of his own political persuasion, one would think he would be able to arrange a deal.

Sir Charles Court: I am just telling you the policy.

Mr HODGE: I can assure Government members that the Melville City Council would have appreciated such an arrangement, as would the residents, and all the members of Parliament who represent the area.

The price tag of over \$1 million for the land rules out the option of obtaining the whole area for the use of the public. If portion of the land must be developed to recoup the \$1 million, the Government should agree to appoint the Melville

City Council as the developer. Development should not be carried out by a private company. The council wants to develop the area, and the Government should indicate a willingness for it to do so. This would mean the development would be carried out in a way which would be in the best interests of the people of the area.

Mrs Craig: Even if a private developer did it, it has to be in conformity with what the Melville City Council finds acceptable. So the council is in a situation to say the manner in which the development will take place.

Mr HODGE: I realise that, but I still believe it would be more suitable for the council to develop it. Certainly it would be developed more efficiently.

Mrs Craig: How could the council develop it more efficiently?

Mr HODGE: If any money were to be made out of the deal, I would like to see the council making that money. Indeed, it may not want to make a profit; it may wish to develop the land and sell it at cost price. I cannot see a private developer wanting to do that. Obviously a private developer would want to squeeze in the maximum number of units and houses.

Mrs Craig: How could a private developer squeeze in any more homes than the number decided on by the council?

Mr HODGE: The Melville City Council may not work to the letter of the law.

Mrs Craig: The Melville City Council must work in conformity with its town planning scheme.

Mr HODGE: The point I am trying to make, if the Minister will stop interjecting for a moment, is that the developer will exploit the law to the full; that is, he will build as many home units and as many houses as he can lawfully. The Melville City Council, not needing to make a profit, may not exploit the law to the full. It may put in fewer houses than the maximum the law allows, and therefore, the public will receive a better deal.

Mrs Craig: Most unrealistic.

Mr Davies: You shouldn't keep interrupting the Minister's interjections! It is rotten of you to do that.

Mr HODGE: I have probably said enough on that subject. I do not think the House is under any illusion about my thoughts on the sale of the Bicton Quarantine Station.

I would now like to refer to the scandalous situation that has been allowed to develop with regard to the extensions to the Royal Perth Hospital. I was interested the other night to hear

the Premier tell the House, by way of interjection, what a marvellous job the present Minister for Health has done and how his accountancy qualifications and expertise had benefited the State in the complex negotiations over funding and general health matters.

I will relate to the house the situation that has developed with regard to the extensions to the Royal Perth Hospital. In 1977-78 the Fraser Government slashed the Western Australian specific purpose capital payments under the hospital development programme from \$12 million to \$4.7 million. Then in 1978-79, the slash was even more dramatic—it was slashed to zero. So under the marvellous financial stewardship of the Minister for Health we have seen the Fraser Government's contribution to the hospital development programme in this State drop from \$12 million to \$4.7 million, and then to zero. So the Minister certainly has an impressive track record so far in his high-powered financial dealings with the Fraser Government.

Mr Young: What would you propose that a State Minister can do when the Federal Government sends a telegram saying that is the end of the funds?

Mr H. D. Evans: These are your own Federal colleagues.

Mr Young: You have read my telex on this matter.

Mr H. D. Evans: You cannot dissociate yourself from those policies.

Mr Young: You can't read!

Mr HODGE: On 22 January 1975 it was announced in *The West Australian* that Cabinet had approved a \$25 million extension to the Royal Perth Hospital.

The then Minister for Health (the Hon. N. E. Baxter) said that work on the new extension for the proposed northern block would start about March 1975 and should be completed by 1980.

The Premier, in his speech to the Appropriation Bill (General Loan Fund) on 9 October 1975, reported on page 3 359 of *Hansard*, had this to say—

The Royal Perth Hospital north block will include accommodation to relieve grossly overcrowded areas in the existing hospital. This work will require total expenditure in the order of \$28 million spread over a period of five years.

Work on the northern block extension finally commenced on 22 January 1976—a year after the announcement was made. The total expenditure in the year 1975-76 amounted to \$1.6 million.

Since then a total of \$8.1 million has been spent over five years, made up as follows—

	\$
1975-76	1.4 million
1976-77	1.2 million
1977-78	2.0 million
1978-79	2.8 million
1979-80	0.7 million

It is clear of course that the State Government is not able to finish the extensions to the Royal Perth Hospital because the Fraser Government has cut off the funds. With the level of funding and the rate of inflation, the extensions will never be completed. They were due for completion this year—five years after work started.

In reply to a parliamentary question on 13 August 1980, the Premier said the anticipated construction time to the completion of the building was not determined at the time the work was commenced, but it would be dependent upon the continued availability of funds so as to complete the building progressively. That is just not true. As I quoted a moment ago, a former Minister for Health (the Hon. N. E. Baxter) said in 1975 that the work would be finished by 1980. The Premier, a few weeks ago, was trying to convince us that no date was set for the completion of the work. Now, five years after the project was started, only 8 per cent of the extensions is completed.

The last major construction work carried out on the hospital was on 29 February 1980. In answer to the same question, the Premier told us that the estimated cost of completing the project is \$68.65 million. That figure has escalated somewhat from the original estimate of \$25 million. So between 1975 and 1980, according to the Premier, the money required to complete the project—not taking into account the \$8 million already spent—will be a further \$68 million.

What is going to happen; and how is the gross overcrowding referred to some years ago progressing now? I draw attention to an article which appeared in the Press on 15 June which stated that the situation had become so grim that the efficiency of Royal Perth Hospital was at stake. The administrator of the hospital was reported to have said, "The longer we leave things, the more inefficient they become."

The next instalment in this saga occurred on 3 August when the present Minister for Health made an announcement that \$3 million to \$4 million will be allocated to the north block extensions of Royal Perth Hospital in 1980-81. Not all of that money will be spent on construction work, because the Minister went on

to say that included in the allocation will be money for the advance purchase of some major equipment that will be brought into service in the existing hospital and then transferred to the north block when it is completed.

So we can see that the north block extensions will cost a great deal more than the original estimate of \$25.5 million, which was approved by Cabinet in 1975. The estimate in 1980 is \$76.75 million. In the five years the project has been under way, the cost has escalated by \$51.25 million, an increase of 200 per cent. This means the cost of building the extensions is increasing by \$10 million a year and at this stage the Government has allocated, perhaps, \$3 million to \$4 million for the total project in the year 1980-81.

As I said previously, if the Government continues to fund this work at the present rate, the hospital will never be completed. Even if the \$3 million or \$4 million allocated for 1980-81 were spent entirely on construction, it would still be only a drop in the bucket and would not go anywhere.

In the next year we can see a 14 per cent increase in costs looming up, which will add another \$11 million to the cost of the building. Even if it were to complete the project by 1985—10 years after its commencement—the Government would need to spend on average about \$13 million each year between now and 1985. Of course, virtually nothing was allocated for 1979-80, and in the current financial year perhaps \$3 million or \$4 million will be allocated to the project. As I said, even if all that money were spent on construction work it would still be of little help. If the Government allocated \$4 million each year, it would still take until 1997 to complete the hospital.

So if we see the funding continue even at this most generous estimate of \$4 million a year, we will not see the north wing of Royal Perth Hospital finished until 1997.

Mr Young: Would you perhaps tell the House which taxes and charges you would increase, or which schools and other hospitals or building programmes you would cut out in order to provide money to finish the north block? If you don't want to tell me now, would you be prepared to write to me and tell me?

Mr Pearce: Do you want him to have your job?

Mr HODGE: If I were the Minister for Health I would be advising the people of Western Australia who voted for the Government at the last election to change their vote and to put in a Labor Government.

Mr Young: You get nil out of 10 for that answer.

Mr HODGE: The Minister is obviously too incompetent to deal with his Liberal Party colleagues in Canberra. I am sure he would notice a change if he were dealing with Federal Labor Ministers.

Mr Young: You get nil out of 10 for that one, too. Have a think about what I said.

Mr HODGE: The Minister ought to talk! We have a white elephant down there upon which he has spent \$8 million, and it is standing there rusting away.

Mr Young: I will send you an answer.

Mr HODGE: What a brilliant Minister for Health he is!

Mr Blaikie: Hear, hear!

Mr HODGE: Such is the genius of this accountant that if he continues to fund this work at the present rate it will never be finished because the cost is escalating at a faster rate than he can keep up with, and the edifice that has been constructed already will just rust away.

Mr Young: I will be waiting for your letter.

Mr HODGE: The Minister has wasted \$8 million of the taxpayers' money; and as he and the Premier have said, inefficiency at Royal Perth Hospital is growing because of the overcrowding and he is powerless to do anything about it.

I think that is a major scandal; it is something over which this Government ought to hang its head in shame. The Government has many failings in the field of health, but surely this must be one of the greatest scandals ever.

Another matter which I wish to draw to the attention of the House and which is exercising the minds of many people at the moment is that of health insurance. At present terrific confusion, uncertainty, and I suppose even chaos exists in the community in respect of health insurance. I think many people were looking to the Federal Budget which was brought down a few weeks ago for some hope of clarity, some hope of a new deal, some hope of the present chaotic situation being resolved. But, alas, they were disappointed. No improvements were made to the health insurance system, and it seems we have to bear with the present mess until after the Federal election. It is quite obvious that the Liberal Party will not fiddle with the health insurance system this side of the election.

As you know, Sir, four major changes have been made to the health insurance system in five years, and this has caused terrific confusion to the public. I am certain we will see another major

change if a Liberal Government is returned after the election. The general public in Western Australia should be warned now not to be conned as they were at the last State election when they were told there would be no increases in charges and so on, and so they voted for the Liberal Party. Then a few weeks later they were hit with increases in water charges, SEC charges, fares, State Housing Commission rents, etc.

I can assure the public of Western Australia now that if they return a Liberal Government to Canberra at the next election two things will happen for certain in the field of health insurance.

The first is that health insurance rates will increase dramatically. The second is that the Minister will introduce his long-cherished means test in respect of public hospitals. Those things are sure to occur. The public of Western Australia should be under no illusion; and if they vote for the Liberal Party and return Fraser to Canberra they should not then scream about health insurance because it is almost a certainty that rates will escalate a great deal after the election.

Mr Watt: Are you tipping a Liberal win?

Mr HODGE: Health insurance rates are being held down artificially for the sake of the election. Since the Federal Budget was brought down, many people have said to me they were disappointed no attempt was made in it to resolve the health insurance issue. A number of letters were written to the newspaper, and I would like to quote one which I think is typical of several that have appeared in *The West Australian*. The letter was written by a D. Wilson, of South Coast Highway, Albany, and appeared in *The West Australian* of Saturday, 30 August this year. It states as follows—

With the bringing down of the Federal Budget I can see the bringing down of private health insurance.

I feel sure that many people had been waiting for some tax concession for health insurance.

It seems that only the chronically ill and stupid pay for health cover; it would not take a bush lawyer to work out who was in front under the present scheme.

The final paragraph of the letter reads as follows—

We are cancelling our health insurance.

That is only one of a number of similar letters which have appeared in the newspaper recently.

A number of people have telephoned me—people I have met around the town—stating

the same sorts of things to me. They said they were looking forward to relief in the Federal Budget, and were disappointed when none was forthcoming. They said they intended to cancel their health insurance and had been holding on only in the expectation that the Government was going to alter the present health scheme. It was not unreasonable for them to suspect an alteration was going to be made because, in an article in the *Daily News* of 30 April this year under the heading of, "New Move on Health", the following appeared—

The Federal government is considering more major changes to the national health insurance scheme.

The Minister for Health, Mr MacKellar, has a submission before Federal Cabinet in which he has proposed a series of options for new health insurance arrangements.

People reading that article were led to believe changes would be made, and the logical time to make them would have been the Federal Budget. The same article goes on to say—

The changes are being considered because of growing concern about the number of people opting out of private health insurance.

Another paragraph states as follows—

The latest annual figures show that between December, 1978, and December, 1979, more than 400,000 people have opted out of medical insurance and nearly one million have opted out of basic hospital insurance.

So, we can see that the private health insurance funds are in real trouble. In fact, I believe some funds in the Eastern States are in a worse position than funds in Western Australia. They are all having a tough time at the moment under this Federal Government, and the uncertainty and confusion in the community is adding to their troubles.

Many people are taking the gamble on ill-health and are opting out of health insurance funds because they do not really understand how the system works, or they cannot afford to pay the high premiums demanded. They are confused by the system. Many people in fact are over-insured. I have had people coming to my office—people on very low incomes—who are paying \$12 and \$14 a week in health insurance. They are paying unnecessarily high premiums simply because they do not understand the system. Other people have been under-insured, again because they did not understand the system. They receive a dreadful shock when they submit a claim to their insurance

fund and find only a percentage of their bills is refunded.

The present scheme just is not working. If it is allowed to drift on much longer it seems only the chronically ill and the elderly will continue to pay into health insurance funds. The number of people going to public hospitals for their medical treatment is increasing rapidly. I receive constant complaints from people who attend public hospitals for medical treatment about the number of hours they must sit and wait, and about the length of time it takes to get appointments. In fact, I raised this very matter with the Minister by way of question, when I referred him to the case of a woman who was given an appointment in six months' time to consult an eye specialist at the Royal Perth Hospital. Her condition may not have been particularly urgent, although obviously it was troubling her and was in need of attention.

The hospitals are feeling the pinch and, in fact, that was the very headline in another article in the *Daily News* of Thursday, 14 August this year. Under the heading, "Hospitals feel the pinch" the following statement is made—

Perth's public hospitals are battling to cope with a big increase in the number of patients while the number of private patients is shrinking rapidly.

The increase in the number of people seeking public hospital treatment is seen by professionals in the health-care field as being a result of public uncertainty and dissatisfaction with health insurance.

We can see that the chaotic mess which the health insurance scheme is in is having a direct effect on our public hospitals and on their efficiency of operations.

Mr Sibson: Directly caused by your colleagues in the past.

Mr HODGE: The same article goes on to state—

The medical superintendent of the Gairdner Hospital, Dr R. Kilgour, said this week that the hospital was barely coping with a big increase in the number of patients.

"Public hospitals are under enormous pressure," he said. "we are full to capacity and I understand that Royal Perth Hospital and Fremantle are in a similar situation."

Another article along the same lines appeared in the *Daily News* of 11 April this year. Under the heading, "Patients face long wait: Hospital Chief", the following appears—

The number of people opting out of health insurance could lead to long queues and

waiting times at public hospitals and higher taxation to pay the cost, it is claimed.

Once again, those remarks were attributed to the medical superintendent of the Queen Elizabeth Medical Centre (Dr R. Kilgour).

I do not think anyone could deny the public hospitals in this State are in a state of crisis at the moment in respect of the treatment of out-patients and uninsured people. This is a direct result of the policies pursued by the Liberal Party in Canberra, and backed up by their colleagues in Western Australia.

Mr Young: You realise, of course, what the situation would have been had the Hayden Medibank system continued to operate?

Mr HODGE: Yes, it is obvious we would have had a vastly superior system to the one now operating.

Mr Young: No, what would have happened is that the Commonwealth Government by now would be printing thousands of millions of dollars a year to build the hospitals to cope with the wipe-out of the entire private medical profession. You know that, and everyone else in this Chamber knows it.

Mr HODGE: I am glad the Minister for Health raised that point. I was going to deal with it later, but I will refer to it now. If anything is leading to a nationalisation of our health scheme, it is the policy being adopted by the Liberal Government in Canberra and their colleagues here in Western Australia. More and more people are attending salaried doctors in public hospitals for their medical treatment; fewer people are going to private medical practitioners; fewer people are taking out private health insurance; fewer people are going to private hospitals for elective surgery; more people are asking their general practitioner to classify them as disadvantaged.

I notice in this year's Federal Budget that an amount of \$51 million has been allocated for the treatment of disadvantaged people. This represents an increase of \$30 million over last year's figure. So, more and more doctors are receiving more and more of their income directly from the Government, which is exactly what they did not want. If that is not pushing the system at a very rapid rate towards nationalisation, I do not know what it is.

