

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 27 August 1985

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Harman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

## SPORT AND RECREATION

### *Square-rigged Sailing Ship: Petition*

**MR MacKINNON** (Murdoch—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.16 p.m.]: I present a petition in the following terms—

We, the undersigned pray that the Premier, the Hon. Brian Burke and the Education Minister the Hon. Robert Pearce, in a time of economic restraint and cut backs on essential services, not waste up to half a million dollars of taxpayers' funds on a square rigged sailing ship that will duplicate existing private charter yacht facilities.

Further, that the State Government undertake an accounting study to find out the total cost of construction, operating costs, viability and maintenance expenses before committing taxpayers to an open-ended cheque supporting this project.

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

The petition bears 20 signatures and I certify that it conforms to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 3.)

## ACTS AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION) BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR GRILL** (Esperance-Dundas—Minister for Transport) [2.22 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the Transport Act 1966 and certain other Acts, and repeals the State Transport Co-ordination Act 1981. Its effect is to amalgamate the office of the Coordinator General of Transport and the Transport Commission to form a new department. This will allow the provision of all policy and ministerial

administrative functions in the State's Transport portfolio to be continued within a single body.

Until the mid-1960s, Western Australia's Transport portfolio functioned without any central policy assistance for its Minister. The Minister, with a handful of personal staff, presided over a small number of Government transport agencies. Each was responsible for the conduct of its own segment of public sector transport activities.

In June 1966, the then Commissioner of Railways (Mr Cyril Wayne) presented to the Government his "overall review of transport in Western Australia". Wayne pointed out the need to ensure that Western Australia's transport policy, covering both public and private operations, should be focused in a deliberate and coordinated manner. He gave voice to a growing concern that there existed insufficient machinery to ensure that comprehensive transport policy was developed and implemented.

He suggested that a Western Australian transport authority, as he called it, should be set up, with a director general of transport as its permanent head. Wayne envisaged widespread new powers for his new authority, including the active implementation of "policy control" over both private road transport and air operations, as well as the four Government transport agencies at that time—Railways, MTT, the Coastal Shipping Commission, and the Transport Commission.

Although Wayne's recommendations resulted in the establishment of the new position of Director General of Transport under the State Transport Co-ordination Act of 1966, no authority was set up. Staff support for the director general was set at minimal levels, and the director general's powers were limited primarily to those of advising the Minister.

This situation, and its founding legislation, prevailed until 1981. In that year, the State Transport Co-ordination Act 1981 was brought in. This broadened the advisory functions of the permanent head, and retitled him the Co-ordinator General of Transport.

However, the co-ordinator general, like the director general he succeeded, has no formal power to implement or administer policy. The co-ordinator concentrates on planning and policy development at an intermodal or strategic level. Much of the Minister's policy and planning advice for each individual agency in the portfolio is taken directly from that agency.

The Minister is accessible to his 13 agency heads, each of whom enjoys a direct line of accountability.

These agencies are—

Westrail  
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust  
Main Roads Department  
Coordinator General of Transport  
Transport Commission  
Marine and Harbours Department  
Stateships  
Port Authorities—  
Fremantle  
Albany  
Bunbury  
Esperance  
Geraldton  
Port Hedland.

This makes the Western Australian portfolio the most decentralised of State and Federal Transport portfolios. In other places a Ministry, department of transport, or its equivalent, is the norm. In practice, the Western Australian system is widely regarded as having worked well. Most Western Australian transport agencies compare favourably with their counterparts elsewhere in Australia. This is partly due to the quality of top individuals, but also to the clearly defined responsibility of those agencies.

Since the election of the Burke Government, transport agencies have worked solidly in support of a wide range of initiatives throughout the portfolio. Let me mention some of them—

Enlargement of the Taxi Control Board to give greater say in the taxi industry in the regulation of its own affairs;  
the rewriting of the Eastern Goldfields Transport Board Act;  
the enlargement of the Metropolitan Transport Trust Board from four to seven members, including representatives of users' and employees' interests;  
plans for the commercialisation of Westrail;  
amalgamation of the Marine and Harbours Department with the Harbours and Rivers Branch of the Public Works Department;  
a review of port administration in the State by the Co-ordinator General of Transport, together with the successive development of a strategy plan for each port; and

the creation of a Western Australian Maritime Council to coordinate the advice to the Minister from the marine sector of his portfolio.

Despite the beneficial effect of these initiatives, I believe there are sound reasons that the highly decentralised approach to transport administration in this State is not as appropriate as it was, and we should now be adopting a tighter, more coordinated approach to the organisation of the portfolio.

In saying that, I am very conscious that transport is becoming more complex and will continue to be so. Much of the future welfare of our State will be determined by how well we can predict and solve transport problems. The so-called "energy crisis", the road toll, pollution and environmental concerns, congestion, the avoidance of massive transport deficits, the structure of our metropolitan area, the future of the central business district, the successful competition of our mineral, agricultural, and other products in export markets, and many other issues are largely dependent upon our success.

Likewise, the management of transport is becoming more complex. Emphasis is increasingly placed on maintaining sound financial performance. Good industrial relations are of paramount importance. Social responsibilities are a growing focus of public attention. A revolution has occurred in statistical and information sciences. The body of technical and policy transport research is rapidly expanding.

Faced with all these sorts of pressures—pressures which will only increase—highly decentralised portfolio control runs the risk of resulting in duplication; it can become increasingly mistake-prone, and it threatens to become uncoordinated.

This situation places increasing demands for day-to-day management on the Minister and his office at the very time when the need for ministerial attention to strategic and policy matters is most pressing. A support structure to the Minister is required in order that many of the day-to-day pressures can be removed from him and his personal staff. The Minister will then have greater control over the portfolio by having more time to consult personal staff and agency heads and to consider strategic policy options. This can be achieved without detracting from the ongoing responsibility of the individual transport agencies to plan and work for greater efficiency.

In the proposed Department of Transport, I see the creation of that support structure.