Mr Young: I have made all those points publicly on a number of occasions, as you well know. I am pointing out to you that you and your colleagues supported the Hayden scheme, which would have speeded up that process.

Mr HODGE: That is not true, and the Minister well knows it. If the Liberal Party had co-operated with the Federal Labor Government in the introduction of Medibank, we would have had a marvellous scheme now operating instead of the ramshackle affair we now have.

Mr Young: You spoke of a woman who had to wait six months to see an eye specialist. In Britain, under their nationalised health system, a pregnant woman must wait longer than her pregnancy term to obtain an abortion!

Mr HODGE: The Minister well knows my remarks today are not directed at justifying the British scheme. In the past five years under the Fraser Government we have seen no fewer than four major changes to our national health scheme. None of these changes has been complementary; they have all been contradictory. They have moved in opposite directions.

In 1976 we saw the transfer of the cost of the health insurance scheme to the contributors. The Fraser Government laid the cost onto the contributors in 1976. In 1978 it was reversed, and the Fraser Government accepted much of the cost. In 1979, the cost was transferred onto the contributors. These contradictory movements have not been done accidentally. They have been done deliberately, to fit in with the Budget considerations of the Fraser Government.

The Fraser Government and the Court Government have not had a health policy for the past five years. The health policy of this country has been dictated by the Treasury officials, not by the health authorities. Treasury considerations have dictated every change in the health insurance scheme since Malcolm Fraser has been in office. When he wanted to fiddle the CPI figures, the cost of the health insurance scheme was moved onto the Government. When he wanted to bring the Budget deficit down, the cost was moved the other way onto the contributors. These budgetary considerations dictated the changes to the health insurance scheme. They were not carried out in the best interests of the health of the people of Australia. They were in the best interests of propaganda for the Fraser Government.

Some weeks ago, in a desperate attempt to keep health insurance costs down until after the election, we saw \$75 million of taxpayers' money paid into the reinsurance pool. Ostensibly this was done to aid the chronically ill. That was the official reason; but everyone knows the real reason was to enable the private health insurance funds to keep their rates down until after the election. With doctors' fees going up by 9.7 per

cent in November, something had to be done. To avoid the electoral backlash of the rise in the fees before the election, \$75 million of taxpayers' money was quietly paid into the private health funds.

Mr Young: Quietly? Only after I called for it at the Health Ministers' conference; and it was carried unanimously by the Health Ministers.

Mr HODGE: The Minister is admitting his implication in this scheme?

Mr Young: We told everybody in Western Australia. There was a public statement, and it was flashed across every newspaper in Australia. The Prime Minister and the Federal Minister for Health announced it; and you say it was quietly paid in. Now, come on!

Mr HODGE: It was paid very quietly. The article in *The West Australian* was no more than one inch high. I can show the Minister the cutting from *The West Australian* if he wants to see it. It was well back in the newspaper.

Mr Young: Plenty of publicity right throughout the nation.

Mr HODGE: I am interested to hear the Minister admitting his complicity in this scheme.

Mr Young: I made a Press release on it.

Mr HODGE: There was a 134 per cent increase in the contribution to the reinsurance pool, for the re-election of the Liberal Party.

Mr Young: A couple of minutes ago you were bleeding at the heart for the private health funds, which is the first time, incidentally, I have heard anyone on that side do that; but now they have received a \$75 million injection, and you reckon there is something suspicious about it. You are a funny fellow.

Mr HODGE: I know there is something suspicious about it. It was done to enable the Liberals to be re-elected. This problem will have to be sorted out at some time. The only solution we have heard from the present State Minister for Health has been in his plaintive cries in the newspaper that we ought to go back to the good old, pre-Medibank days. That is his solution. There was a letter containing his nostalgic reminiscences in *The West Australian* of 9 August 1980. In that letter he said—

Till we can revert to the pre-Medibank health-care system, where all but pensioners and disadvantaged people paid for hospital services, there will continue to be anomalies.

Then the Minister went on to take a shot at the morals of the people who cannot afford to pay for private health insurance.

Mr Young: I beg your pardon? Will you read it?

Mr HODGE: It reads—

It is morally wrong that people who can afford to pay . . .

Mr Young: "Who can afford to pay". You just said "people who cannot".

Mr HODGE: Is the Government going to judge people—

Mr Young: I know you cannot tell the difference between "can" and "cannot". I have been telling you all day you cannot read.

Mr HODGE: Is the Government going to make judgments about people?

Mr Young: If a man is on \$40 000 a year, do you think you ought to pay for his medical treatment?

Mr HODGE: The Minister has no right to judge the morals of people.

Mr Young: Answer me. Do you think he should have free medical treatment?

Mr HODGE: That is what the Government is providing.

Mr Young: Do you think he should receive it?

Mr HODGE: I believe he should have the right to go to a public hospital if he wants to.

Mr Young: Everyone, regardless of their income?

Mr HODGE: Yes.

Mr Davies: Under a proper scheme.

Mr HODGE: This marvellous pre-Medibank scheme that the Minister is suggesting, this era of pre-Medibank—

Mr Wilson: He is making notes again.

Mr Young: Do not try that again. It is not going to help your silly causes.

The ACTING SPEAKER: (Mr Crane): Order!

Mr HODGE: I would like to point out to the Minister for Health some of the failings of this marvellous pre-Medibank scheme that he is urging on us. In 1969 the Liberal Government commissioned a committee of inquiry into the pre-Medibank health insurance scheme. The committee of inquiry reported to the Commonwealth Government in March 1969, in a report called the Nimmo report. I would like to read to the Minister the three major findings of that inquiry about his marvellous, pre-Medibank scheme. Those findings are as follows—

1. The operation of the health insurance scheme is unnecessarily complex and beyond the comprehension of many.

2. The benefits received by contributors are frequently much less than the cost of hospital and medical treatment.

3. The contributions have increased to such an extent that they are beyond the capacity of some members of the community and involve considerable hardship for others.

Mr Clarko: Would you agree there was quite a distinction between the problems of the health funds in the Eastern States and those in Western Australia?

Mr HODGE: The problems were common, but they were not as severe in this State.

Mr Young: They were worse here. You do not know anything about the subject.

Mr HODGE: The Minister should read the Nimmo report. The problems were not as severe in Western Australia in those days.

Mr Young: In those days!

Mr HODGE: I am referring the Minister to that. He should listen to me, instead of writing so many notes. He might learn something.

They were the three major findings of the Nimmo report. In 1969 the system was in a chaotic mess. The Liberal Prime Minister at the time (Mr Gorton), commissioned Mr Justice Nimmo to inquire why the system was in such a mess and why it was not working. Mr Justice Nimmo said that it was too complex and confusing—most people could not understand it. It was too expensive—people could not afford it. The refunds were not adequate, and the whole thing was a mess. They are the reasons the Medibank scheme was brought in, as the other scheme was not working.

That is the sort of chaotic mess to which this Minister wants us to return. We are virtually back to it now.

Mr Young: If anyone wrote a report on the circumstances following Medibank compared with those prior to Medibank, they would think they were halcyon days prior to Medibank.

Mr HODGE: If anyone wrote a report on the present mess, they would say that about Medibank.

This Minister takes his instructions from the AMA. On 11 April this year, the AMA had a front-page story in *The West Australian* calling on the Government to force the people back into the health funds, whether they could afford it or not, by bringing in a means test.

Mr Sibson: You know that is not true.

Mr HODGE: The next day, the Minister issued a Press release indicating he also believed people should be forced back into the private health funds by abolishing free treatment in public hospitals. That exposes the shambles that the Government's policy is in.

Mr Young: Do not read the last paragraph. You will spoil your story.

Mr HODGE: The Minister has admitted his complicity in the \$75 million scheme to have Malcolm Fraser re-elected. I hope the public of Western Australia—

Mr Young: That is a straightout untruth.

Mr HODGE: —are alerted now, and do not receive a shock if they elect the Liberals and find that health insurance charges rocket and a means test is introduced in the public hospitals.

MR SPRIGGS (Darling Range) [12.40 p.m.]: I take this opportunity to speak to the Address-in-Reply moved by the member for Mundaring—

Mr Pearce: The opportunities do not come along very often.

Mr MacKinnon: You should take a leaf out of his book.

Mr Barnett: Yes, and go to sleep.

Mr Clarko: When he is asleep he is still twice as intelligent as you are awake.

Mr SPRIGGS: In the absence of the Speaker, I would like to convey through you, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Crane), my congratulations on his return to his high office. I would like to congratulate also those members who were elected this year. I wish them well.

There are a number of electorate matters on which I would like to make some comment and one concerns the Kelmscott High School. I recently had the privilege of having the Minister and some of his departmental officers visit this school. For those members who do not know, the Kelmscott High School—whilst not in my electorate, it certainly caters for the pupils from within my electorate—does have one significant factor not available in other high schools within the metropolitan area. This high school has a farm project, and it is on this particular aspect of the school that I wish to speak.

In my opinion, and, I am certain, in the opinion of any other interested person, the farm project is doing a tremendous job for the community of Kelmscott and the metropolitan area as a whole. It is the only school with a capacity to show pupils in the metropolitan area all about the farming industry on which this State depends so much. It enabled pupils—about 9 000 attended last year—from the metropolitan area to learn,

perhaps for the first time, that milk comes from cows and eggs from poultry, and not from the supermarket shelves!

Mr Davies: That was meant to be a joke, was it not?

Mr SPRIGGS: That is correct; but perhaps the Leader of the Opposition was one of those unfortunate pupils who lived in the metropolitan area and did not know from where milk and eggs came.

Mr Sibson: And still does not.

Mr Shalders: That is why he wins so many votes in the country!

Mr SPRIGGS: Two-thirds of the students who attend the high school opt to take part in the project, and that in itself enables a fair percentage of all pupils not only to learn the fundamentals of farming but also to gain an understanding of just what the rural communities of our State produce.

There is a problem facing the Kelmscott High School and as such I would have liked the Minister for Education to be in the Chamber.

Mr Pearce: He is out asking the Museum more questions.

Mr SPRIGGS: I am certain that following his visit he fully understands the problems which the Kelmscott High School will have in the very near future. The area where the farm project is situated lies partly on the primary school site and because of the necessity for an additional primary school in the area there is a chance in the very near future that this land will be required. It is necessary and highly desirable for the needs of the Kelmscott High School and the catchment area it serves—indeed the entire metropolitan area—that the project be granted additional land so that it may continue and in fact expand to enable more and more pupils from the metropolitan area to have the opportunity to learn the meaningful things of life. I take this opportunity to place on record my thanks to the Minister and his departmental officers for their visit to the Kelmscott High School and for the interest they showed. I am certain they are interested in providing land to enable the project to continue.

If the Speaker were in the Chair, he would not need to be told that I have had a lifetime interest in sporting clubs. I am very pleased to find that at long last there seems to be a commitment to look at the anomalies in the Liquor Act and all the laws pertaining to licensed clubs. Sporting clubs in this State provide facilities for something like 200 000 people. They provide sporting facilities for juniors and adults in all kinds of sports. Over the years they have had to function under a

Liquor Act containing anomalies and under laws which have made it difficult for them to operate.

Certain sections of the Liquor Act prevent sporting clubs from carrying out the functions which are so necessary for them if they are to maintain sporting facilities which have been established at no cost to the taxpayer or to the ratepayer. Without these clubs, both the Government and the local municipalities would have to find thousands of dollars to establish similar facilities.

One of the anomalies in the Act which works against these clubs prevents licensed clubs from borrowing any liquor if they happen to cut out their supplies on a particular day. That is a stupid situation. Another anomaly which affects clubs is that they can obtain an extraordinary licence to make a success of a function provided there is a meal available in a dining room. A tremendous number of the 300-odd licensed clubs in this State cannot afford the facility of a separate dining room. However, they are capable of providing a meal elsewhere on club premises.

Mr Davies: They should be allowed to play bingo there, too.

Mr SPRIGGS: I will mention that later because I completely agree with that comment. While I am completely in favour of not seeing the reintroduction of poker machines in this State, I support those forms of gambling such as bingo which, to my mind, can do no harm but can do a tremendous amount of good for licensed clubs. I believe that mild form of gambling is another avenue that should be available to licensed clubs.

I am pleased to see a most competent committee has been appointed to examine this matter. I understand licensed clubs, along with many other organisations, have made submissions to the committee setting out their feelings with regard to the anomalies which exist in the Liquor Act and Gaming Act.

Mr Jamieson: But these matters do not come within the purview of those Acts. They come under the Lotteries (Control) Act.

Mr SPRIGGS: The committee is empowered to inquire into the anomalies which exist in the Liquor Act, the Gaming Act, and the Lotteries (Control) Act to enable some of the problems which exist in the area of licensed clubs to be overcome.

I should like to mention some other anomalies, in particular, a strange section of the Act which allows visiting competitors of most sports to attend a club for the purpose of playing sport; but the definition excludes tennis players and cricket players. I am certain this anomaly will be

rectified as a result of the submissions which have been placed before the committee.

I should like to emphasise to the House the great and important role played by licensed clubs within this State. They provide facilities which would not otherwise be available to a great percentage of our people. They would not be available, because neither the State Government nor local government would have the capacity to provide those facilities.

I urge Cabinet, in looking at a review of the Liquor Act, the Lotteries (Control) Act, and the Gaming Act to take account of the services these clubs provide to this State.

There is only one other matter I wish to mention in this debate.

Mr Pearce: Aim for 15 minutes. See if you can make 15 minutes.

Mr SPRIGGS: I shall speak for only the prescribed time. I do not support the theory that standing up in this House and making speeches contributes to the workings of the State when such contributions or speeches are of no value.

Mr Davies: You are more for lying down and sleeping I think.

Mr Pearce: You carry out your policy in a most consistent way.

Mr Sodeman: To whom were you speaking then?

Mr SPRIGGS: I was referring to the member for Gosnells. I should like to refer to one other matter which does not relate to my electorate. I believe this matter is of great importance to the well-being of a large number of people, in fact to the well-being of every person in our State.

Last year, with a number of other members of the House, including the Deputy Conservator of Forests, I had the privilege to visit Manjimup.

Mr H. D. Evans: It is good country.

Mr SPRIGGS: I agree with the member for Warren, it is excellent country. It is probably some of the best country in this State; although it is not as good as the hills area.

We had the privilege to visit the Manjimup area for several days during which time we looked closely at the wood chipping industry and the reforestation programme which is being carried out by the Forests Department of this State. We also visited sunklands and saw the pine-growing projects.

I have lived in forest areas for most of my life and I had certain reservations about the wood chipping industry. However, I am delighted to say that, having had the opportunity to visit

Manjimup and to examine all aspects of the wood chipping industry, the reforestation programme, and the karri forests in great detail, I left the area with no doubt in my mind that the only thing which will save the karri forests in this State is the wood chipping industry and the activities of the Forests Department.

Whilst in the Manjimup area we looked at the devastated regions where complete tree felling had been carried out. I am sure anyone who has had anything to do with country areas would agree that, when land is cleared, it leaves great devastation. However, the Forests Department is the only true conservationist that exists and operates in this State. The officers of the Forests Department are dedicated to their work. In no way does the department, which includes the officers from the road gangs to the Conservator, destroy the forests of our State.

It was an eye opener to observe the different methods used by the department for the preservation of forests. I only wish the so-called conservationists of this State and the various lobby groups would go down to the Manjimup area and take the opportunity provided by the Forests Department to view at first hand what can be done and what is being done to preserve the forests of our State.

Mr Herzfeld: You know that if the ALP came to power it would stop wood chipping.

Mr Pearce: That is not true.

Mr Herzfeld: The member for Warren is very worried about it.

Mr Pearce: The only person worried about it is you, in your desperate efforts to hold onto your seat.

Mr SPRIGGS: Along with the member for Warren, I was dismayed recently to see that it was stated at the Labor Party conference of this State—

Mr Bertram: Have you had a Liberal Party conference yet?

Mr SPRIGGS: —that if the people of Western Australia were stupid enough, and I am sure they are not, to return a Labor Government to this State, not only would the wood chipping industry be destroyed, but the reforestation of this State would be destroyed also.

Mr H. D. Evans: That is not true. I had better send you a copy of the minutes.

Mr Jamieson: You should have a copy of our platform.

Mr H. D. Evans: You were going so well too.

Mr Jamieson: When you talk in this House, talk sense or shut up!

Mr SPRIGGS: The member for Welshpool should talk to some of his colleagues.

Mr H. D. Evans: You were going very well with the Forests Department.

Mr Jamieson: Talk sense or shut up!

Mr Pearce: Lunch time!

Mr SPRIGGS: I have the Labor Party platform—

Mr Jamieson: What a stupid person!

Sitting suspended from 1.00 to 2.15 p.m.

Mr SPRIGGS: Prior to the suspension for lunch I was rather surprised to be challenged by the member for Welshpool to produce the Labor Party policy document as well as his claim that it was not the correct one. It was the Federal policy. I did not realise that the Opposition dissociated itself from the Federal Labor Party policy.

Mr Jamieson: We don't.

Mr SPRIGGS: I have always understood that with the centralist policy of the Labor Party there would be one policy for the whole of Australia. Perhaps the Federal Labor Party is not quite so stupid as to implement in its policy something which would destroy the livelihood of approximately 30 000 people as is proposed in the present policy of the Labor Party of this State. This would occur if the State were ever unfortunate enough to have the Labor Party as a Government.

I say to the member for Welshpool that I believe what I read in the paper. I am also pleased to note that the member for Warren fought very strongly against this devastating policy at the Labor Party conference.

Mr Jamieson: What particular details of the policy do you have in mind?

Mr SPRIGGS: I will excuse the member for Welshpool for not listening previously.

Mr Jamieson: You did not particularise then.

Mr SPRIGGS: It is of concern to me that there is talk of implementing a policy which will destroy completely the wood chipping industry.

Mr H. D. Evans: The problem is: which is preferable—a national park? Just get it clear in your mind.

Mr Young: I thought the subject of jobs was the most important matter in your speech.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SPRIGGS: There is no doubt in my mind or in the mind of the member for Warren that

that policy is a destructive one and to use the member for Warren's words, "It would affect the livelihood of 30 000 people." I can rest assured that the member for Warren will not be advocating that policy at the next election.

Several members interjected.

Mr SPRIGGS: I suggest that if members on the Opposition side of this House spent more time asleep, more constructive work and action would come from this House.

Government members: Hear, hear.

Mr SPRIGGS: I have never enjoyed a sight—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr SPRIGGS: —more than I did the other night—Tuesday night—because I felt we had a chance to have constructive government for the first time since I have been in this House.

Mr Jamieson: Would you like a one-party system of government?

Mr SPRIGGS: I would like to see government where the Opposition offers constructive criticism. The Opposition's identification of "constructive" is to delay the progress of this State.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr SPRIGGS: I assure the member for Welshpool that I intend to sit in this House for a long time and I expect to be on this side of the House also.

Mr Jamieson: You will be crying your eyes out.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SPRIGGS: I am confident—

Mr Jamieson: Born to rule.

Mr SPRIGGS: —that the wood chipping industry and the livelihood of the people will be protected by a constructive Liberal Government for many years to come.

MR GRILL (Yilgarn-Dundas) [2.22 p.m.]: In my contribution to the Address-in-Reply I want to deal with three issues. The first is the dire necessity within this State to set up what we have referred to as a Western Australian development corporation to help the future development of this State in the interests of Western Australian people. The second issue is the necessity for some supervision of the mushrooming growth—and some accountability for that growth to the Parliament and the people of this State—of semi-Government authorities. The third issue is the

strategic necessity for a highway to link our two major mining areas—the eastern goldfields and the Pilbara.

Firstly I will deal with the concept of a Western Australian development corporation. For some time in Australia there has been operating what I call a form of financial feudalism. Amongst the serfs who contribute to that feudalism are the people of Western Australia.

Western Australian business people, corporations, and individuals for a long time have been badly disadvantaged by the fact that the financial structure and the financial markets of Western Australia—and of all Australia, in fact—are centralised in the south-eastern corner of Australia; namely, in Melbourne and Sydney. I believe the Premier is well aware of the problems, but either because of his ideological beliefs, or because he cannot do anything, he has taken no action. Nothing has been done over the years.

What actually happens is that at the end of each trading day—each week day—the surplus moneys of this State are added together, and apart from half a million dollars or so it is syphoned off to the Eastern States. It is then invested there on the short-term money market.

Complementary to that action is the fact that each day the Western Australian branches of the major banks in this State, including the Rural and Industries Bank, syphon their money to the Eastern States for similar investment. The structure of the short-term money market in this country is such that its benefits are derived from the whole of Australia, but those benefits are enjoyed by the commercial interests in the cities of Sydney and Melbourne.

Even our Western Australian Government, each evening and each morning, invests its cash balance, surplus to its day-to-day requirements, on the short-term money market in Sydney and Melbourne. There is no such market available in this city or in this State.

When a local business, corporation, or individual requires finance by way of a loan to carry on business, or to develop a business, an approach has to be made to a local branch of a bank or financial house. The application is entertained, but a decision is not made in this State. All decisions on loans over \$250 000 are made in the Eastern States. We are a long way from the decision-making process which controls financial transactions in this State. That usually necessitates businessmen having to travel to the Eastern States to avoid a long wait until a reply is received from the Eastern States as to whether applications for loans will be granted. Therefore,

Western Australian businesses are disadvantaged, firstly, in respect of the quantity of money available for investment in this State; secondly, because of the necessity for travel arrangements to be made to the Eastern States in order to present cases; and thirdly, because of the isolation of this State. Some financial houses in the Eastern States are somewhat loath to risk money in an isolated or far-away location such as Western Australia. On those three grounds Western Australian businessmen are very severely disadvantaged.

It is the smaller businessman who is most disadvantaged rather than the bigger corporations. The larger organisations usually have headquarters in either Melbourne or Sydney.

Mr MacKinnon: I cannot understand there being any problem if you are talking about people wanting loans over \$250 000.

Mr GRILL: These days a loan of \$250 000 is not very large. If a person wanted to construct a block of four or six home units he would be looking for an amount in excess of \$250 000. I would call that a small business operation. The decisions are made in the Eastern States, and that is where the money is centralised.

Mr Trethowan: But short-term money is available on a day-to-day call basis.

Mr GRILL: The set-up of the market in Sydney and Melbourne affects the finances of this State because the money which is available eventually finds its way to those markets. Certainly, decisions with respect to day-to-day needs in this State are made in the Eastern States.

Mr MacKinnon: Are you saying there is no day call money invested in this State?

Mr GRILL: Some is, but not enough of it is available. It is an impediment to obtaining loans in this State.

Mr MacKinnon: Have you any proof of that?

Mr GRILL: I am not alone in my views.

I will refer now to the Kimberley Finance Corporation, of which the leader of members opposite has some knowledge.

Mr Williams: What do you mean, "some knowledge"?

Mr GRILL: He has some shares in the company. I will quote what Mr Harry Kitson had to say in *The Australian Miner* of 18 August 1980. Under the heading "Financier urges major lending house" the following appears—

Western Australia needs a major finance house now more than ever, the chairman of

Kimberley Finance Corporation Ltd., Mr. Harry Kitson said.

Mr Kitson told the securities institute that the impending economic uplift through projects such as the North West Shelf natural gas pipeline and increased mining would see businesses and individuals looking for more cash.

Then I quote—

"More than ever, we would need a WA-based, WA-controlled finance company capable of providing large loans and making on the spot decisions on loan applications," Mr Kitson said.

"When I last made the suggestion a couple of months ago, I was criticised by the Australian Finance conference.

"But I know of specific cases where people have been put in a precarious position when their applications were rejected after a long delay.

"In most instances, time is the essence."

Further on he says this—

"In Western Australia, I know of at least 35 finance companies operating—of which I know of only five Western Australian-controlled," Mr Kitson said.

"I believe it far better for us to have one major WA-controlled company to do at least 20 per cent of the finance company business in the State, much the same as the R & I, which does about 22 per cent of the banking business here.

And the article continues—

"But 20 per cent would mean outstandings of about \$230 million—20 times what my company now has, for instance."

Then he goes on to indicate he would like to see his company become a major finance house. It is implicit in his comments that he does not see that as a reasonable prospect in the foreseeable future.

So this is not just some sort of socialist view being put forward by the Australian Labor Party. It is a view which, by and large, has come from the financial sectors of Western Australia. The idea was not put forward by some back-room boy of the ALP; the idea was put to us by one of the foremost merchant bankers in the State.

I would say this view is now becoming generally accepted in financial circles throughout the State. Of course it has run into trouble from the more conservative sections of the financial world and from the entrenched sections of the financial world which have a vested interest in ensuring

that this State for ever remains a serf as far as financial transactions are concerned. The real interest of these sections of the financial world is not with this State, but with overseas and interstate companies which have their base operations centred in Melbourne and Sydney.

The Labor Party has put forward a proposition that a Western Australian development corporation should be set up. We do not necessarily say that should be the name of the apparatus. Its purpose would be to attract an inflow of capital funds from outside the State to begin with. Its second purpose would be to marshal certain funds from within the State, and its third purpose would be to bring in funds from overseas.

Mr Sibson: Do you suggest that is not being done now?

Mr GRILL: It is not being done satisfactorily.

Mr Sibson: You are always criticising the amount of funds coming into this State.

Mr GRILL: We are not criticising the amount of funds coming into the State, but we do criticise the unfettered control over the use of those funds and the way the companies involved can take over major control of our resources without having regard for the future of those resources.

Mr Young: I think the member for Maylands has made comment about the flow of money into the country generally.

Several members interjected.

Mr GRILL: I am telling members about a feasible system to attract money into this State and to marshal that money for the development of our resources. Such a project is backed basically by the financial world of Perth. It has the support generally speaking of those people in this State who know about finance. As I said before, the Premier knows all about it and he knows what he should do. However, he does not like the idea; he has some sort of ideological bias. Many other members on the Government side are likewise manacled by their ideological bias.

The fact is that we are being ripped off by overseas and interstate companies which operate from eastern bases. This Government is not prepared to do anything about it.

Mr P. V. Jones: Is this the way you would use that sort of funding—to pay half the cost of an aluminium smelter worth millions of dollars? Is that the way you would do it?

Mr GRILL: I do not want to get down to specifics.

Several members interjected.

Mr Sodeman: I'll bet you don't.

Mr GRILL: Any steps in this direction would have to be taken after consultation with those persons who would control the corporations I am envisaging. Firstly, we would propose that a major banking corporation from outside Australia would take a major minority shareholding.

Mr Sibson: A major minority shareholding? You fellows have some funny ideas.

Mr Pearce: You know what a major minority shareholding is.

Mr GRILL: For those who need to have it spelt out, I will say that we propose that a major banking company from outside Australia would take up a large minority shareholding so that (a) we would have the expertise that is not available in this State at the present time and (b) we would have the confidence necessary to set up an undertaking of this sort.

Secondly, we would propose that the Government would take up a minority shareholding in the corporation.

Mr Sibson: You had to swing that bit in.

Mr GRILL: Thirdly, we propose that the balance of shares in this corporation would be taken up by those bodies, basically Western Australian owned, which would like to take part in such a corporation and which are interested in resource development in this State.

Mr Sibson: For how long would the sunset clause apply?

Mr GRILL: I will deal with that in a moment, but I do not think the honourable member understands what it means.

Mr Sibson: I do not think you understand what I mean.

Mr Sodeman: That is the thin edge of the wedge.

Mr Pearce: Some of you appear to have shares in the oil rig. You should be careful when talking about Government participation.

Mr GRILL: The idea of the corporation does not scare off some of the more astute business people of this State. For instance, at the time of the last State election, probably one of our most astute businessmen—namely, Robert Holmes A'Court—was quite prepared to consider taking up the chairmanship of the board.

Mrs Craig: Prepared to consider it?

Mr Jamieson: That is what he said.

Mr GRILL: Yes. Other well known financial authorities in the State gave their endorsement to the idea and they will give it their backing.

Mr Sibson: They would need to be there to protect private interests; that is why they would want to be in there.

Mr Pearce: Are you speaking of Robert Holmes A'Court?

Mr Jamieson: The member is an expert on overseas finance.

Mr GRILL: I can assume only that opposition to this proposal would come from those who are concerned about the protection of the interest of overseas and interstate companies.

I want to turn now to semi-Government authorities. Under the Court Government there has been a burgeoning and unprecedented growth in the public sector. Contrary to public opinion, most of this growth has taken place in semi-Government bodies and agencies, commonly known as "qangos".

If we look at the employment performance of the Court Government it is probably surprising to find, firstly, that since 1974 it has been able to provide an increase in the actual number of jobs in this State of something like 32 000. However, the important factor about all this is that very few of those jobs have been increased in the private sector. The majority of those jobs—some 23 700—have come from direct Government growth and the balance of 8 500 has come from the private sector.

Mr Sibson: You know, of course, that it is necessary to build up certain Government departments to allow for the infrastructure and help required in the creation of projects which will bring many more thousands of jobs to Western Australia.

Mr GRILL: The Government has built them up, all right! It has gone mad in building them up; it has gone overboard. No Government in the history of this State has increased the public sector in the way and manner of the Court Government. This Government has created more Government agencies than any other State Government before it. During the period 1974 to 1979, the Court Government created 46 new semi-Government agencies. In its 1980 election platform, it promised to create another 27 during the course of this Parliament. At present, we have 203 semi-government agencies, not taking into account the 40 or so departments and strictly Government controlled and directed agencies, which gives a total of something like 250 agencies within this State.

The great majority—something like 65 per cent—of those agencies, contrary to public belief, have been established under conservative Governments. The one which stands at the

pinnacle of all those conservative Governments is the Court Government. It has created new agencies at the rate of nine a year. No Labor or socialist Government has ever created new Government agencies at anything like that rate. Even at the height of the Tonkin Government, agencies were created at the rate of only about four or five a year. The Court Government has created agencies hand over fist.

These semi-Government or quasi-Government agencies in this State control or employ something like 100 000 individuals, and by and large it is jobs for the boys and for the people at the top. I believe this to be one of the real reasons the Court Government and other conservative Governments have created so many of these agencies; they can shove many of their mates into these jobs. They are paid exorbitant fees to sit on these boards, committees, and agencies. I understand the rate at present is between \$60 and \$70 for anything over a four hour shift and between \$40 and \$50 for anything less than that.

Mr MacKinnon: How much did you charge an hour in your legal practice?

Mr Bateman: How much did you charge in your accountancy business? You have had one hell of a lot to say in the four minutes since you have been a Minister.

Mr GRILL: Many of these agencies have been around for a long time and many are not accountable to the Parliament; in fact, most are not accountable.

The Government does not know how many agencies are in existence. When I questioned the Premier in 1978 on just how many Government agencies there were, his department took two or three months, and several reminders from me to provide me with a list which turned out to be completely inadequate. In other words, the Government just does not know how many Government agencies there are. It has no control over a large number of them. It does not know whether they are duplicating each other's services, whether they are efficient, whether they are doing the job they were established to do, whether they should continue to exist, whether they have overlapping areas of responsibility, or whether their administration is efficient or otherwise. The Government has absolutely no idea whatever; it is completely in the dark on the subject.

As I said, it took the Premier's Department some two or three months to provide me with a list which turned out to be inadequate; it did not include many agencies which obviously the Government was not aware existed. In fact, these

agencies not only exist but also are operating under the umbrella of the Government.

No machinery exists in this State for the revue or supervision of these bodies. There is no system of reporting to Parliament, so we have no way of examining their efficiency. No monitoring of their activities takes place; we do not know whether they are catering for the needs of the community. There is no monitoring as to whether, in fact, these bodies are necessary at all. Their accountability is almost zero.

During the period 1974 to 1979, State taxes in Western Australia leapt from \$524 per head in 1973-74 to \$1 289 per head in 1979-80. This represents an increase during the period of the Court Government of 145 per cent which in fact is a long way ahead of the inflation rate.