Let me make it perfectly clear at the outset that I have set myself the objective of creating a department which will be highly efficient and will resist any temptation to grow into an overblown and slow-moving piece of bureaucracy. One key to this, I am convinced, is to maintain direct access between the Minister and the heads of the various transport agencies—the Metropolitan Transport Trust, Westrail, Stateships, the Main Roads Department, the Marine and Harbours Department and the ports. There is certainly no intention that the new Department of Transport will become a supreme authority through which the other transport agencies must report. In all cases, agencies will continue to be responsible directly to the Minister.

On the other hand, it should be clear to anyone with a passing knowledge of transport development in this State that there are potential grave inefficiencies if we attempt to maintain the Transport Commission, including its policy research and advice functions, in Nedlands, while maintaining a completely separate body—the Office of the Coordinator General of Transport—with other research and advice functions, in St. George's Terrace.

The Coordinator General of Transport, with a staff of 13, carries primary responsibility for policy research and planning, as well as overseeing and coordinating the portfolio's capital programme, operating budgets and pricing. The Transport Commission, with a staff of 90, primarily administers regulatory, licensing and subsidy policies, with a policy evaluation and development role and industry support functions.

The roles of the two offices have grown increasingly close to each other and it is now possible, without increasing staff numbers, to formally integrate their functions and skills and, as a result, provide better support for the Minister in the administration and operation of the portfolio. The uncommonly high level of goodwill between the two offices is valuable. Senior officers in the respective bodies support amalgamation and have undertaken to work enthusiastically to implement the amalgamation. Heads of other transport agencies have likewise offered their support to the concept.

The department will be headed by a Director General of Transport and a Deputy General of Transport, which positions in the first instance will be occupied by the present Coordinator

General of Transport, Dr J. H. E. Taplin, and the present Commissioner of Transport, Mr R. J. Ellis, respectively.

The department will have a policy side and an administrative side. In essence, the former will address the strategic issues, while the latter will concern itself with the tactical issues. Both functions are vital to effective overall performance. The Minister's office will comprise his personal advisers and private secretarial staff who will remain under his direct control.

It will be the director general's responsibility to manage major transport issues, develop policy initiatives, put into effect Government policy and assist in evaluating agency performance. To support this function, he will have a watching brief on all transport activities and provide an information-gathering service for the Minister. His department will prepare Budget papers and Cabinet minutes, and evaluate all proposals formally requiring the Minister's approval. It will perform many of the departmental functions currently performed within the Minister's office.

Additionally, through the administrative functions of licensing, field activity and the co-ordination and organisation of transport services, the department will provide a direct link to the non-Government sector of transport in terms of both policy implementation and feedback on issues and developments.

Emphasis will be put on the department maintaining close and ongoing contact with all sectors of the transport industry in order to provide scope for feedback of user views and identification of problem areas. This will ensure that the administration remains aware of and sensitive to user, general public, industrial and interest group viewpoints.

Through its closer co-ordination of policy development and administration, consolidated analytical resources and emphasis on agency performance, the department will provide an essential ongoing support service to the Minister which has, to date, necessarily been somewhat limited. By removing many of the day-to-day pressures from the Minister and his personal staff, the Minister will have greater control over the portfolio by having more time both to consult personal staff and agency heads and to consider strategic and policy options. The development, evaluation and monitoring of policy will be thereby greatly enhanced.

The department will provide advice from a portfolio-wide perspective rather than from a more narrowly-based agency or interest group

viewpoint. At the same time, the Minister will continue to have available to him the advice of personal staff and agency heads; he will not be "locked-in" to one particular source of advice.

In the Committee stage of the Bill, I will have the opportunity to explain further any individual points which members may wish to raise. For the moment though, I reiterate that I see the proposal before us as the most significant development in transport in this State for a long time, and one which I am confident will help maintain Western Australian transport administration in a position which is the envy of other systems.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr MacKinnon (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FIFTH DAY

##### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 22 August.

**MR TAYLOR** (Kalgoorlie) [2.36 p.m.]: I begin my Address-in-Reply speech by congratulating, first of all, the Governor, and, secondly, the Government for the content of the Governor's Speech. I take issue with the Press release put out by the Leader of the Opposition following the opening of Parliament in which he said the Governor must have been embarrassed by the content of the Speech because the Government had insisted on putting certain things into the Speech which the Governor may have found embarrassing. You, Mr Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition know that I worked in the Department of the Treasury in the days when the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister in the Court Government. For many days I worked with other Treasury officers in putting together economic information and other information which was to the Court Government's liking for inclusion in the Governor's Speech. It is not at all uncommon for the Governor to say those things in his Speech. I feel it was uncalled for for the Leader of the Opposition to make that sort of statement about what was quite an ordinary Speech by the Governor at the opening of Parliament.

I turn now to other matters which I think are of great importance to this Parliament and to this State. Those matters include the economy and industrial relations. I wish first to speak on the economy in general terms and turn later to the issue of industrial relations and particularly the attitude of the Opposition to industrial re-

lations. I wish to give one or two examples of where that attitude has had a great negative affect on this State and on Australia as a whole.

The Leader of the Opposition does not like anyone disagreeing with him about the economy or industrial relations. He seeks to make the most of the divisions in our community and because of that he is doing a great disservice to our community and to the people of Western Australia and Australia.

Only last week at the start of Parliament we heard Opposition member after Opposition member say how badly Australia was doing, how badly Western Australia was doing, and that we were heading down the tube as far as the economy is concerned. Not only are those statements untrue, as I will demonstrate, but also I believe it is a definite policy of this Opposition to try to convince the people that Australia and Western Australia in particular are not doing well. It does that because it realises that the economy is going well and, because of that, the Opposition is staring defeat in the face at the next State election. It is in its interest to create divisions in our community and to try to convince the people that Australia's economy is not doing well and that the Opposition can do a little better. It certainly can do no better than the job presently being done by this Government and the Hawke Government in relation to the economy or in relation to industrial relations.

I refer to members of the Opposition as the economic Luddites of the twentieth century. As Luddites they are seeking, in a selfish way, to wreck our economic development, and the future of Australia for a self-seeking purpose; that is, to try to win the 1986 election. It will not work because the people will find out and will know the truth, which is more than easy to prove as I will show in my speech.

I believe the Opposition works on the basis that it can tell the electors that the Government is not doing well. The fact is that the newspaper headlines show time and time again that the Labor Governments, both State and federally, are doing very well.