On top of that is the fact that these semi-Government authorities have no accountability to this Parliament. By and large, they generate their own revenue, although in some cases, any deficit they incur is met from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The most significant factor in Western Australian finance over the last 10 years has been the growth in the size and financial operations of semi-Government bodies. Many of these bodies have a direct and personal effect upon the lives of Western Australians; I refer particularly to the State Energy Commission, and the major increases in rates it has effected over the last few years, and bodies such as the Public Works Department and the Metropolitan Water Board.

In a State which has a budget of about \$1.5 billion, we have semi-Government agencies—not accountable to the Parliament—which have budgets of almost as much. Currently, semi-Government authorities in this State have total budgets approaching \$1 billion. Of course, the exact figure is not known; the Treasury really has no idea because it has never conducted a survey into just how much money is being raised and spent by these agencies. However, it is certain they have a comparative budget—when combined—to the State Budget. We on this side of the House feel that the Government is remiss in not making these bodies accountable not just to the Executive, but also to the Parliament, as are ordinary Government departments.

Sir Charles Court: Which of the major agencies do you suggest are not accountable? You would not say that the SEC, the MWB, or Westrail are not accountable, would you?

Mr GRILL: I refer the Premier to the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust. Although some scant accounting procedures are involved, by and large

that body is not accountable to the Parliament; it is not subject to the same rigorous accountability by the Auditor General.

Sir Charles Court: All their findings have to be tabled in the Parliament.

Mr GRILL: They are not subject to audits in the same way as Government departments. The fact that the Premier may, from time to time, lay their final reports on the Table of the House means nothing, because we must accept those reports on their face value. We cannot go behind the face of those reports. There are no strict accounting procedures with respect to the MVIT as there are with other departments.

As a consequence, we on this side demand the following: Firstly, there should be a major review of all Government agencies, and those agencies should be reviewed on the basis that they are accountable and efficient and seen to be functioning in a way that is benefiting the public.

Secondly, if we were to come to power, we would demand and immediately set up the concept of sunset legislation for those agencies which would be susceptible to sunset legislation. I am not talking about major Government departments or State trading concerns. We would make these agencies subject to a life of five years, at the end of which they would be asked to justify their existence. If they were not able to do so to a parliamentary committee, they automatically would go out of existence.

Thirdly, we would demand and set up apparatus to ensure that major Government departments and State trading concerns were subject to performance audits on a five-yearly basis. Such performance audits would be carried out by various experts, depending on the nature of the department or authority. By and large, we suggest no new body would need to be established to perform such audits, and in respect of Government departments, such audits could be carried out by the Treasury, the Auditor General, the Public Service Board, and such like. With respect to business and trading concerns of the State, we suggest that outside consultants be brought in from private enterprise on a contract basis to review the operation of those concerns. With respect to the other bodies I have mentioned, we believe a parliamentary committee would be the appropriate body to review the operation.

Sir Charles Court: On the question of sunset legislation, I announced some weeks ago that all Ministers had been asked to make submissions on any authorities they felt could be subject to such legislation.

Mr GRILL: I know also that the Premier was panicked into doing something in this regard after the *Sunday Independent* leaked sections of our policy.

Sir Charles Court: No, we had already announced our intentions.

Mr GRILL: It is rather strange that the first noise we heard from the Government in respect of sunset legislation came out the very day we announced our fully documented policy, and on that particular day the *Sunday Independent* had interviewed the Premier.

Mr Young: You announced your policy the day after us, yet you say we are copying you! You don't come from Tipperary, do you?

Mr GRILL: From the answer to a recent question it would appear the Government has dropped many of the ideas it had initially formed with respect to introducing sunset legislation. The Government has come forward now with a suggestion for a rather vague and amorphous inquiry. The inquiry has been suggested by someone in another place. This is unfortunate, because we need action rather than more words.

The last matter I wish to deal with is that of a black-topped road linked to the major mining areas; namely, the eastern goldfields and the Pilbara. The suggestion I make is a major decentralisation initiative. It is a bold and imaginative step and one which must be taken up by this Government or a Government in the future. The proposal is simply this: The eastern goldfields should be linked by a bitumen road from Kalgoorlie, Leonora, Leinster, Wiluna, and the Three Rivers area, to Mt Newman in the Pilbara. It would entail the construction of a new road, probably from Wiluna, to the Meekatharra-Mt. Newman Road.

Mr Rushton: At present the alignment is more towards Meekatharra. The link-up of the industrial development taking place between Kalgoorlie and Meekatharra lends itself to an extension through to Meekatharra.

Mr GRILL: If they were followed on, yes. However, I understand the Government has not committed itself to such a road.

Mr Rushton: A lot is committed, and it is a matter of the link-up being taken on.

Mr GRILL: It is the link-up about which I am talking. I understand the most direct route would entail about 320 kilometres of extra road costing—and this is an unofficial estimate from the Minister's department—about \$26 million. That could be easily financed over a five-year period. That road would link up the areas between the

goldfields through Wiluna to the Meekatharra-Newman road, linking at a point perhaps in the Three Rivers area. The Minister has suggested it should link up towards Meekatharra.

Sir Charles Court: I think you are light on with your estimate.

Mr GRILL: The estimate came from one of the senior engineers in the Main Roads Department.

Sir Charles Court: I would also like to know what we should slow down to make way for this. I am not knocking the proposition, but merely seeking information.

Mr Pearce: You could save \$2 million at Noonkanbah.

Mr GRILL: I understand that new development roads can receive an allocation from the Federal Government in the form of a special grant. I ask the Treasurer whether that has been considered and if any application has been made.

Sir Charles Court: We are pressing the Commonwealth on the road question generally. In particular, we believe it should make a greater contribution for developmental areas and should include another component which becomes more important, and that is the defence factor. We are pressing on all those fronts, but I have to look at the problem of the money I have.

Mr Rushton: There is also a big programme in this area this financial year; that is, a black top to Teutonic Bore and a high-grade road through to Leinster.

Mr GRILL: I understand that. My proposal is on the basis that that road from Leonora to Wiluna will be concluded in a year or so.

Mr Rushton: Within the financial year.

Mr GRILL: Within a year from now?

Mr Rushton: Yes.

Mr GRILL: For the benefit of the House, I will outline some of the benefits of such a road. Firstly, from the Eastern States to the Pilbara it would cut off something like 1 400 kilometres on a round trip, which would save about 1 000 litres of fuel for the average truck, a fairly large fuel saving in anyone's book. Secondly, by virtue of that fuel and cost saving, the expense of Eastern States manufactured goods in the Pilbara could be substantially reduced. Thirdly, there would be an immediate economic advantage in places like Leonora which are at the head of the rail link, and places such as Kalgoorlie which must in the circumstances become a major trans-shipping centre. With a trans-shipping centre and the necessary warehousing, we could provide up to 1 000 additional jobs. Kalgoorlie would then be linked with Esperance. It would be natural to do

that because Kalgoorlie and Esperance are linked by a railway. The Port of Esperance also would benefit from a black-topped road.

A major transferral centre in Kalgoorlie would be a very positive decentralisation initiative and it would also mean that manufactured goods from Pilbara—presuming that the Government would support the idea of some secondary industry in the Pilbara—would have a much shorter road to the major markets in the Eastern States.

Decentralisation of many industries is not really feasible but decentralisation of the transport industry is a feasible operation at all times. It is an area where decentralisation could be justified on economic grounds alone.

The strategic benefits of such a road, in terms of defence, have already been mentioned by the Premier. At the moment the north of this State could not be defended properly because of the state of the roads and also because most of the equipment would have to come from the Eastern States. The road also links the areas which are the mineral enriched areas of this State. Additional areas would then be opened up by this road.

Those are the three points I wished to raise and I thank the House for its indulgence.

MR NANOVIK (Whitford) [3.02 p.m.]: I wish to offer my congratulations, along with those which have already been expressed, to the Speaker on the occasion of his re-election to the high office of Speaker of this House.

I wish also to take this opportunity to congratulate those members who have been elected to this Parliament for the first time. I wish them a very successful term of office.

I congratulate the member for East Melville on the excellent content and delivery of his maiden speech.

I did not have the opportunity at the conclusion of the last Parliament, as others did, to say a few words about the then Deputy Premier and now the Honourable Sir Desmond O'Neil. I wish to endorse fully the compliments paid to him by the speakers during the last session of Parliament. Sir Desmond represented his electorate in a most efficient and dignified manner and I am sure his successor will continue in that way.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr NANOVIK: I take this opportunity to wish Sir Desmond and Lady O'Neil a very happy retirement. Sir Desmond was a respected member of this House. He was well respected by members on both sides of the House. This respect is clearly justified because of the contribution he made to the Parliament over the many years he was here.

The Address-in-Reply normally takes its theme from the Governor's Speech and it is very sad to see that in this session most of the debate to the Address-in-Reply has been on a personal attack basis. I believe the debate should have ranged around the Speech a little more. However, it is the prerogative of members to put forward any issues they wish.

I am a little worried about the manner in which things have started to move in this State. Our law system has been eroded so much. We have a situation where departments are being prostituted by attempts to have documents revealed in order to claim political mileage for the Opposition.

I am sure members of the Opposition who have had the opportunity, in the past, of being Ministers would recognise the effect this can have on the State, especially when uncompleted documents and uncompleted reports have been leaked from Government departments. This creates an uneasy atmosphere for the Government and for the department concerned.

Mr T. J. Burke: Can you give three examples?

Mr NANOVIK: The member for Perth knows very well the source of these documents. When this occurs it is like stealing from another person. If the member for Perth condones that type of action I wonder what would happen if he stole a vehicle from the State Energy Commission or the Metropolitan Water Board and gave it to a member of the media. It would be an offence and it would also be an offence for the member of the media to be in possession of that vehicle. It is a stealing offence and the leaking of documents should be treated on the same basis.

Several members interjected.

Mr NANOVIK: If this problem continues I am sure it will to the detriment of the departments concerned and the people of this State.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): Order!

Mr NANOVIK: We have seen a constant stream of demonstrators protesting against our laws. The laws are made here and processed elsewhere. For example, let us look at section 54B of the Police Act. There is nothing wrong with that law but certain minority groups will not let the law work. This law is a clean, protective law and should be applied without any problems.

Of course, we have the likes of Mr Tennant who is always criticising the Government and criticising the Minister for Police and Traffic and his department. He is always trying to keep out of

prison the people who break these laws. We have to have laws and a referee.

We could not expect fair play at the next semi-final of the football if the two teams played without an umpire and without rules. There would be nothing. It would finish up a shambles.

Whilst we have people such as Mr Tennant protecting criminals, I am afraid our problems will only increase. Steps will have to be taken to have these people stopped. Mr Tennant is only a spokesman for a group of lawyers. I am sure the Opposition members are aware of this. I ask Opposition members to deny that Mr Tennant is a member of the Communist Party.

Mr Pearce: We do not know, ask him.

Several members interjected.

Mr NANOVIK: Mr Tennant is always advocating that the law in regard to capital punishment should not be carried out. I want to say loudly and clearly in this House that I fully support capital punishment. I believe it must remain on the Statute book as a deterrent. The only thing wrong with it is that it is not being exercised. I want to ask members of the Opposition to say openly, "Abolish capital punishment."

Mr Pearce: Abolish capital punishment.

Mr NANOVIK: If they were serving on a jury in a case where glaring evidence was given that the accused person wilfully took the life of another, I wonder which way they would vote.

Mr Barnett: Guilty.

Mr Parker: But that does not imply capital punishment.

Mr NANOVIK: Which way would they vote? Or would they walk out? Members opposite are trying to say that we who support capital punishment would hang people willy-nilly.

Mr E. T. Evans: You are saying the jury would say that.

Mr NANOVIK: The people on the jury decide whether or not a person is guilty and whether or not to make a recommendation for mercy.

Mr Pearce: If you are advocating lawfully killing people, someone might hang you.

Mr NANOVIK: I am not like the member for Gosnells. I take a sensible approach to matters. I do not carry on with his rough style, spurring out 500 words a minute and not thinking about what I am saying. I think a little bit before I say something.

Whilst we have capital punishment on our Statutes, it must be exercised on those occasions

when it has been proved that a person wilfully took another person's life. I fully support the retention of capital punishment on our Statute book.

Mr Pearce: That other lunatic came from up your way—the one who sounded off about the Liberal Party.

Mr NANOVIK: If the member for Gosnells knew anything about the Brajkovich family he would not say things like that about them. They are a fine, upstanding family who are very industrious and making a great contribution to the economy of this State, not only in the business field but also in community and sporting activities. They have made a wonderful contribution to the State and I wish there were more citizens like them.

Mr Barnett: He is a chook killer.

Mr NANOVIK: I now want to mention a few matters which perhaps are adding a great deal to the uneasiness which is spreading through the community. I refer first of all to our media friends. I am not attacking personally the people who are in the Press gallery at the moment. Most of them are very nice people. But what happens when their reports go back inside? A very unbalanced picture is always presented to the public, and I think that is very unfair of the media. They give a lopsided view on all issues which they believe will create news. They have not given a balanced presentation of section 54B of the Police Act, Noonkanbah, and nuclear power issues. I will later prove that they give an unevenly balanced picture.

The media have never given the facts about nuclear power. They give publicity to the groups which march on local authorities and so on to demonstrate their opposition to nuclear power. I make it clear that I have not voted in support of building a nuclear power plant anywhere in Western Australia, nor have other members on this side of the House. We have not supported the building of a nuclear power plant. All we have done is ask that a survey be made into all sources of energy, including nuclear power, which any responsible Government should be doing.

Mr Carr: Have you back-tracked since the election?

Mr NANOVIK: No, we have not.

Mr Parker: What about the Commonwealth document which reveals that the Premier will make a decision on nuclear power within the next 12 months?

Mr NANOVIK: The Opposition has them fairly well trained in Fremantle.

Mr Parker: We have everything except a railway line.

Mr NANOVIK: Local government is another area where members opposite can feed out to the public their untrue propaganda.

Mr Pearce: You ought to talk about political interference in local government.

Mr NANOVIK: Can members opposite name a Liberal member who has produced a petition relating to an anti-nuclear stand in local government? I also make the point that *The Labor Voice* clearly indicated immediately after the local government elections where the Labor Party stands in regard to endorsing and supporting candidates for local government.

Mr Sodeman: "No party politics in local government", the member for Ascot said last year.

Mr E. T. Evans: Were you not on the shire?

Mr NANOVIK: Yes I was, but I have never used my political influence on the local shire council.

Mr Pearce: That cannot be said of Councillor Searson, who has been leaned on by the Premier to get the nuclear-free zone motion revised.

Mr NANOVIK: That is not true. I suggest the member for Gosnells talk to the shire president.

Sir Charles Court: He has never discussed the matter with me in any way at all.

Mr NANOVIK: I do not know who is feeding out those lies. A petition forwarded recently from the Shire of Wanneroo contained some 1 600 signatures, and it read—

We the undersigned residents of the Shire of Wanneroo—

I perused the petition and it contains signatures of people from 15 different districts outside the Shire of Wanneroo, from as far away as Kalgoorlie. It is then claimed that these 1 600 people represent the thinking of all the 90 000 people of Wanneroo. That gives an indication how misleading petitions are. That petition is a farce and an absolute disgrace.

Some people came to me after signing the petition and told me the basis on which they signed it. They were told that by signing it they would be acting against the Premier—or Charlie Court, as they called him—and preventing him building a nuclear plant in the Shire of Wanneroo. Lies!

Mr Sibson: The same method was used in Bunbury.

Mr NANOVIK: That is right. Some people after signing the petition asked what was going to happen. They said they had no objection to the Government going ahead with research at this time. All sorts of lies were spread by the people concerned in an effort to get names on the petition. Again I read from the petition: "We, the undersigned residents of the Shire of Wanneroo..." That is an absolute disgrace.

Mr Pearce: That statement is an absolute disgrace. The petition was presented by well intentioned and well motivated people.

Mr NANOVIK: What I have said in this place is the exact truth.

Mr Pearce: It is not; it is far from it.

Mr NANOVIK: The member for Gosnells would not even know anything about it, apart from what he has heard.

Mr Pearce: So little interest have you in the Wanneroo Shire Council that you appear not to know it passed a motion.

Mr NANOVIK: Who did?

Mr Pearce: The Wanneroo Shire Council. And Councillor Searson and the Liberal Party tried to get it fiddled around for Government purposes.

Mr NANOVIK: What are the red hot supporters of members opposite going to do with all the little "Exit" signs throughout the districts there? Are they going to bury the waste, or transfer it and dump it in another area?

Mr Pearce: What are you talking about?

Mr NANOVIK: The member for Gosnells can find out about that.

Mr Parker: What about Dick Hamer? He doesn't want nuclear power in Victoria.

Mr NANOVIK: I felt it was my duty to present the facts concerning that petition to the Parliament and to show how misleading it was.

Mr Sibson: They all are. They are all taken around by members of the Labor Party.

Mr NANOVIK: They are spreading around unfair propaganda and going about the community saying this Government has approved the building of a nuclear plant. Again I repeat: we have not. We have commissioned the SEC to look into every aspect of energy, and one of those aspects is nuclear energy.

I did not intend to participate in the Address-in-Reply debate, but I felt I had a duty to bring forward that matter.

Before I conclude I would like briefly to mention the matter of severe increases in rates and taxes over the last few years. We as a Government have never said that all would be

rosy, because we are in a difficult situation. We are prepared to stand by our convictions. The present situation is unfortunate and I hope the investigation into rating and valuation produces a more equitable method to be used when rates are struck. The present system of valuations is a simple one; and perhaps that is the reason we have kept it for so long until it has finally caught up with us and has caused concern.

When speaking about the issue of nuclear power, I omitted to refer to an article which appeared in the "North Suburban News" of *The West Australian*. The article refers to a meeting of the Wanneroo Shire Council and says that over 150 people attended the meeting to hear a debate on the nuclear issue.

This shows how matters can be presented in the Press in a misleading way, because that was not the case. The debate in question was a mild one of hardly any interest. The main reason for the large attendance was that a rural ratepayers' group attended in force; it was not because of the nuclear debate.

In respect of the taxes and charges which the Opposition says we are always increasing so unfairly, now that the Leader of the Opposition has resumed his seat I would like to quote what one of his colleagues in the upper House said recently. I refer to yesterday's newspaper in which the following article appears—

What was needed was a planned socialist society, rather than one that limped from confrontation to confrontation.

Mr Hetherington said that he would not mind paying more tax to help those who earned less than himself.

Sir Charles Court: That has made them quiet!

Mr NANOVIČ: That is a clear indication that the Opposition advocates higher taxes.

Mr Jamieson: Where was that said?

Mr NANOVIČ: In the upper House.

Mr Jamieson: Do you know you are not supposed to quote from anything said in the upper House during the same session?

Mr NANOVIČ: Well, I have quoted it now, and it is recorded.

With those few remarks, I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Mundaring.

MR BATEMAN (Canning) [3.28 p.m.]: I guess I had better say a few words in this debate. I thought a member from the other side might have risen and taken part in it.

Mr Pearce: The sterling eloquence of the member for Darling Range has frightened them into not competing with him.

Mr BATEMAN: I would like to congratulate all the new members who have been elected to Parliament. I have been greatly impressed with their contributions and their maiden speeches, because I can remember back some 12 years when I made my maiden speech.

Mr Sibson: And an eloquent speech it was, too.

Mr BATEMAN: It was, too; thank you very much!

Mr Sibson: I was not here, but I have read it.

Mr BATEMAN: Members can rest assured the cheeks of my buttocks were running a banker! I suppose it is always difficult to make a reasonable sort of speech without suffering from some degree of nervousness. I can recall the Hon. John Tonkin telling me, "If you get to your feet and you don't feel a little nervous, you should sit down because you will not make a decent contribution."

Mr Sibson: Like Dale Carnegie.

Mr BATEMAN: I do not think I will ever be a Dale Carnegie or a John Tonkin, because I am not much of an orator.

It is a shame the Minister for Labour and Industry is not present because he had a great deal of involvement in the price of bulk beer in Western Australia. Some members on my side may feel I should find more in my electorate to talk about rather than referring to the price of beer; and I guess some people on the other side of the House may feel the same way. However, being one of those people who have from time to time had the odd beer or two, I have always been a little interested in the cost of this commodity. We in Western Australia pay very much more for bulk beer than the people in any other State of Australia pay.

As a result of my attitude about the pricing business, I asked the Minister for Labour and Industry many questions on the subject last year. As a result of those questions, he organised an inquiry into the retail price of draught beer in Western Australia. The inquiry was conducted by the Bureau of Consumer Affairs; and it was completed in November 1979. In the inquiry, 94 conclusions were arrived at; and every single one of them agreed that the price of bulk beer in Western Australia was higher than in any other State. However, the inquiry gave only the reason that hotels charge more—the freight charges. It did not go to the source of the problem—the Swan Brewery.

There is no report on the Swan Brewery in the 94 conclusions; yet they are the people who brew the beer, who bottle it, and do everything else with it. They are the people who, when they left Riverside Drive, said that when they went to their new premises in Canning Vale they would be able to maintain a reasonable price structure for their commodity. In effect, what they ought to have done was to decrease the price of the beer because when the brewery was on Riverside Drive they had something like 105 people operating one plant; and today the same plant is operated by five people, because of computerisation. Surely to goodness, with computerisation and with the upgrading of facilities, the company should have been able to do something about the needs of the working public. It is the working man who goes into the hotels. One does not find the lawyers, and the doctors, and the so-called elite frequenting the public bars of hotels.

It is strange that the Swan Brewery has been able to have five price hikes in less than 12 months. They promised all sorts of things when they went out to Canning Vale; but what strikes me or upsets me more than anything else is that, legally, the Swan Brewery did not pay tax last year; it has not paid tax this year; and, legally, I doubt whether it will pay tax next year. However, the poor old worker, if he tries to avoid something on his medical accounts or his hospital charges is up before the Taxation Department. That does not apply to the multinational Swan Brewery, not only the greatest monopoly in Western Australia, or the greatest monopoly in South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales, or Queensland, but also the greatest monopoly in the world. It can evade taxation for three years running; yet the poor little working bloke in the street is jackknifed into that place at 1 St. George's Terrace, and it does not matter if he has dodged fourpence in his taxation return. The Taxation Department will rip the poor little bloke to bits; but these companies are protected by law. They can dodge and evade. It is high time something was done about them.

I admire the group of lawyers in the Labor Party who have been appointed to investigate the rip-offs by the doctors who have farms, by the lawyers, and by people like that. It is a great shame; it is a great tragedy that we see this sort of thing happening.

We call people "dole bludgers" because they are out of work and they have a dozen kids. However, these people who evade taxes are worse than dole bludgers. They take money at every chance they get.

So I can demonstrate proof of what I have said about the Swan Brewery, I refer to *The West Australian* of 25 June 1980, under the headline "Brewery cuts back debts". It is cutting its debts back so fast it just does not matter. Its payouts to its shareholders are increasing. The quote is as follows—

The directors said that with considerable tax benefits remaining, no tax would be payable in the current year and almost certainly none next year.

Is not that nice? It is an absolute scandal! They have had five price hikes this year, and two pay rises. That is not justified. Talk about a liquor review!

I wish to refer to this cutting from the paper: "Bar prices blamed on licences". This was in *The West Australian* of 5 June and it reads as follows—

The front-bar price for a 200-millilitre glass of beer in WA is 43 cents—

It is now 50c. That shows how rapidly the price has increased since 5 June. The quote continues—

—three cents higher than the next most expensive State, Tasmania, and eight cents higher than in Victoria and NSW.

Well, that has already been investigated and the situation has not improved.

Only a couple of months ago, I was in Cairns. Now, Cairns is on approximately the same parallel of latitude as Derby. The price of a 7 ounce glass of beer in Cairns, if my memory serves me correctly, was 39c. In Derby it is about 80c—on the same parallel. No-one can convince me that in Western Australia we have greater cartage problems or freight problems than they do in Queensland. No matter what we may say about Mr Bjelke-Petersen, the people in the north of Queensland do enjoy some concessions as far as freights and rates are concerned. In North Queensland, the food and hotel prices are cheaper than they are in Sydney.

Mr Rushton: They have big populations up there.

Mr BATEMAN: Where is this?

Mr Rushton: In North Queensland.

Mr BATEMAN: So do we in Western Australia.

Mr Rushton: Right up in the north they have 80 000.

Mr BATEMAN: We have a population in the north, and we should give them greater concessions.

Mr Rushton: They work on volume in Queensland.

Mr BATEMAN: The Minister is correct; but that does not make it any better. We give the farmers every possible handout, not only in Western Australia but also in Australia generally. I am told that even the farmers' dog food is subsidised. Is that right or wrong? It is true, and the Government cannot deny it. Even the dog food is subsidised! That is not bad, is it?

Mr Old: Dogs are employees.

Mr BATEMAN: The workers in the north have nothing subsidised. It is about time consideration was given to some sort of handout for them. A loaf of bread costs \$1. Goodness gracious me! A bottle of milk costs 80c. It is just not good enough. Those people are entitled to a fair go, the same as anyone else is.

Mr P. V. Jones: Come and bring your hanky!

Mr BATEMAN: The Minister will not need a hanky; he should just go and have a wash in the "thingo"! He does not look very bright.

I was interested to read an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of 1 August last, under the headline "Liquor probe gets under way". It appears the Chief Secretary intends that the liquor laws should be reviewed. The article I have just referred to reads, in part, as follows—

A three-man committee appointed by the State Government to inquire into WA's liquor laws has begun dealing with the 60 submissions it has received.

A committee member, Mr Keith Shimon, the secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department, said yesterday that about half the submissions were lodged by individuals.

The three people who have been appointed to that committee are Judge Syme, Superintendent George Brown, and Mr Keith Shimon. I am sure a less suitable group of people could not have been chosen for such a task. Let us have a look at them. Superintendent George Brown, despite the fact that I have the utmost respect for him, is connected with the Gaming Squad. Throughout his life his main task has been as a law enforcement officer, determined to clamp down on the sale of liquor at football clubs, cricket clubs, and any other welfare club which is trying to raise a few bob for the benefit of its sporting members. Superintendent Brown's main interest has been in prosecuting people and confiscating their grog. I do not believe that particular type of person is one who should be on a committee of this nature.

I have a great deal of respect for Judge Syme, but once again he is not the right type of person to be involved in an inquiry into the liquor laws. I doubt whether Judge Syme has ever set foot in a hotel. He does not understand what is going on. He was appointed by the Government, because he is one of its flock.

Mr Hassell: That is disgraceful! You are attacking three worthy Government people and you have no reason to do so.

Mr Davies: This is the place in which such criticisms can be made.

Mr BATEMAN: I have a great deal of respect for these people; but they are not suitable for the job. Surely the Government wants the best people it can get, but these individuals do not fit that description.

Mr Hassell: Tell us why not.

Mr BATEMAN: They are not suitable, because they do not have a common interest in what the matter is all about.

Mr Hassell: They have a proper balance between the enforcement side and the other side. One of the problems with the Liquor Act has been enforcement.

Mr BATEMAN: I should like to ask the Minister how enforcement has been a problem.

Mr Hassell: Are you suggesting that one of the issues in relation to the Liquor Act in recent times has not been the problems of noise, overcrowding, and Sunday entertainment?

Mr BATEMAN: That is not what the function of Superintendent Brown has been.

Mr Hassell: You were just complaining because it was his function.

Mr BATEMAN: I am not complaining about that. I am complaining about the fact that his particular job has been prosecuting all the sporting organisations which have been selling alcohol illicitly.

Mr Hassell: And that is wrong, is it?

Mr BATEMAN: Steps should be taken to have a damned good look at the matter. How are these sporting bodies going to survive if they do not have some way of raising an odd bob or two? The Government will not give them any funds. The Government gives money to people like Alan Bond and other affluent Liberal Party supporters. However, it will not give money to people who are trying to raise a few bob for the sporting activities in which their children are involved.

Mr Hassell: The problem the committee is looking at concerns licensed clubs, including sporting clubs.

Mr BATEMAN: I differ from the point of view held by the Minister.

Mr Old: How is the hotel industry going to survive if the Government does not control licensed clubs?

Mr BATEMAN: We do not see any hotels going broke.

Mr Old: That is not quite right.

Mr BATEMAN: I am not involved in the hotel industry, so I do not know whether it is right or wrong.

Mr Hassell: What happened to the Melbourne Hotel?

Mr BATEMAN: I believe that is going well. I will not go into details on that matter; but I believe it is doing very nicely.

I do not agree with the conclusions arrived at by the committee which inquired into the price of beer. However, the committee which compiled the report did a fantastic job as far as statistics are concerned. I must pay the utmost respect to the members of that committee for the effort they put into this report. They went to a great deal of trouble to compile it.

However, I do not believe the right men have been chosen to review the Liquor Act. I have nothing personal against them; they do a job as they see it according to their own fields of employment. However, I do not believe they are the right people to be involved in a liquor probe.

I should like to refer to resumptions of land throughout Western Australia. I have referred to this matter previously and I am aware, as are all members of Parliament, that it is necessary from time to time to resume land for the purpose of development, road building, and for all sorts of reasons. I do not believe anyone would be upset about that. However, people do become upset when the subject of resettlement value is raised.

Land which has been owned by families for 20 or 30 years may be resumed. In fact, I am aware of a family which had lived on a particular block of land for 100 years. They had raised their children and grandchildren there. It is very sad when such a family loses its residence. It has a great psychological impact on the family. It is clear that such people should be given a decent resettlement value.

At the moment the Beechboro-Gosnells freeway is being constructed. Many resumptions have been made and I have written many letters to the Minister for Works on the matter. Some of the people have been paid out and when one makes a comparison of the resettlement values, it can be seen that they vary greatly. There is a great

variation between the valuation placed on similar pieces of land which have been developed along the same lines. It should be borne in mind that if it is necessary for the Government to resume property, it should at least give the people concerned a decent resettlement value.

Mr Mensaros: I can assure you that the method is under study; but it is rather complicated. Different systems around the world are being studied. At the present moment all the advice I can give is that, if possible, people should accept the offer instead of appealing for years and years, because unfortunately, under the present system, inflation has a big effect on values. Even if a person gets another 5 per cent, on appeal, inflation will cut into that.

Mr BATEMAN: I do understand that point. It is a difficult situation with inflation at its present rate. I have been through the mill and I know what I am talking about and, as I have already said, when my property was resumed I said I did not want any money. All I wanted was a house, a tennis court, and a swimming pool—

Mr Davies: You did not want a racehorse. You will be as bad as Bob Hawke if you are not careful!

Mr BATEMAN: No, racehorses did not come into it. I said I wanted a replacement property within nine miles of Perth and I would be quite happy. Obviously, that was impossible. I believe a person whose property is resumed should be placed in a comparable position. I have discussed many of these problems because of the extension of the Gosnells-Beechboro freeway. They are not finalised yet.

I want to impress on the Government the fact that it should give greater consideration to this problem. When properties are resumed the Government should make sure that the resettlement value is sufficient to provide everything which a displaced person had previously, if not a little more. I am sure the Government would then have no problems whatsoever except for the odd argument.

Another problem affecting my electorate—and I am aware that it affects other electorates also—is the increase in violence and thuggery. I appeal to the Minister to provide extra police for my area. We seem to be short of policemen. I can see the Minister smiling, but this is indeed a great problem.

Mr Hassell: More police being requested from that side of the House!

Mr BATEMAN: We definitely require more policemen in my area.

Mr Hassell: You spend half your time attacking the police for everything they do.

Sir Charles Court: You talk about a police State, and now you want more policemen.

Mr Bryce: It is not a question of number, but of *modus operandi*, and the orders.

Mr BATEMAN: We have to get our priorities in order. A different point of view has been raised, and it relates to a different occasion.

I appeal to the Minister to look into this problem. As more and more development takes place, and as the population increases, more policemen are required. There is the added problem of the influence of drugs. I am sure that if the Minister were to discuss this matter with his senior officers they would agree that more policemen are required.

Mr Hassell: To which area are you referring?

Mr BATEMAN: The situation at Forrestfield is really bad at the moment. At present policemen have to travel from Kalamunda and Midland. I respectfully ask the Minister to look into the problem.