Rather than do what Opposition members do—that is, to read directly from newspapers during their speeches—what I intend to do is to refer to some of the headlines we have read in the papers over the past month or so which indicate how well the Western Australian and Australian Governments have done. *The West*

*Australian* of 17 July carried an article headed, "Western Australia up with the Leaders" and read as follows—

West Australian shopkeepers are among the leaders in Australia's retail recovery.

The article pointed out how well Western Australia was doing in the area of retail spending. It is an important issue because it demonstrates that people have faith and confidence in the future of the State and for that reason they are spending their money. It certainly was not the case when the Fraser Government was in power in Canberra and the Court and O'Connor Governments were in power in this State.

Mr Tonkin: They are knockers.

Mr TAYLOR: The Leader of the House is right; in fact members of the Opposition are not only knockers but also whingers and economic Luddites seeking to oppose what is right for the country. They should learn a lesson from the Government and adopt a more positive attitude to what is happening in regard to the economy.

Another article to which I refer was published in *The Australian* dated 24 July and carried the headline, "Australia heads growth study with 14pc rise forecast." The article was the result of a survey conducted by the Columbia University Centre for International Business Cycle Research, and referred to the barometers of future activity in Australia. It is good news because it says that in comparison with other nations Australia is doing well—in fact, the best out of the eight nations included in the study.

*The Australian* dated 30 July included an article which referred to a report from an independent group about an economic survey undertaken by Westpac and the University of Melbourne. The article reads as follows—

Australia's economy is set to grow strongly later this year with continued growth likely into 1986, according to a joint economic survey by Westpac and the University of Melbourne.

The survey reported on the "leading" economic index which measures economic statistics like new orders which reflect future production levels.

The survey involved several nations and once again Australia stood head and shoulders above the other nations.

Even my favourite newspaper, *The West Australian* on 9 August carried the headline "Good news on Aust. economy lifts hopes", and the article reads as follows—

Canberra: A surge in Australia's economic performance has cut unemployment to its lowest level in almost three years and produced a cautiously optimistic outlook for the economy in 1985-86.

All these headlines really show the opposite to the tripe that members heard in this House last week from Opposition members who took part in this debate. They tried to talk down Australia and this State and it is about time they woke up to themselves and realised that what the people of this nation and this State are looking for are leaders who have a positive outlook for the future and who will make sure that it will happen.

The final article to which I refer appeared in *The West Australian* on 12 August under the headline, "Rosy picture for Australia", and read as follows—

Canberra: Australia's gross national product is expected to grow by 4.5 per cent in the next year and unemployment is expected to keep dropping for the third successive year.

Rather than refer to other headlines it is appropriate that I relate to members of the Opposition some of the comments from independent bodies—certainly bodies to which they would relate such as the Confederation of Western Australian Industry. The *WA Economic Review* dated June 1985 included an article from the Confederation of Western Australian Industry which read as follows—

A high proportion of the current stimulus to growth now appears to be coming from the private sector. Recent months have seen a strengthening of consumer spending and a substantial increase in the capital expenditure plans of the corporate sector.

The article continued—

These and other statistics appear to indicate the medium-term economic strategy adopted by the Hawke Government during the recession of 1982-83; i.e., stimulate domestic recovery through increased public sector spending with a view to the momentum of the recovery being maintained by ensuring private sector revival.

That is what is happening and that is what the Burke Labor Government has been part of. It has worked hand-in-hand with the Hawke Government towards the economic recovery of this country. This Government in its early days recognised that it was necessary to get Australia onto a sound economic footing, and joined with the Federal Government to that end.

I refer to the area of housing: In my opinion the current Minister is the best Minister for Housing that this State has seen. This Government will achieve its objective of building 5 000 housing units in its first three years in office.

This Government and the Federal Government have been successful in promoting economic recovery, and statistics show that the recovery in the private sector is well in hand.

As members would be aware there are several ex-teachers on the Government side of this House and they have indicated to me that when engaging remedial education it is quite often helpful to be able to refer to graphs. Obviously, the Opposition needs remedial work in regard to the economy and for that reason I have with me graphs and figures which will show what is happening to the Australian economy.

The first graph which members of the Opposition might look at, if they dare, gives an indication of the rate of inflation in Australia from 1970-71 to 1984-85. In percentage terms the rate of inflation peaked in 1974-75 and it peaked again in 1982-83 when the Fraser Government and the O'Connor Government were in office. Since the Labor Governments have come into power in various States and the Commonwealth the rate of inflation and percentage change measured by the CPI and the gross national product price deflator have dropped dramatically. Members opposite are obviously not interested in looking at the graph because they are afraid of not only hearing the truth, but also seeing the truth.

Inflation dropped rapidly at the beginning of 1985 and even though there has been a small rise in inflation because of the impact of the devaluation of the Australian dollar I have no doubt that the current rates of inflation can be maintained in the future.

Mr Trethowan: The Budget estimates indicate that the rate of inflation is significantly higher than other countries including Japan.

Mr TAYLOR: It indicates that the rate of inflation has been slightly higher than the previous years in which the Labor Government has been in power. The reason for that is the

action taken to strengthen the Australian dollar. Of course, that probably will have an inflationary impact, but positive benefits will flow on to the economy from the strengthening of the Australian dollar.

Another important matter to this State which relates to increased prices is building costs. This matter is certainly close to my heart because of the need for new housing in my electorate. In June 1985 the Master Builders Association, an independent body, stated that the average per square metre cost of building a home in Perth is about \$225. Perth has the lowest building cost of all the capital cities of Australia; in fact, the cost is less than one-third of the building costs in Hobart, Adelaide, Sydney, Darwin and Melbourne.

That is indicative of how well our local economy is going as far as the building industry is concerned and the success we have had from the industrial relations point of view in the building industry in reducing wages and costs.

I now turn to growth rates in Australia showing real gross non-farm product. We saw in 1984-85 a five per cent real growth in gross non-farm product in Australia. That is the highest real growth rate since 1972-73, and it is expected to continue into this financial year. It is a very important part of what is happening in this economy and how well we are doing it.