Finally, I will mention drainage rates. I have appealed to the Minister, and I have asked questions with regard to drainage rates. The people throughout my area are incensed at the increase in valuations. At present we have five different rates. There are water rates, sewerage rates, industrial rates, excess water charges, and now a drainage rate. The drainage rate is the last straw which is breaking the camel's back.

Some of the people living in Forrestfield and Beckenham are not within miles of a drain. It is logical that they should query the drainage rate. They believe it is fair enough to pay the other rates, including the sewerage rate. However, to

have to pay a drainage rate when they are not within miles of a drain is more than they can understand.

Many people in my area have constructed their own drains. In one instance a householder spent a sum of \$600 on drainage. I have had a look at it and I know it is a fact. Many people have spent considerable sums of money and they are cranky and quite upset to think they have to pay a drainage rate. Those people maintain that the natural drains have been there since Adam was a boy. Woodlapine Brook is a natural drain from the Lesmurdie Falls right through to the Canning River. The residents in that area believe it rather rude of the Metropolitan Water Board to charge a drainage rate for something created by nature.

I ask the Minister to think again about the feelings of those people because they are incensed. I am aware that many people have refused to pay their drainage rates while others have paid them because they are fearful of their water supply being cut off. Many of them have young children and they want to ensure that they have an adequate water supply. I ask the Minister to examine the position to see whether something can be done to relieve the pressure which has been placed on these people.

It is good to see you back in the Chair, Mr Speaker. I think I have had enough to say today. I believe I have already made one speech from my seat during the last two or three weeks so, without further ado, I indicate that I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Clarko.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

House adjourned at 4.22 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**PENSIONERS***Motor Vehicle Registration Fees*

543. Mr BRYCE, to the Treasurer:

Adverting to his answer to question 357 of 1980 concerning pensioner motor vehicle registration fee concessions, will he provide details of the income test applied to the concessions which vary between 50 per cent and 100 per cent?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Persons classified by the Social Security Department as civilian invalid pensioners or persons classified by the Department of Veterans Affairs as service pensioners qualify for a concession vehicle licence provided they are in receipt of a full pension.

The qualifying factor is that the applicant is in receipt of a full pension and the means test applied is as follows—

- (1) A 100 per cent concession applies if the total income does not exceed the State minimum wage.
- (2) A 50 per cent concession applies if the total income does exceed the State minimum wage.

PAY-ROLL TAX*Revenue*

545. Mr BRYCE, to the Treasurer:

- (1) How many people are expected to pay payroll tax in the current financial year, and how many persons actually made payments in each financial year since June 1976?
- (2) What is the estimated revenue from payroll tax in the current financial year and what amount was actually raised in each financial year since June 1976, indicating in each case:
 - (a) the percentage of estimated receipts as shown in the Budget;
 - (b) the percentage of total State receipts;
 - (c) the variation over the previous year?
- (3) What would be the estimated cost of exempting from payroll tax wages and salaries paid to—
 - (a) apprentices;
 - (b) persons under 21 years of age?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Not known for 1980-81.

1976-77	6 891
1977-78	6 851
1978-79	6 799
1979-80	6 454

- (2) Estimated collections for 1980-81 will be disclosed to Parliament when the Budget is introduced.

Actual collections for 1979-80 were \$168 042 309.

I refer the member to the 1979-80 Financial Statement presented to the Parliament in September 1979 and to copies of the Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for details of other years.

- (3) Records are not available to provide this information.

STATE FINANCE*Fuel Levy*

589. Mr DAVIES, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What was the total estimated receipts in 1979-80 from the State's fuel franchise levy?
- (2) What were the estimated collections in 1979-80 from the levy on—
 - (a) petroleum;
 - (b) distillate?
- (3) What was the actual total receipts in 1979-80 from the State's fuel franchise levy?
- (4) What were the actual collections in 1979-80 from the levy on—
 - (a) petroleum;
 - (b) distillate?
- (5) What is the total estimated receipts from the fuel franchise levy in 1980-81?
- (6) What are the estimated collections in 1980-81 from the levy on—
 - (a) petroleum;
 - (b) distillate?
- (7) What is the estimated additional revenue from the levy in 1980-81 resulting from the recent increases?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) \$16 950m.
- (2) Petrol \$11.75m—Distillate \$5.20m.
- (3) \$16.899m.

- (4) Petrol \$11.763m.—Distillate \$5.136m.
- (5) \$24.925m.
- (6) Petrol \$18.545m.—Distillate \$6.380m.
- (7) \$5.70m.

STATE FINANCE

Commonwealth Fuel Levy Policy

590. Mr DAVIES, to the Treasurer:

What was the additional cost resulting from the Fraser Government's import parity oil pricing policy and increase in crude oil levy charged to Consolidated Revenue Fund in—

- (a) 1977-78;
- (b) 1978-79;
- (c) 1979-80;
- (d) 1980-81 (estimate)?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (a) to (d) It is not possible to estimate the impact of the crude oil levy upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund as it relates only to Australian production. The proportion of petroleum products produced from imported and Australian crude oil consumed by State Government departments is not known.

WATER RESOURCES

Consumption, Dam Storage, Number of Services, and Metered Services

596. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What was the total annual water consumption in the metropolitan area in—
 - (a) 1975-76;
 - (b) 1976-77;
 - (c) 1977-78;
 - (d) 1978-79;
 - (e) 1979-80?
- (2) What was the total water storage at 30 June in each year for (a)–(f) in the following dams or reservoirs—
 - (a) South Dandalup;
 - (b) Serpentine;
 - (c) Serpentine pipehead;
 - (d) Canning;
 - (e) Churchman;
 - (f) Victoria?

(3) What was total residential consumption in—

- (a) 1975-76;
- (b) 1976-77;
- (c) 1977-78;
- (d) 1978-79;
- (e) 1979-80?

(4) What was total non-residential consumption in—

- (a) 1975-76;
- (b) 1976-77;
- (c) 1977-78;
- (d) 1978-79;
- (e) 1979-80?

(5) (a) What was the total number of residential services supplied with water in 1979-80;

(b) what is the estimated number of residential services to be supplied with water in 1980-81;

(c) what was the total number of non-residential services supplied with water in 1979-80;

(d) what is the estimated number of non-residential services to be supplied with water in 1980-81?

(6) (a) What was the number of residential services supplied with water in 1979-80 that was metered;

(b) what is the number of residential services to be supplied with water in 1980-81 that will be metered;

(c) what was the number of non-residential services supplied with water in 1979-80 that were metered;

(d) what is the estimated number of non-residential services to be supplied with water in 1980-81 that will be metered?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) (a) 1975-76 194 million cubic metres
- (b) 1976-77 174 million cubic metres
- (c) 1977-78 107 million cubic metres
- (d) 1978-79 119 million cubic metres
- (e) 1979-80 142 million cubic metres.

		Million m ³				
		1976	1977	1978	1979	1980
(2)	(a) South Dandalup	106.5	71.8	49.6	49.3	39.8
	(b) Serpentine	98.4	58.8	60.7	63.1	45.0
	(c) Serpentine Pipehead	2.0	2.2	1.3	1.0	1.4
	(d) Canning	26.9	17.3	23.8	35.5	19.4
	(e) Churchmans	0.7	0	1.0	1.4	1.1
	(f) Victoria	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.5

(3) Total metered residential consumptions were—

- (a) 1975-76 107 million cubic metres
- (b) 1976-77 100 million cubic metres
- (c) 1977-78 67 million cubic metres
- (d) 1978-79 67 million cubic metres
- (e) 1979-80 80 million cubic metres.

(4) Total non-residential metered consumptions were—

- (a) 1975-76 24 million cubic metres
- (b) 1976-77 24 million cubic metres
- (c) 1977-78 17 million cubic metres
- (d) 1978-79 16 million cubic metres
- (e) 1979-80 18 million cubic metres.

(5) (a) and (b) Total number of residential services supplied with water as at 30 June—

1980 260 900
1981 269 000 (estimated).

(c) and (d) Total number of all non residential services supplied with water as at June 30—

1980 28 100
1981 29 400 (estimated).

(6) (a) and (b) Total number of metered residential services as at June 30—

1980 259 500
1981 268 000 (estimated).

(c) and (d) Total number of all metered non-residential services as at June 30—

1980 6 500
1981 6 600 (estimated).

Note: The answers in questions (3) to (6) are calculations, as the Metropolitan Water Board records are not kept in exactly the same way as the questions are asked.

WATER RESOURCES

Metropolitan Water Board: Funds, Loans, and Interest

597. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Water Resources:

(1) What was the total amount of funds available to the Metropolitan Water Board in—

- (a) 1975-76;
- (b) 1976-77;
- (c) 1977-78;
- (d) 1978-79;
- (e) 1979-80?

(2) In (a) to (e) in (1), what were the amounts in each year derived from—

- (a) State Grants;
- (b) Commonwealth grants;
- (c) General Loan Funds;
- (d) public borrowings;
- (e) private borrowings;
- (f) developers;
- (g) domestic funds;
- (h) rates and annual fees;
- (i) water sales;
- (j) building fees;
- (k) interest on deposits;
- (l) reserves;
- (m) other sources?

(3) What were the other sources of funds identified in (m) of (2)?

(4) (a) What were the sources and amounts of public borrowings shown in (d) of (2)?

(b) what were the rates of interests in respect of each borrowing?

(5) (a) What were the sources and amounts of private borrowings shown in (e) of (2);

(b) what were the rates of interest in respect of each borrowing?

(6) What was the total external indebtedness of the board in—

- (a) 1975-76;
- (b) 1976-77;
- (c) 1977-78;
- (d) 1978-79;
- (e) 1979-80?

(7) What was the total interest charges to the Metropolitan Water Board in each year for—

- (a) 1975-76;
- (b) 1976-77;
- (c) 1977-78;
- (d) 1978-79;
- (e) 1979-80?

(8) What are the expected rates of interest between 1980-81 and 1984-85 on the Metropolitan Water Board's annual borrowings of between \$54 million and \$65 million in addition to borrowings of up to \$44 million per annum for conversion of maturing loans?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The answer was tabled (see paper No. 235).

WATER RESOURCES AND SEWERAGE: RATES

St. Patrick's Primary School, Fremantle Port Authority, and Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.

613. Mr CARR, to the Premier:

- (1) Further to question 334 of 1980, is all non-ratable property in the metropolitan area exempt from a metropolitan drainage charge as is St. Patrick's primary school?
- (2) Are Fremantle Port Authority and Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. exempt from water and sewerage rates and charges?
- (3) If "No" to (2), what charges are they required to pay for in the year 1980-81 to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board?
- (4) How is it possible for a property to be classified non-ratable by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board yet minimum charges levied?
- (5) How does the Government consider it equitable that an organisation such as Co-operative Bulk Handling, which last year had a surplus of \$7.7 million and an accumulated surplus of nearly \$26 million, should not pay rates despite the costs it imposes on the City of Fremantle?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) Fremantle Port Authority—

Water	\$ 200
Sewerage	\$2 360
Meter rent	\$ 4
Total	\$2 564
Plus: water usage in excess of allowance.	

Co-operative Bulk Handling Silo at Kwinana.

Water	\$5 664
—sewerage and drainage services not available	
Fire service	\$40
Total	\$5 704
Plus: water usage in excess of allowance.	

- (4) It is provided by legalisation. The charge is for the service rendered. If such properties do not avail themselves of the service no charge is levied.

- (5) The Metropolitan Water Board charges are based on CBH legislation.

RURAL ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY

Applications

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

- (1) How many applications for—

- (a) build up;
- (b) debt reconstruction,

have been received by the rural reconstruction authorities in each of the past three years from lessees of pastoral holdings in the following areas—

- (i) Kimberley;
- (ii) Gascoyne;
- (iii) Murchison;
- (iv) Goldfields?

- (2) Of these applications, how many in each category were—

- (a) approved;
- (b) rejected;
- (c) are pending?

- (3) What amount of finance was involved in funding these approvals in each of the past three years?

Mr OLD replied:

		Kimberley	Gascoyne	Murchison	Goldfields
(1) (a)	1977-78	1	—	—	—
	1978-79	—	—	—	—
	1979-80	1	—	—	—
	(b) 1977-78	2	2	7	—
	1978-79	—	1	3	—
	1979-80	1	—	1	1
			Build-Up	Debt Reconstruction	
(2) (a)	1977-78		2	6	
	1978-79		—	1	
	1979-80		—	—	
	(b) 1977-78		1	3	
	1978-79		2	1	
	1979-80		1	3	
	(c)		—	—	
(3) 1977-78—\$260 000; 1978-79—\$52 000; 1979-80—Nil.					

HEALTH: MENTAL

Electroconvulsive Therapy

632. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) (a) How many persons suffering from a mental disorder and under the Mental Health Services have received ECT during the last 12 months;
- (b) of these, how many—
 - (i) signed a consent form prior to the treatment being administered;
 - (ii) were treated unsuccessfully;
 - (iii) have attempted suicide since being given the treatment;
 - (iv) no longer require any form of psychiatric treatment?
- (2) It has been suggested that the decline in the use of ECT within the Mental Health Services could be due to the fact that this treatment is being increasingly administered from private and public hospitals. Mental Health Services now release statistics on administration of ECT but public hospitals such as Royal Perth Hospital and Sir Charles Gairdner have refused to supply this information. Could he please assure us that there is no deliberate intent to hide statistics with regard to the use of ECT in public hospitals within Western Australia, by releasing the figures of ECT use in public hospitals over the last five years?
- (3) Could he please supply the figures for mental patients absent without leave from mental health services institutions over the last five years?
- (4) (a) How many Mental Health Services patients have died while on after care during the last 12 months;
- (b) of those who died, how many had previously received ECT;
- (c) of those who received ECT how many died by committing suicide?
- (5) (a) How many patients admitted to Mental Health Services approved hospitals during the last five years were re-admissions;
- (b) are re-admission figures included in the admission figures?
- (6) Of the patients discharged by Mental Health Services over each of the last five years, how many have been discharged previously?

(7) What are the Mental Health Services current findings of the effect of ECT of patients—reference Dr Bell's statement on ABC news, 14 February 1979?

(8) During the last five years, how many minors have been voluntarily and involuntarily administered ECT?

Mr YOUNG replied:

(1) to (8) The information required to respond to this question will necessitate a considerable amount of research.

I will convey the information in writing as soon as it has been collated.

HEALTH: MENTAL

Act: Amendments

633. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

Is he going to grant the status of interested party to the Foundation for the Abolition of Compulsory Treatment, MIND, Richmond Fellowship and the Citizens' Committee on Human Rights, with regard to the proposed amendments to the Western Australian Mental Health Act, due to be presented during this session?

Mr YOUNG replied:

I have not received such a request from the Richmond Fellowship. With respect to the other three organisations named, it does not seem to me that the status of "interested party" is one which can be conferred by myself or anyone else. The interest of these organisations in the proposed amendments to the Mental Health Act is acknowledged.

Their views have been received and any further comment will be considered.

When the draft Bill has been prepared it will be available to interested parties and organisations, who are at liberty to offer such comment as seems appropriate to them.

ROAD

Camballin

634. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware that heavy traffic has caused the access road to Camballin to deteriorate to such an extent that it will

become impassable with the first rains, and that funds to adequately upgrade the road will need to be made available as a matter of urgency?

- (2) Does he intend to make funds available to upgrade the Camballin Road?
- (3) If "Yes", when will the funds be made available?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) As with other unsealed roads in the Kimberley, the condition of the Camballin Road is subject to seasonal variation depending on usage and weather conditions. Regular inspections are undertaken by Main Roads Department staff. As the road is controlled by the West Kimberley Shire Council, it undertakes the maintenance work required.
- (2) Funds have been provided in the 1980-81 programme to assist the local authority with the maintenance of the road.
- (3) Answered by (2).

EDUCATION: SCHOOL

Camballin

635. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware that children from the Looma community are no longer attending Camballin Government School as the bus service transporting the children to and from school has had to be stopped because of the deterioration of the access road to Camballin?
- (2) If he is aware that the children are unable to attend the school at Camballin, what is he doing about it?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) I am aware that children from the Looma Community are not being transported to Camballin because of the deterioration of the access road.

- (2) I am also aware that the Looma Community children are unable to attend school as a result of this road deterioration. The West Kimberley Shire Clerk has advised the Education Department that the road between Camballin and Looma has been partially upgraded.

The roadworks cannot be completed for some months unless the shire receives additional financial assistance. As the Education Department does not have funds available for roadworks, I have written to the Minister for Transport strongly supporting the West Kimberley Shire's application for additional finance to complete the upgrading of the Camballin-Looma road.

HOSPITAL *Derby Regional*

636. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware that there is an urgent and immediate need for provision of accommodation for nursing staff at Derby Regional Hospital?
- (2) Does the omission of any reference to provision of nurses' accommodation in his press statement advising of plans to upgrade the Derby Regional Hospital, published in the *News of the North* dated 28 August, mean that there are no immediate plans to provide the additional nurses' accommodation required?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) and (2) I am aware of criticism of the shortage of accommodation for staff at the Derby Regional Hospital. It is considered there is adequate accommodation for the present level of staff, however, negotiations are in hand to lease suitable accommodation which has just become available and which is hoped will meet the anticipated future requirements.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Industrial Lands Development Authority: Resumptions

637. Mr TAYLOR, to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce:

With respect to those houses resumed or purchased by the Industrial Lands Development Authority as being on land required for future public purposes—

- (a) what number are within the Perth metropolitan area;
- (b) how many of these are presently occupied by tenants of the authority;
- (c) how many are presently habitable but not occupied;
- (d) how many of those within the Perth metropolitan area are handled for the authority by private letting agencies?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (a) The Industrial Lands Development Authority currently has four properties at Canning Vale that were acquired because they were on land needed for future industrial use.
- (b) Three of the properties are presently occupied by tenants.
- (c) One property has been vacant since 4 April 1980 because of difficulties in providing an adequate water supply for it.
- (d) All properties are handled for the authority by a private letting agent.

TOWN PLANNING: MRPA

Land Resumptions

638. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

With respect to those houses resumed or purchased by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority as being on land required for future public projects—

- (a) what number are within the Perth metropolitan area;
- (b) how many of these are presently occupied by tenants of the authority;
- (c) how many are presently habitable but not occupied;

- (d) how many of those within the Perth metropolitan area are handled for the authority by private letting agencies?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

The following figures relate to the Metropolitan Region—

- (a) 169;
- (b) 160;
- (c) 7—these are in the process of being let;
- (d) none.

ROADS: MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Land Resumptions

639. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Transport:

With respect to those houses resumed or purchased by the Main Roads Department as being on land required for future public projects—

- (a) what number are within the Perth metropolitan area;
- (b) how many of these are presently occupied by tenants of the department;
- (c) How many are presently habitable but not occupied;
- (d) how many of those within the Perth metropolitan area are handled for the Main Roads Department by private letting agencies?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (a) 207;
- (b) 202;
- (c) five;
- (d) two.

LAND

Resumptions: Public Projects

640. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Works:

With respect to those houses resumed and/or purchased as being on land required for future public projects:

- (a) what number are within the Perth metropolitan area;
- (b) how many of these are presently occupied by tenants of the Government;

- (c) how many are presently habitable, but not occupied;
- (d) Are any of those within the Perth metropolitan area handled for the department by private letting agencies?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Houses under the control of the Minister for Works—

- (a) 38 houses;
- (b) 33 occupied;
- (c) five not occupied;
- (d) None. The leases and tenancies are arranged by the land and property branch.

HEALTH

Private Bores: Contamination

641. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he consider there is a health risk from septic tank effluents and micro organisms entering the ground water and then being intercepted by private bores?
- (2) What action has been taken, or is it contemplated might be taken, to ensure that this is not happening at this time?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) No, if the septic tank is constructed and installed in accordance with the regulations administered by the Department of Health and Medical Services.
- (2) Plans for all septic tank installations must be submitted to the Department of Health and Medical Services for examination and approval before construction commences. The on site construction is then supervised by the local authority health surveyor to ensure compliance with prescribed standards before a "Certificate to Use" is issued.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Wetlands

642. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Does the Government have any control over privately owned wetlands in the greater Perth region?

- (2) Does the Government see a need to protect these wetlands from alteration or filling by landowners and land developers?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) I understand that this issue has been examined in the System Six Study which will be available to both the Government and the public shortly.

WATER RESOURCES: UNDERGROUND

Waste Disposal Sites

643. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Will he advise whether bores which reticulate public open spaces created from former refuse disposal sites are monitored for pollutants and nutrients?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

Not known. Monitoring of water supplies intended for use for other than human consumption is the responsibility of the particular local health authority.

WATER RESOURCES: UNDERGROUND

Liquid Waste

644. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What is the Government's policy with respect to the disposal of liquid waste within the greater Perth region?
- (2) What guarantees does he have that such liquid waste will not enter the ground water?
- (3) How does he intend to "clean up" any liquid waste which may enter the ground water?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Deep sewer where available or treatment in waste stabilisation ponds when deep sewer is not available. A system to treat all liquid wastes emanating from the metropolitan area is currently being examined by the responsible Government departments.

- (2) Health Department constraints do not permit a disposal site to be located where the ground water will be adversely affected.
- (3) Not applicable.

WATER RESOURCES: UNDERGROUND

Waste Disposal Sites

645. Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Have leachates from refuse disposal sites been detected in ground water in close proximity to these sites?
- (2) How does he intend to ensure that these leachates do not or will not enter the ground water, and how does he intend to "clean up" any leachates which may enter the ground water?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) A refuse disposal site is not approved by the Public Health Department until the views of other affected departments—e.g., Water Board, Conservation and the Environment, Town Planning—have been obtained to ensure there is no pollution of the ground water.

HEALTH: MENTAL

Patients: Treatment and Deaths

646. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many patients have died whilst in the care of the Mental Health Services in the period 1973 to 1978?
- (2) In which hospitals or institutions did the abovementioned deaths occur?
- (3) What is the total number of mental patients on after care of approved hospitals for each of the past five years?
- (4) How many lobotomy operations have been performed in Western Australia by the Mental Health Services since 1972?
- (5) Has the number of persons treated for mental disorders in Mental Health Services approved hospitals decreased during recent years?
- (6) Has the number of persons treated for mental disorders in Western Australian public hospitals increased in recent years?

- (7) How many patients of Mental Health Services died during the period 1978-79 while—
 - (a) in approved hospitals;
 - (b) on after care?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) The number of patients who died whilst in Mental Health Services institutions in the period 1973 to 1979 are—

	Died in Hospital				
1973-74	80				
1974-75	71				
1975-76	64				
1976-77	65				
1977-78	60				
(2)	The institutions in which the abovementioned deaths occurred are—				
	Graylands	Swanbourne	Heathcote	Lemnos	Total
1973-74	7	50	1	22	80
1974-75	12	47	—	12	71
1975-76	7	39	2	16	64
1976-77	6	50	3	6	65
1977-78	9	35	2	14	60

- (3) The total number of patients on after care from approved hospitals for each of the past five years was—

As at 30/6/76	1479
As at 30/6/77	1482
As at 30/6/78	1080
As at 30/6/79	1070
As at 30/6/80	1064.
- (4) Nil.
- (5) The number of persons who have received inpatient services has been relatively stable in recent years.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) The number of patients who died during the period 1978-79 while—
 - (a) in approved hospitals—68 patients;
 - (b) on after care—31 patients.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Infrastructure Borrowing Programme

647. Mr BRYCE, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What is the nature and scope of the Government's borrowing programme to finance infrastructure work associated with the North West Shelf gas project?
- (2) Is the State Government contemplating borrowing money, overseas or interstate, to finance infrastructure costs associated with—
 - (a) projects already established in the Pilbara;
 - (b) future projects, other than the North West Shelf gas project?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Loan Council approval has been obtained for three separate borrowing programs associated with the North-West Shelf gas project, namely—

\$553.3 million for the Dampier-Perth gas pipeline.

\$38.6 million for certain social, civic and industrial infrastructure requirements.

\$7.05 million for the Jervoise Bay offshore construction facility.

All figures quoted are in June 1980 values.

- (2) (a) Yes.
(b) This will depend on the nature of the projects, the amounts involved and the availability of suitable finance in Australia and overseas.

FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

North-West Shelf: Dampier-Perth Pipeline

648. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) When will work commence on the construction of the gas pipeline from Dampier to Perth?
(2) What stage has planning reached for the construction of the pipeline?
(3) What is the latest estimate of the cost of the pipeline?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Preliminary planning requires construction to start mid-1982.
(2) Construction planning is in progress and is due for completion in November 1980.
(3) \$450 million—based on 1979 dollars.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Myer Committee

649. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

With reference to his answer to question 449 of 1980 relevant to the Myer Committee, which Ministers or departmental officers have been given the responsibility to examine the Myer Committee report?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Labour and Industry.

Treasury.

Industrial Development.

Public Service Board.

They will co-opt other Ministers and departments as required.

TOWN PLANNING: MRPA

Land: Redcliffe

650. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) With reference to her answer to question 358 part (2) of 1980 relevant to Metropolitan Region Planning Authority land at Redcliffe, what proportion of the land referred to is classified as urban?
(2) Who owns or controls the proportion of the land referred to as urban?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) 8.5 ha.
(2) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority.

MINISTER OF THE CROWN

Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce

651. Mr BRYCE, to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce:

Will he provide details of the personnel and the departmental structure under his authority as Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

The Department of Industrial Development and Commerce is structured under the director with seven sections responsible for—

1. Administration.
2. Research.
3. Industries Liaison.
4. Regional Services.
5. Marketing.
6. Finance.
7. Publicity.

The departmental personnel number 67 substantive items and six attached items. Total 73 staff.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Power Stations: Coal Consumption

652. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What quantity of coal was burned at each of the State's coal burning power stations during 1978 and 1979?
- (2) How much "fly ash" was produced at each coal burning power station?
- (3) How and where is the "fly ash" disposed of in respect of each coal burning power station?
- (4) What are the chemical components of "fly ash"?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

(1)	Coal Tonnes	
Coal burned	1978	1979
Muja	990 000	1 073 000
Kwinana	155 000	514 000
Bunbury	558 000	484 000
South Fremantle	314 000	303 000
East Perth	102 000	123 000

(2)	Fly Ash Tonnes	
Fly Ash Burned	1978	1979
Muja	35 600	38 600
Kwinana	8 100	26 900
Bunbury	29 200	25 400
South Fremantle	16 400	15 900
East Perth	5 300	6 400

- (3) Fly Ash disposal—

Muja—	No precipitators — released to atmosphere.
Kwinana—	Off-site disposal in disused quarry some 5 km east, using ash slurry and water recycling
Bunbury—	Off-site disposal by ash slurry for land fill some 1 km north for eventual recreation area.
South Fremantle—	Off-site disposal by ash slurry some 2 km south-east in disused quarry or by road tanker under removal contract.
East Perth—	Off-site disposal some 1 km east by pipeline using ash slurry for land fill.

Note: Tenders for purchase and removal of fly ash from Kwinana and Bunbury by contract being assessed at present.

- (4) Fly Ash Chemical components—

Ash comprises principally silica, aluminium and iron oxides—(85-93 per cent)—with the remainder comprising calcium, magnesium, phosphorus sodium and potassium oxides. Proportions vary depending on coal source.

SLOW LEARNING CHILDREN'S GROUP OF W.A.

Government Funds

653. Mr BRYCE, to the Treasurer:

What was the level of—

- (a) State Government;
 - (b) Commonwealth Government,
- funding allocated to the Slow Learning Children's Group during each of the last six financial years?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (a) State Government Funding—

1974-5	\$790 000.00
1975-6	\$800 000.00
1976-7	\$1 050 000.00
1977-8	\$1 250 000.00
1978-9	\$1 574 000.00
1979-80	\$1 763 000.00

- (b) Commonwealth Government Funding—

As specific grants and subsidies are paid direct to the Slow Learning Children's Group by the Commonwealth Government the information sought is not available.

HEALTH

Community Centres

654. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many community health centres have been established in Western Australia?
- (2) Will he indicate the location of the existing community health centres?
- (3) Does his department propose to establish additional community health centres in the future?
- (4) What requirements must be met for a community to qualify for the establishment of such a centre?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) 12.
- (2) Multi-disciplinary community health centres are located at—

Busselton
Claremont
Geraldton
Karratha
Kwinana
Lockridge
Mandurah
South Hedland.

Smaller centres are located at—

Bremer Bay
Cervantes
Lake Varley
Nullagine.

- (3) Yes.
- (4) Where and when a community health centre is established depends on the needs of the community and availability of funds.

EDUCATION

Community Centres

655. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many community education centres have been established in Western Australia?
- (2) Will he indicate the location of the existing community education centres?
- (3) Does the Education Department intend to establish additional community education centres in the future?
- (4) What requirements must be met for a community to qualify for the establishment of such a centre?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Four.
- (2) Fremantle, Albany, Geraldton, Derby.
- (3) These centres were established by the Commonwealth Schools Commission and are funded independently of the Education Department of Western Australia. Thirty two centres in total have been established throughout Australia.

- (4) The Schools Commission invited proposals from interested parties in 1975 for funding to create community education centres. There have been no subsequent invitations to submit proposals for further centres. The Schools Commission is currently undertaking a review of the centres established in each State.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Members of Parliament

656. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Attorney General aware that people frequently visit members of Parliament's constituency offices seeking information and assistance with electoral enrolments?
- (2) Is the Attorney General prepared to allow all members of Parliament who wish to assist their constituents with enrolment procedures to do so by approving their appointment as Justices of the Peace?
- (3) If the answer to question (2) is "No", will the Attorney General explain why the Government does not consider members of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council to be fit and proper persons to be appointed to the commission of the peace?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) I am aware that members of the public do seek information and assistance on a wide variety of matters.
- (2) and (3) No. The proposition is contrary to Government policy—see paragraph 5 of reply to question 1671, Legislative Assembly, 3 October 1979.

BIRTH CERTIFICATES

Adults Adopted in Childhood

657. Mr BRYCE, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) (a) Is it a fact that adults who were adopted in childhood are currently prohibited from obtaining their own original birth certificate;
- (b) if so, why?

- (2) Is the Government currently considering proposals to change this position?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
 (b) This practice operates in order to preserve the confidentiality of the adoption and the adoptive parents' right to decide what information and when they will pass on to their child. The practice is long established—going back to the earliest legislation on the matter—and is part of the very basis of our present adoption system.
- (2) No.

FIRE BRIGADES

Bassendean, Bayswater, and Belmont

658. Mr BRYCE, to the Chief Secretary:

On how many occasions in each of the last five years have fire brigade units been called to attend fires in—

- (a) Belmont City;
 (b) Bayswater Shire;
 (c) Bassendean Town?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (a) to (c) Fire Brigade units have attended fires as under—

	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Belmont City.....	284	265	242
Bayswater Shire.....	223	206	138
Bassendean Town.....	94	73	94

Information for years 1975-76 and 1976-77 is not readily available and would take some time to research.

SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS

Committee: Report

659. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

Does he propose to present a report to Parliament outlining the cost, scope and achievements of the committee which organised the State's 150th Anniversary Celebrations last year?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:
 Yes.

BOATS

Jurien Bay

660. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the Government any plan for constructing a marina for small boats at Jurien Bay?
 (2) If so, when is it anticipated that this marina will be constructed?
 (3) If no marina is contemplated, will facilities be provided for small and pleasure craft in conjunction with the proposed jetty?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) and (3) As I have communicated to the member for Moore on his prior inquiry, the Public Works Department is continuing with investigations into possible improvements for small craft facilities at Jurien Bay. Until these are completed, the nature of facilities to be provided cannot be defined.
 (2) Depending on the outcome of the investigations and the competing requirements for available funds, it is hoped to commence work in 1982-83.