I have some other small graphs that the Opposition members—especially some of the older members—will not be able to see which show the building permits and approvals in Western Australia and how dramatically they have increased over the last two or three years. External trade in Western Australia has grown in leaps and bounds from 1976-77. One of the key indicators is the housing industry where the lending of finance from building societies and savings banks has also increased dramatically.

Mr Trethowan: What is the interest rate?

Mr TAYLOR: Interest rates are fairly steady at the moment.

Mr Court: They are five per cent higher than they were last year.

Mr TAYLOR: One matter that I have no doubt will interest the member for Nedlands—who is a part-time politician and a part-time businessman—is the business profit share and the extent of profit that is going to business in Australia. Quite clearly, since both Labor Governments came into power in this State and nationally, the share of profits going to business has improved dramatically from

the level in March 1982 of 12.6 per cent to the level in March 1985 of 15.7 per cent, and they are continuing to improve on the latest budget figures.

Surveys of business opinions also show, with respect to trading conditions in Western Australia, that most business people believe that Western Australia is doing very well in this area.

Another matter that interests me is the Opposition's attitude to industrial relations. It is an attitude this is reflected by the attempts of the Leader of the Opposition and some of his cronies—in particular the shadow Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr Masters—to divide, conquer, and kick the working people of our community in making sure that employers can never discuss matters with workers and unions in a sensible and rational way.

An Opposition member: What about Borthwicks?

Mr TAYLOR: Who will stand up and say that is a good thing? I think the Premier of New South Wales, Neville Wran, was spot on in what he had to say. We will not see that happen in Western Australia. Industrial disputes, in terms of working days lost, have dropped dramatically in Australia since the Labor Government came to power. One only has to view the statistics to see that they have dropped by about a million man days lost in November 1981 to just over 100 000 towards the end of 1985.

Mr Hassell: Who prepared those for you?

Mr TAYLOR: I am quite capable of preparing figures myself. I am trying desperately to give the Opposition an economics lesson.

The fact is that industrial disputes in Western Australia have dropped dramatically since the Burke Government came to office, and no-one can dispute that fact. The reason for that is that the Government has been prepared to see that the employers, the unions, and the working people of this State sit down and talk together to try to resolve their problems. I have seen it happen time and again in my own electorate of Kalgoorlie where the goldmining industry is famous for the example it has set in industrial relations and how they are handled by people who have mutual respect for each other.

The Opposition set out to try to divide our community and to try wherever it might to create industrial sabotage and as much strife as possible in every dispute. No matter what the

dispute, the Opposition raises its ugly head by intervening and making life more difficult for those concerned and for its own base political advantage. It believes, quite wrongly, that the more industrial disputation it can create in this State the better. It hates to see the statistics which show the level of industrial disputation in this State and Australia going down day after day because it likes to see people at each others' throats. No better example of that exists than where the Opposition became involved at Borthwicks in Albany. This is a classic example of industrial sabotage. The Opposition, led by the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Minister for Industrial Relations, deliberately set out to try to sabotage Borthwicks. They deliberately conspired to make sure that as much trouble was created as possible. I feel sorry for people such as the member for Albany who are always genuine in these matters; but I have nothing but contempt for the role played by the Opposition in trying to buffer up industrial disputation at Borthwicks. The Government's intention was to try to bring the parties together to settle the issue between the union and Borthwicks. Time after time the Minister for Industrial Relations and other Ministers within the Government have tried to get the management and union to sit down and resolve that dispute, but to no particular end because it was not going to happen. I believe that Borthwicks had been conned into following the path set down by the Opposition, and I have proof that Borthwicks were so conned.

Mr Court: Give us the proof then.

Mr TAYLOR: I will give the member for Nedlands proof. Borthwicks were involved in a conspiracy with the Opposition—not at Borthwicks' bidding but at the Opposition's bidding—and I have here a telex which reveals a mistake made by the Leader of the Opposition's office that shows it in its true light. The telex is marked for the eyes of Brian Milton only. Milton is the senior manager at Borthwicks and it was sent to him on 22 May by the Minister for Industrial Relations, Peter Dowding. That telex reads—

The West Australian Government regrets the decision by your company to permanently close down its meatworks operations at Albany.

We understand the commercial reasons for the decision, noting your comments that industrial relations problems contributed to this decision, however we still believe there is an avenue for resolving the matter.

We earnestly ask you to reconsider the option of an independent mediator to seek to resolve differences as they arise between Borthwicks and union members to ensure the continuation of operation in Albany. . . .

That telex was sent to Brian Milton, and was for his eyes only. The only reason I read it out now, despite its being a confidential document, was that the Opposition already had a copy. It was sent by Borthwicks for the attention of Mr B. MacKinnon, who was then Acting Leader of the Opposition. The office of the Leader of the Opposition made the mistake of sending out copies of this telex and other associated matters to members in country areas. Somebody in that office was silly enough to think that because the member for South-East Province, Mr Mark Nevill, happened to live in Esperance, he was a Liberal Party member. As a result, he received a document from the office of the Leader of the Opposition. It had been stamped at Parliament House and contained a copy of the telex which had been addressed to Mr B. MacKinnon, Acting Leader of the Opposition. However, it had, in fact, been sent to Borthwicks for the attention of Brian Milton's eyes only. Thus information was being passed on a regular basis to the Opposition.

Mr Bryce: As a political stunt.

Mr TAYLOR: It was a political stunt on the part of the Opposition.

Mr Court: Attack Borthwicks a bit more; go on!

Mr TAYLOR: I am not attacking Borthwicks. I am attacking the way this Opposition has involved Borthwicks in its dirty dealing. It has actually set up Borthwicks by trying to involve it in the creation of an industrial dispute and then in the exacerbation of that industrial dispute for its own purposes. The fact that the Opposition conspired with Borthwicks to the extent that it had that telex sent to the then Acting Leader of the Opposition is indicative of the stance that this Opposition takes on industrial relations matters. The taking of such a stance for political advantage is detrimental to the people of this State. In this case, the Opposition is being shown up as trying to take advantage of the situation.

The Government is still trying to do its best to resolve the issue at Borthwicks. It is leaving no stone unturned in finding a buyer for Borthwicks. It is assisting Borthwicks in every reasonable commercial manner to resolve the situation. The Government at any time stands

ready to bring together the parties and to try to resolve these issues. It stands ready to help resolve the situation and to do whatever it can from a commercial point of view to help Borthwicks get on the track again. We are not prepared to stand back and see 400 people left out of work because Borthwicks made the mistake of taking the Opposition into its confidence.

This Opposition must learn that the people of this State have had enough of its way of thinking. They have had enough of its tactics. Come 1986, the people of this State will prove once again that they are awake up to the hardline attitudes of the Leader of the Opposition and his cronies. Those attitudes will not take this State into the 1990s.

**DR DADOUR** (Subiaco) [3.04 p.m.]: I first says a few words about tourism. Early this year I had six weeks holiday overseas. I visited a number of countries, including Singapore. The growth of the housing industry in Singapore is quite fantastic. I imagine that the amount of building going on in Singapore exceeds that going on in all of Australia at present.

I then went to England, Scotland, Belgium, Holland, West Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, France and Hong Kong. That trip totally reinforced my opinion that Australia is the greatest country in the world. I was so pleased and relieved to get back home. After 17 years of remaining in Australia I had forgotten how carefully one has to watch one's passport and valuables overseas. Keeping a constant eye on these things becomes quite a burden after a while. The poor old tourists are subjected to great pressures. So many people are trying to get the tourist dollar by fair means or foul—more commonly foul.

On a tour of the Continent we were taken to factories to see various items such as leather goods, perfume, glassware and the like being made. We were advised by the tour guide to buy from these outlets as they sold the genuine article at prices cheaper than elsewhere. To our horror we found that the prices at these outlets were 30 per cent higher than anywhere else. The tour guide got 10 per cent; the coach driver got 10 per cent; and the travel company got 10 per cent of the take. Everybody seemed to be on the make; everybody was on the take and everybody seemed to get a piece of the action. It does not end there. The tourist must also contend with thieves, spivs and the like. A



money belt is a must when anyone goes overseas, as the honourable member for Balcatta informed me before I went.

It was almost impossible on the Continent to exchange or use Australian dollars, travellers' cheques and money. Those on the tour who had only Australian currency had to borrow from the rest of us until we got back to the United Kingdom. Continental people just did not want anything to do with Australian currency.

In Hong Kong I had a haircut at the hotel salon. There were three different people involved—one to wash, one to cut and one to rewash my hair. Each one asked me two questions. There was no other conversation. The first question was, "Are you a tourist?" It was quite obvious that I was. The second question was, "Are you travelling with your wife?" I wonder what they were getting at. Is it any wonder that tourism is a dirty word and deserves the emblem of the Jolly Roger.

I purchased a video recorder in Hong Kong and when I got back to Australia I rang a very reputable firm in Perth to arrange for it to be fitted to the television. I was told that it was the wrong set and would not work. I was advised to flog it in the "Readers Mart". The person who advised me said that he knew of a person who would buy it and that I would not lose any money on the deal. Notwithstanding that advice, I rang another reputable firm which sent someone out. He installed the video recorder in 10 minutes. Thus even here people are on the make. There were thieves in the Sistine Chapel—the holiest of holy places for Catholics—in Westminster Abbey and in Notre Dame Cathedral. I feel sorry for tourists.

Australia is a wonderful country, the best in the world, but we, the legislators, are progressively ruining it. We are following the United Kingdom down the black hole. I refer first to the high level of unemployment in our young, prosperous, and rich country. It is easier to receive unemployment benefits than to find employment. Unemployment is especially soul-destroying for the young. Successive Governments have failed us in not coming to grips with the situation.

A second area of concern is big government. Much of the legislation we pass further erodes our freedom. Nikolai Lenin once said—

Liberty is precious—so precious it should be rationed.

We are certainly rationing it.

A third area of concern is industrial relations. We have permitted the unions to become too strong. The Government is often ineffectual. Some of the unions are arrogant, militant and unfair to the nth degree. I believe in unionism and unionists when they do the job of looking after employees. They do a wonderful job in that area, especially by being involved with workers' compensation or interceding when an employer has been unfair. However, they are going far beyond those functions. I blame neither the Government nor the Opposition; both sides are at fault. We are all responsible. Successive Governments have not come to grips with the union movement. We have taken the easy way out by doing sweetheart deals with the unions and by permitting sweetheart deals between unions and certain employers. Thus we procrastinate.

We have permitted the unions to become stronger than ever. We have laws for arbitration and conciliation and we now have consensus, which is working better. However, I must stress that with consensus, as with arbitration and conciliation, the final decisions must be made by the Government and the agreements must be obeyed by both sides. The unions must not be permitted to thumb their noses if the decision does not suit them. No matter which political party is in power the outcome is the same—the unions seem to win all the time.

Demarcation disputes are the most horrible things I have ever seen or wish to see. Why should the public be held to ransom by the unions over such matters? I propose that any strikes arising from demarcation disputes, as a result of which the public suffer, should be treated most severely with immediate deregistration of the union concerned. The only way out is to impose severe penalties.

At this point I must say that in Western Australia the difference between a Liberal or Labor Government is very subtle. For example, in the case of J. J. O'Connor the Labor Government did not proceed with charges against him because it feared industrial anarchy and for other reasons. If the Liberal Party had been in power it would have charged him but ensured that he was acquitted. The difference is subtle; on the one hand the Labor Party is open and on the other hand the Liberal Party is secretive. I definitely prefer the open method.

We are following events in the United Kingdom; we can see their mistakes but we do not take note and change course. We persist in

making the same mistakes and will follow them down the black hole. We seem to be hell-bent on destroying ourselves.

My last point, and I may be branded a socialist for this, refers to the quick rich. No-one can become a millionaire or become rich in a short time if he pays his taxes. We, the honest people, have to pay the taxes being avoided by such people. This has been allowed to continue and not enough is being done in this area.

The party system sometimes makes me shake with horror. Oliver Cromwell once said, "A few honest men are better than numbers." I think that saying is applicable no matter where one is.