HOUSING: BUILDING SOCIETIES

Interest Rates

661. Mr JAMIESON, to the Honorary Minister assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the rate of interest paid by building societies on savings bank deposits in this State?
 (2) What is the rate of interest charged for a building society loan in this State?
 (3) As terminating building societies are allowed only one per cent for management costs, what justification exists for the higher 'management costs' of the permanent building societies?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) The predominant interest rate paid on no fixed term investments with permanent building societies is 8 per cent p.a., and the interest rate paid on term deposits varies, the predominant rate being 11½ per cent p.a. for a 12-month term.
 (2) The interest rates charged on owner occupier loans are—

Up to \$20 000 by one society 10% per cent p.a.

Others up to \$25 000—10½ per cent to 11½ per cent

Others up to \$40 000—11½ per cent to 12 per cent

Others over \$40 000—11½ per cent to 12½ per cent

- (3) As the method of funding permanent building societies differs considerably from that of terminating building societies the managing costs are not comparable: Terminating societies receive loan funds from institutional and Government sources in large amounts matching the term of advances to purchasers over periods from 25 to 30 years, whereas permanent building societies, not unlike savings banks and other non-bank financial institutions, are continually turning over their funds and new funds must be derived with intense competition in a complex and sensitive open market situation.

The margins of permanent building societies need to reflect an operational surplus to meet the required statutory levels of liquidity and reserve ratios.

POLICE

Girrawheen House: Search

662. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Can he confirm that a Detective Brophy along with other detectives in two cars called at 47 Harford Way, Girrawheen on the morning of 2 September 1980 with inquiries concerning a breaking and entering offence?
- (2) If "Yes", did the detectives have a warrant to search the house?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), why did they refuse to allow the 18 year old son of the family, who was the only person in the house, to read the warrant?
- (4) Did the detectives leave one of the bedrooms, which was searched, in a "shockingly disturbed state" as is alleged by the parents of the family?
- (5) Did the detectives accuse the 18 year old son, who is a licensed ham radio operator, and was not wanted for questioning, of having stolen equipment they found in his bedroom?

- (6) Did the detectives threaten the same person with regard to his chances of enlisting in the Army?
- (7) Have these actions by the police been in any way high handed, or in excess of what law abiding citizens might expect as standard police procedure?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) He did read the warrant.
- (4) No.
- (5) No.
- (6) No.
- (7) No.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

NOONKANBAH STATION

Museum: Statement

126. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

- (1) Did the Minister for Cultural Affairs see a report in today's issue of *The West Australian* with the heading, "MUSEUM MADE NEW WARNING TO GOVT"?
- (2) Was this an accurate account of the statement which was made by the Museum and referred to by the Minister in Parliament yesterday?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) No, the account was definitely not an accurate one and I deplore the fact that it was interpreted in this way. The statement by the Museum in a memorandum to me and which I tabled in the House yesterday was not a warning in any sense of the word. It was simply a reply to a specific question which I had asked the Museum Trustees in order to satisfy myself as to what should be the Government's attitude to future mining activities on the so-called area of influence at Noonkanbah should this situation arise some time in the future.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Elections: Plural Voting

127. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has Cabinet recently considered the abolition of plural voting for local government elections in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, would she advise the results of those considerations?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) Any matter that Cabinet has considered remains confidential. At a suitable time in the future the honourable member will find out the result of the deliberations.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Transport of Drilling Rig: Police Escort Cost

128. Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

Will he advise details of any dispute between the Government and the Police Department regarding rates of payment to police who escorted the drill to Noonkanbah?

Mr HASSELL replied:

To the best of my knowledge, there is no dispute between the Government and the Police Department as to the rates of pay for policemen who escorted the drill to Noonkanbah.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Museum: View

129. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

Is he of the opinion that the Western Australian Museum is in a position to express a view that oil drilling at Noonkanbah should not proceed?

The SPEAKER: I rule the question out of order because the honourable member is asking for an opinion and the Minister is not in the position to answer such a question.

MINING ACT

Farmers' Union: Criticism

130. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of a report of a meeting involving the new Mining Act at Donnybrook, appearing in the *South Western Times* on 2 September 1980?
- (2) As the report quotes Mr P. J. Gethin, on behalf of the Farmers' Union, as criticising private landholders' provisions of the 1978 Mining Act, will the Minister please advise—
 - (a) is Mr Gethin's assumption regarding sand, gravel, and clay correct;
 - (b) have private landholders' entitlements to compensation been eroded;
 - (c) does the 1978 Mining Act give miners unrestricted access to private land in order to gain access as claimed by Mr Gethin?
- (3) When will the 1978 Mining Act be proclaimed?
- (4) Can the Minister refute the claim by the *Farmers Weekly* newspaper that the Government will introduce the new Act and regulations early in 1981 and it will be six months before the Parliament can raise any objection to it?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

There are some slight variations to the question—

Mr Davies: Could the Minister read the question again, please?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn members that I will bring questions without notice to a close if the interjections continue.

Mr P. V. JONES: I understand it was read to someone in my office over the phone and one or two words are slightly different.

Points of Order

Mr DAVIES: If the Minister has admitted that there are variations in the question he has and the question asked, how do we know the Minister is giving a correct answer to the question asked as we in the House will know it?

The SPEAKER: Having served in the House as a member of the Opposition, I know that members sometimes follow the practice of ringing a question through to the Minister's office, and the question is asked in the House at a later stage by the member. In my experience, there have sometimes been variations in the question which is transmitted to the Minister. I believe the Minister is answering the question on the basis of his understanding of it as it was transmitted to his office, and I cannot see anything wrong in allowing the Minister to continue to answer the question in that way.

Mr DAVIES: On a further point of order, which question will appear in *Hansard*—the question which has been asked and taken down by the *Hansard* reporter or the question which the Minister is now answering and which is written on a piece of paper to which none of us is privy?

The SPEAKER: There is a difference in the way questions without notice are recorded as distinct from questions on notice, as the Leader of the Opposition knows. Questions without notice are recorded by the *Hansard* reporter and the answers are taken down in the same way. The *Hansard* reporter will have recorded the question as asked by the member and will also record the reply as given by the Minister, and I see no reason to attempt to influence the Minister in the way in which he should answer the question, any more than I would attempt to influence a member in the way in which he might seek to ask a question, unless of course it transgresses the Standing Orders.

Questions (without notice) Resumed

Mr P. V. JONES: The answer is—

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) No. Mr Gethin is wrong. The Mining Act 1978 will not take away the rights of farmers to

gravel, sand, and clay on their properties. The Mining Act 1978 has no jurisdiction over these materials when they are situated on private land. Under the provisions of section 8 of the Act and the definition of minerals, gravel, sand and clay are not minerals when situated on private land. Therefore a prospecting licence or exploration licence granted in respect of private land does not include any entitlement to these materials. Section 112 of the Act, mentioned by Mr Gethin, would not apply in these circumstances and gravel, sand, and clay would be the property of the owner of private land.

If these materials are situated on Crown land the reservation contained in section 112 in favour of the Crown to remove gravel, sand, and clay would apply.

(b) No.

(c) No.

(3) The proclamation of the 1978 Mining Act and promulgation of the regulations to that Act will be effected simultaneously, and this is proposed for later in 1980, after further discussions with the mining industry and other interested parties following consideration of the public comments which have been received.

(4) Answered by (3).

NOONKANBAH STATION

Museum: View

131. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

Is the Western Australian Museum in a position to advise whether oil drilling on Noonkanbah should not proceed?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

In respect of mineral exploration and existing mining tenements generally the Museum has stated that before further activity takes place there should be consultation with the Aborigines. The Government agrees with this view. In

the case of the current oil exploration hole, that consultation has already taken place. Naturally, any other exploration at Noonkanbah that might take place in the future should be on the same basis. The Museum also made it clear that it is in no position to express a view on the effect of drilling within the protected area as no evaluation in respect of this matter has taken place. Statements which some people have made to the effect that the Museum expects the whole of the so-called area of influence to be held inviolate are therefore erroneous for this and many other reasons.

As no evaluation has taken place the Museum is simply not in a position to express a view in respect of whether oil exploration should be agreed to or otherwise. When the Museum attempted to conduct such an evaluation some weeks ago its officers were refused access to Noonkanbah Station by the Aboriginal community.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Drilling Rig: Takeover by Government

132. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Mines:

I would like to ask a question without notice of the Minister for Mines, but before I do so, I would like to congratulate the Minister for Cultural Affairs on the fluent and comprehensive way he responded off-the-cuff to the previous question.

The SPEAKER: Get on with your question.

Mr PEARCE: I ask the Minister for Mines—

- (1) Will he explain to the House the legal basis on which the Government has assumed control through Omen Pty. Ltd. of the Noonkanbah drill?
- (2) Will he explain the extent to which Amax or Richter Drilling have assigned their rights in the drill or in the exploration lease to the Government?
- (3) Will he explain any compensation the Government is paying to the companies for that assignment?
- (4) Will he explain whether or not documents are available which explain the legal tie-up between CSR, Amax, Richter, and the Government?
- (5) Will he table the document?

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: I want to say that the first part of the member's question is out of order as it seeks a legal opinion. I direct that the Minister is not to answer that part of the question, but the balance of the question is in order, and he may answer that.

Point of Order

Mr PEARCE: I did not ask for a legal opinion.

The SPEAKER: Will the member restate the question?

Mr PEARCE: I asked the Minister to state to the House the legal basis on which the Government has assumed control.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. In my view the Minister would be required to give a legal opinion if he were to answer that part of the question, and I rule it out of order.

Mr Pearce: That is rubbish.

Questions (without notice) Resumed

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (3) to (5) The member for Gosnells used the work "compensation" in relation to the contractual arrangements that have been made. If in fact he is referring to assignment, which I think he is, the answer is clearly "No". There is no involvement as far as assignment is concerned. In regard to the latter part of the question, this has been carried out through legal arrangements provided for under the terms of the contract, and that is a matter between the parties concerned.

COMPANIES

Government Interest

133. Mr DAVIES, to the Treasurer:

Yesterday I asked the Treasurer question 527, parts (1) and (2) (a) of which were as follows—

- (1) In how many companies registered in Western Australia does the Government have a participating interest?

- (2) (a) What is the name of each of the companies identified in (1);

In reply the Treasurer said one company—West Trade Centre. I now ask

him: Does the Government have a participating interest in the Systems Research Institute of Australia Ltd., and if so, why did he not tell me this yesterday?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I will have research undertaken about the particular organisation to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. I was assured by the people who researched the material to answer the question yesterday that there was only one such company. As a matter of fact I sent the reply back to the department because I thought the Government may have a minor interest in some other companies and that reference to this interest had not been indexed properly. I believe the people researching the question interpreted the word "interest" as being an equity or share interest in the company.

Mr Davies: You did not answer it that way.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I will have the matter researched.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Protected Sites

134. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

Does the Government consider that any area of Noonkanbah should be declared a protected site?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question, the reply to which is as follows—

There is a case for Pea Hill and for a cluster of several sites which have been delineated by the Museum being declared protected sites.

The Government offered the Aborigines a special lease over these areas, but it would be equally satisfactory to declare them protected areas. In view of the activity which the Museum now says should be permitted on the so-called area of influence there is certainly no case for the whole of that area to be declared a protected area.

When the Museum made its recommendations that the area of influence be declared a protected area it was unaware that the land on which the homestead, buildings, shearing shed, and stockyards had been constructed was freehold land. It was unaware also that extensive drilling had taken place already in the vicinity of Pea Hill. This subsequent information destroys the basis for the original recommendation by the Museum.

The replies which I received from the Museum in respect of questions which I asked them on the Noonkanbah issue clearly indicate that there is no basis for the so-called area of influence being declared a protected area under the Aboriginal Heritage Act and that instead portions only should be protected as was originally suggested by the Government.

In reply to my questions the Museum has indicated that in its view normal activity should continue within the area of influence at Noonkanbah. This normal activity applies to the use of the station homestead and outbuildings, the shearing shed, stockyards, and roads throughout the area of influence. The Museum also indicated that there was no objection to normal activity on the established airstrips, water points, trig points, and such things. This applies also to the grazing of stock, mustering and other animal husbandry activities within the so-called area of influence.

OPERATION "SANDGROPER"

Smoke Canisters

135. Mr BARNETT, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware of reports that smoke canisters from operation "Sandgroper" have been washing up on beaches between Warnbro and Mandurah?
- (2) Is he aware that these canisters are reported to contain highly dangerous phosphorus?

- (3) Will the Government investigate the reports, and if found necessary, issue adequate warnings to people and children frequenting beaches in the vicinity?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (3) The member for Rockingham gave me notice of this question just a few minutes before question time. However, I have been able to ascertain the following information from official sources: Three canisters, marine, marked "W5" have been located and all were expended. One was found on Monday and two on Wednesday.

Of those three, two were found at Golden Bay and one at Shoalwater Bay. The Navy diving team recovered them as soon as reported.

Mr Davies: Just as well they were not in our water supply!

Sir CHARLES COURT: I am advised that normally these canisters sink, but with the heavy seas of the past few days, they were washed in. An alert will be kept by the authorities.

- (2) Regarding the danger of the contents of the canisters, the report I obtained says that they were all expended, and so there is no danger. I have been informed that there is no danger to the public from the canisters, but in any case there is an alert on this matter.

HOUSING

Land: Dianella

136. Mr WILSON, to the Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has he received the report from the General Manager of the State Housing Commission on possible alternatives for the land between Yirrigan Drive and Morley Drive in Dianella?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1) what recommendations does it contain with respect to the former proposal for the Northwood Drive link between Morley Drive and Yirrigan Drive?
- (3) Has this recommendation been accepted by the commission and himself?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3) what immediate action does the commission propose to take on the matter?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

I thank the member for some notice of his question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) to (4) No. But I have asked the general manager to expedite the report to me.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Advisory Council for Inter-Government Relations

137. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Did he attend a meeting of the Advisory Council for Inter-Government Relations on or about 15 August as a representative of the Western Australian Government?
- (2) Did that meeting consider a discussion paper on local government franchise, voting, and other electoral matters, as prepared by its projects officer?
- (3) Does the discussion paper highlight the Western Australian system as being the least democratic of all States?
- (4) Will he please arrange for a copy of the document to be tabled in this House at the earliest opportunity?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) to (4) I did attend the meeting, and I believe it was on the date referred to. I do not think the council considered a discussion paper of the nature referred to by the member. A committee of the council considered some draft material which had been submitted, but I do not believe that material was final, is final, or has been accepted by the advisory council. If my recollection is correct, the material is not available for publication because it is not as yet a constituted document of the advisory council. If the honourable member wants to obtain further details, I suggest that he should put the question on the notice paper, directing it to the Minister for Federal Affairs who would be the responsible Minister. No doubt that Minister can reply to the question from the records and minutes of the meeting. I represented the Minister for Federal Affairs on that occasion. I am almost certain that the type of discussion paper he referred to has not been produced as a discussion paper by the advisory council.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Drilling: Contractual Arrangements

138. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Mines:

What contractual arrangements have been entered into between the State Government, Omen Pty. Ltd., and Amax with regard to drilling at Noonkanbah, and will he table the contract?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

This information has been given on several occasions. The contractual arrangements which have been entered into are those which apply under the normal standard oil drilling contracts of which, I understand, the Opposition has seen a copy. Therefore, there is no need to table it.

FRUIT

Fruit-fly Baiting Scheme

139. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Can the Minister advise the House what was the final result of voting—that is, for, against, and informal—in the recent Donnybrook-Boyanup fruit-fly baiting poll?

Mr OLD replied:

I thank the member for some brief notice of this question. The results were: Votes in favour 96, votes against 60, and informal 9, making a total of 165.

NOONKANBAH STATION

Omen Pty. Ltd.

140. Mr BRIDGE, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a Mr Jack Lambert was until recently a senior employee of Richter Drilling?
- (2) Is the Minister aware that the same Mr Lambert is now an officer and/or director and/or employee of Omen Pty. Ltd.
- (3) If so, when did he first know of Mr Lambert's involvement in Omen?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes, I am aware of some of the information on which the honourable member is seeking my concurrence; however, I do not know all the details surrounding the matter. I certainly could not tell him the current employment situation of Mr Jack Lambert, or when it changed. The honourable member seems to suggest he has changed his employment. When I first knew of him some time ago, he was an employee of Richter Drilling.