I ask myself how this situation will be remedied; that is, the establishment of a Government which is actually in charge of government and where laws are made and must be abided by. It is obvious that penal clauses in arbitration cannot be directed against only one party; punitive measures must be applicable to both employee and employer. In my opinion the measures should be more severe on the employer who is in a position of trust and should know better how to behave. The employer takes the initiative in an enterprise and takes the risks of a venture, and as such he is entitled to greater remuneration than the employee who takes no risks. Taxation should be geared so that the employer receives more than the employee, otherwise no-one would be willing to take initiatives, production would fall, and unemployment would rise.

With regard to advances in technology, we must always use technology to the best advantage, but we must never let technology rule us.

The Opposition is adopting a policy of privatisation; that is, it proposes to sell or get rid of certain Government departments or instrumentalities. One department in particular has been earmarked by the Opposition—the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service. This is one of my pets that really tickles my fancy. I will give members some background of that department.

In 1971 when I first entered Parliament the Liberals had lost Government and Labor took office under a very good Premier, John Tonkin. The present Minister for the Arts, the member for Victoria Park, became the Minister for Health. When he went to the office of the Minister for Health he found a proposal on his desk which had been conveniently left by the previous Minister, Hon. Graham MacKinnon. The proposal was to create a Government hos-

pital laundry and linen service to be funded by loan funds from the large teaching hospitals and the Home of Peace over three years. The contribution was to be \$300 000 each a year and that amount was increased to \$400 000 a year later because loan funding was increased to local authorities and hospitals. Each contributor gave approximately \$1 million to establish this monster, as I call it. When the Liberal Party was in Opposition it decided to bitterly oppose the creation of this monster, which it did in this House. I remember one of the reasons I gave for my opposition was that it would create a monopoly and by strike action could bring the hospitals to a standstill. The Bill passed through this House by weight of numbers of the Government. It went to the other place where it was expected to be defeated because the Opposition had a majority there as it has always had. However, by wheeling and dealing on the part of the Leader of the Opposition in that place, Hon. Graham MacKinnon, the Bill was passed. It should be remembered that it was his brainchild.

As predicted, within a short time in 1976 a strike took place at the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service. I think it was caused by a demarcation dispute, which made it even worse. The strike was successful in bringing teaching and major hospitals to a standstill. That was repeated a few years later when another strike took place.

I raised the question of the Hospital Laundry and Linen service in the party room in 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983. It was unanimously agreed by those who were eligible to vote in the party room—members of the Cabinet do not vote on such matters in the party room and therefore it involved backbenchers—that we would get rid of the monster by either closing it down or selling it because of the strike actions which had brought hospital and emergency services to a standstill.

At that time I did some ferreting around and went to private laundries such as the Monash Laundry, the Home of the Good Shepherd and the Fremantle Steam Laundry Co Pty Ltd for information on prices. Those companies were quoting something like 48c to launder a dry kilo of washing and the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service was charging 83c to launder a dry kilo of washing, yet it was running at a loss of \$1 million a year. During the second strike linen to the value of \$1 million was lost because it became affected by mildew. It is rather difficult for me not to swear at this juncture because nothing was done.

We now find that the Opposition has declared its policy on this matter. What a pack of hypocrites! It is disgraceful for the Opposition to say that it will sell the service now. I fought this battle with successive Ministers of Health; Norm Baxter, Alan Ridge, and Ray Young, who all procrastinated and did nothing.

After nine years of doing nothing to this monster, it is astonishing that the Opposition should come forward with this policy to get rid of it. How can I have any respect for the present Leader of the Opposition and his policy makers? That is one of the reasons why it lost government.

I am certain the quotation by E. E. Cummings is apt—

A politician is an arse upon which everyone has sat except a man.

Those words are well-suited to the present Leader of the Opposition.

A further point of contention is this privatisation plan for certain Government departments. For years I have been proposing their rationalisation. Let us consider the State Engineering Works which we are told is up for sale. A great amount of duplication of facilities has occurred, and was probably encouraged, in the past.

The Royal Perth Hospital and other large hospitals carry out work which should be done by the State Engineering Works, work for which the SEW has the facilities and the know-how. One example is information on the tensile strength of splints and so on.

We should be rationalising all Government departments so that there is little or no duplication. Much money would be saved in this way. Once that is done, then we can look to see whether privatisation should occur. But we should not blithely privatise this, that, and the other, without first doing the homework and finding where the duplication is so that it may be got rid of as quickly and as neatly as possible.

However, I must say that the Hospital Laundry and Linen Service does not deserve to survive; it occupies a special place—it should become extinct.

**MR WATT (Albany)** [3.22 p.m.]: I welcome the opportunity of the Address-In-Reply debate to canvass some of the issues of concern in my electorate and in the State as a whole. In moving the motion for the adoption of the Address-In-Reply, the member for Bunbury commented in fairly glowing terms about the achievements

of the Government in the areas of decentralisation policies. Those advantages that he sees are distinctly lacking in Albany. Indeed, if he were to make his speech in Albany saying what he did on the opening day of Parliament I am sure he would not be regarded as being at all convincing.

When it was elected, this Government gave a commitment to a policy which it called "Bunbury 2000". That was said to be a commitment to decentralisation. I suppose so far as Bunbury is concerned that was completely true. By the Government's own admissions that policy was basically a collection of Liberal policies and initiatives parcelled together and labelled "Bunbury 2000" and called a Labor Party policy. It was supposed to be a panacea for regional development and decentralisation, but the Labor Party should have been prosecuted for deceptive packaging and false advertising. It made a commitment that this time it would be Bunbury, next time it would be somewhere else. Everybody knew that somewhere else was to be Albany. The ALP won the electors of the seat of Bunbury by its carrot-dangling policy, and now it has its sights on Albany.

The member for Rockingham can laugh, but that is a fact. It will be interesting to see what happens after the next election.

**Mr Barnett:** You should be grateful for what we are offering Albany.

**Mr WATT:** The member for Rockingham might be wise not to comment about things he does not understand, because if he could identify what is being offered to Albany, he would be better than most people.

**Mr Barnett:** Don't you want these benefits?

**Mr WATT:** Absolutely nothing has been done for Albany. In the time this Government has been in office, things have become progressively worse. Despite this, Albany demonstrates an amazing resilience to do reasonably well in times of adversity.

Recently, the Minister for Regional Development and the North West was in Albany to release the report of a study which was actually requested by the great southern regional advisory committee—a study which I supported. When the report was presented to the Minister, and he publicly accepted it at a local function, it became apparent that even that study was not able to identify and to recommend any major new course that should be taken for the development of Albany.

Essentially, what it said was that the industrial base needed to be broadened and it recommended a whole heap of things which essentially meant additional public servants. The lack of any real new direction shows that the task in Albany is not an easy one. In fact when the Minister was presenting that report he read a prepared speech and then put it in his pocket and said, "That is the end of the prepared speech. Now I want to tell you that Albany has many more knocks to come." What those knocks were to be he would not say.

It would appear that as time has passed one of those knocks might have been the fact that Hunts Foods Pty Ltd was to go into receiver-managership. It may be also that he was expecting Albany to lose its wool-handling industry because we were threatened with that at the time. Fortunately that threat was averted, and that is something for which Albany people are very grateful.

The Government has been trying to talk things up in Albany by committees, studies, and all sorts of things. While I would be happy if those investigations reveal a direction to be taken which has not previously been taken, so far it would appear that will not happen.

Earlier this year the Government had a number of four-colour brochures prepared and distributed, together with car stickers, which said absolutely nothing. Essentially, these called for further submissions for the Albany Tomorrow Study Group. This could well have been done through the local paper. I understand the method used resulted in 14 additional submissions, and I regard that result as not justified by the cost of printing those brochures, which was somewhere in the region of \$15 000, and works out at about 80c each. The brochure was printed locally. In response to a question to the Minister for Industrial Development I was told that they were printed by the *Albany Advertiser* after obtaining quotes from other companies. I am sure other local companies were not asked to quote because one of those companies, Albany Printers, told me it was not invited to quote, and it should have been the next logical company from which to obtain an estimate. I can assume only that the other quotes were obtained in Perth.

I am happy the brochures were printed in Albany, if they were to be printed at all, but I regard it as a waste of money. It is also a waste of money for the Government to have spent \$8 000 on television advertising of the opening of the new Bunbury railway station. That

should have been done through local newspapers if it was to be advertised in the Bunbury region.

I just question the percentage of all these things for Albany when we are being told how much the decentralisation policies of this Government are to benefit us. During this Government's time, we have seen the virtual demise of our tuna industry. A couple of years ago the tuna industry was thriving, with some 80 boats working the coastline in the Albany and Esperance areas; we are now down to something in the order of only half dozen. This situation came about mainly because of the imposition by the Federal Government of a quota system which provided individual transferable quotas to fishermen who had been engaged in the southern bluefin tuna fishery, but unfortunately as soon as that happened, a large majority of the local fishermen sold their quotas to fishing interests in the Eastern States. There was a lot of trading in quotas at that time, and it is to the Government's credit that it did make some money available to try to buy some of those quotas. Unfortunately—and I do not altogether blame the Minister for Fisheries for this because I know that decisions of this type cannot be made at the snap of one's fingers—the majority of the quotas had been sold.

Mr Evans: That is not so. More than half of those quotas are still in this State because the State Government came in with funds and bought them.

Mr WATT: I would challenge the Minister's statement. Even so, the point I wish to make is that even with the quotas being sold at a fairly considerable rate to the Eastern States, I asked the Minister at the time whether the Government would use some of the money that had been set aside to try to buy quotas in the Eastern States. The Minister replied that he was not prepared to do that, in the same way as he was not prepared to make available any of the funds that had been set aside for the purpose of subsidising the leasing of the quotas purchased by the Western Australian Government.

Mr Evans: You are incorrect.

Mr WATT: I asked whether funds would be made available from the amount set aside to assist local fishermen to lease from the State Government that quota which it had purchased, and the Minister told me that the Government was not prepared to do that. That is in the *Hansard* record and it can be easily established.

Mr Evans: Yes, but at the same time don't forget that the leasing figure is now far below what the market value would be.

Mr WATT: I do not wish to argue that matter now because I have not the time but the facts are there. I was asking that it be for the maximum period of only three to five years while the whole situation settled down so that we might have some opportunity of retaining not just the fishing industry but also the canning and processing industries, which is what I want to lead into now.

Casualties of the tuna industry have been the two processors which were operating in the region, West Ocean Canning and Hunts Foods Pty Ltd, both of which have been badly affected. The employees of Hunts Foods have been paid off and those who have been retained have been put on a casual basis. Fishermen have been affected because many had to sell up their boats and in some cases their homes and other assets in order to meet their debts.

As most members will be aware, Hunts Foods has gone into receiver-management and I am told that it has debts of some \$6 million. Unfortunately, it is difficult for any business which loses some 30 per cent of its cash flow in one hit to survive, and of course cash has been a very important part of the operations of Hunts Foods. Fishermen have always been paid in cash for their catches and in the past vegetable growers have been paid promptly as well. In addition many small businesses in the Albany region have unsecured debts, some in excess of \$10 000 and for those people this situation is a real tragedy. When they sought advice from the receiver-manager, they were told that all they could do was to try to write off the debts. That is not a very satisfactory solution.

Unemployment in the region is already high and business confidence is down. What has the Government done? It has done very little indeed. Over the past few years various Ministers have visited the town, but they have not done anything tangible to try to rectify the situation. As I said earlier, when the Minister visited Albany all he said to my constituents was, "You have worse knocks to come" and then he refused to give any details.

I am glad that the member for Kalgoorlie referred to the fact that Albany has seen a substantial economic decline as a result of the dispute at the Borthwick abattoir which saw the permanent closure of that concern. One can only wonder at the real reasons why the Government failed to take any interest or have

any involvement in the dispute when it became apparent that a solution would be difficult, if not impossible, to find.

Much has been said about that dispute that was exaggerated and ill-informed. I repeat that the member for Kalgoorlie was also somewhat ill-informed in view of his comments today. I have a good working relationship with the member for Kalgoorlie on the Public Accounts Committee and I regret that he did not come and talk to me about the matter of Thomas Borthwick and Sons. I could have presented him with documentary evidence indicating the facts in the matter, but for the sake of greater accuracy I intend to provide the House with a summary of what did occur.

For some time there has been a difficulty at the abattoir because the work force—members of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union—came under a Federal award, while every other abattoir in Western Australia came under the State award. Cost pressures within the industry became so acute that after a number of stoppages, Thomas Borthwick and Sons made application for the Albany works to be placed under the State award, and the matter was eventually heard before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The union argued that the commission should dismiss the application "in the public interest". In handing down its decision on 21 December 1983, the commission rejected the union's request that the company's application be dismissed, and ruled that the Albany works should remain under the jurisdiction of the Federal commission but under the terms of the State award.

The commission made the observation at the time that the State award had recently been the subject of a thorough review by Mr Commissioner Martin of the Western Australian Industrial Relations Commission and the Federal body accepted the fairness of the award in relation to meatworks operating in Western Australia. Given that independent view, that decision should have been satisfactory to the union.

The commission also made some interesting observations about the union and the company. Union leaders had consistently accused the company of being less than honest about its financial position and it was interesting to read the following comments of the commission—

The company, in a manner unique in our experience, exposed for detailed examination by the union and the Commission its books of accounts, its operating techniques, its costing procedures and its forecasting methods.

The commission went on to say that three witnesses were called: A senior partner in the firm of chartered accountants responsible to the lending consortium appointed to monitor the operations of the Borthwicks group; the managing director of the Australian division of Borthwicks; and, the manager of the Albany plant. They provided extensive oral and documentary evidence and were available for cross-examination by the union. Thus the union had every opportunity to find out exactly what was the company's economic position. The commission's report said that most of the evidence was unchallenged and the union had no understanding of basic commercial realities. The union assumed, for example, that the interest on borrowings directly concerned with the Albany operations need not have been met. The commission was satisfied that, taken as a self-contained business, the Albany works was not viable and was in fact in a loss position. That was in March 1983. The loss position was neither understood nor accepted by the union, then or in the recent industrial dispute.

In March this year, the union was still trying to revoke the Federal commission's decision of more than a year earlier and it had planned a one-day strike for 11 March as a protest to accompany an industrial hearing in Perth. The union had applied for an adjournment and when the adjournment was granted at the 11th hour, the Albany workers called off their strike. Because of the proposed strike, the company was not able to provide sheep for the next working day, and even though the workers turned up, they were not employed and not paid because there were no sheep for them to kill.

On 26 March 1985 Borthwicks' chief executive for Australia issued a letter to all its Albany workers explaining the difficulties in the industry, the particular problems at Albany, and plans to rationalise its operations to turn recent losses into profit. The proposal was to achieve higher productivity and lower costs and also contained an undertaking to spend \$2.4 million on upgrading the plant, provided the cost improvements were maintained. Essential to the improvement in efficiency was a control of the flow of product in the boning room.

The union objected to this, despite the fact that the company had lost more than \$4 million on its Albany operation since 1981. The dispute which followed got quite away from those issues and became a test of strength between the company and the union leadership. The company made its position clear—the plant had to return to a profitable basis. The union membership as a whole, being led by the nose by its boss, Mr Alex Payne, insisted that the company was only bluffing. He told them time and time again, "You stick with me fellows, because the company is only bluffing."

The situation worsened to the point where, at the company's request, the dispute was referred to the full bench of the arbitration commission on 23 April 1985. It was not a compulsory conference and was only able to make recommendations. The recommendations made were very interesting. I would like to read the first of those recommendations to the House. It said—

Further claims by the union (including the claims made on 15 January 1985) but excluding national wage adjustments are not to be pursued by industrial action or otherwise for the remainder of the 1984-85 season and may only be pursued by negotiation and/or arbitration during the 1985-86 season.

That says no strikes for the remainder of the 1984-85 season, which was virtually finished anyway, and no strikes during the 1985-86 season. That is exactly what the commission recommended, and a full bench of the commission at that.

The other three recommendations related to manning levels, speed through the boning room, and the fourth stated that any dispute which arose would be processed without any industrial action of any kind.

The main point was that the company agreed to accept all those recommendations. It conveyed its acceptance of those recommendations by letter to its workers on 24 April, together with a copy of the commission's recommendations. Nothing could be much clearer than that, but the union boss, Alex Payne, had an interesting part to play throughout all this. It was he who insisted that the company was bluffing, and told his members not to worry about a few weeks' pay, not to worry about their jobs, their mortgage pay-

ments, car payments, nor their wives and families, because the company was only bluffing about closing the plant.

This was the same union boss who told a company official at Borthwicks a couple of years ago, when a workers' committee was offering, to forgo wage increases in preference to lost jobs, that he did not care how many people lost their jobs so long as those who remained were paid at the highest possible rates. This was the same union boss who has been severely criticised by his own union for his handling of a matter in the industrial court and, having been shown to be incompetent in that situation, was embarrassed to the point where he vowed to see Borthwicks close down. This was the same union boss who, when it became apparent that Borthwicks could no longer carry the multi-million dollar losses caused in large measure by his union's antics, and the company had made it clear that it would permanently close, changed his tack completely and said the company had always intended closing the works at Albany, and had engineered the dispute to blame the union for its closure.

That is sheer vindictiveness, and it is a pathetic and puerile attitude from a man who calls himself a leader. The only style of leadership he knows is to con his membership into believing things which are just not true while he does very nicely with his own union office, car, and expense account. It is also worth remembering his role with the Western Australian Meat Commission. As a commissioner with a general responsibility for running the Robb Jetty abattoir, surely he has a conflict of interest. The Government commissioned the Treloar report on the future of Robb Jetty, and the report recommended that it should be closed. But the Government decided to spend \$3.5 million on expanding and upgrading the Robb Jetty works.

Mr Payne did have at least one person who was prepared to listen to him, and even worse, to believe him. Who was that? No less than the Premier. What part did he play in the dispute, members might ask? What attempts did he make to try to find a solution? It is true that the Premier was absent from Western Australia while much of the dispute was going on, but of course he would have been kept informed of the situation which was developing at Albany. For example, he was in London at the time when the company indicated its intention to close the works permanently. The Leader of the Opposition was also in London at that time,

and because he had visited the company and talked with the management, had visited the picket line and talked with the members both on the line and in my office, he had a first-hand appreciation of the issues involved. While in London he called on the chief general manager of the Borthwick group, together with the chief executive for Australia who happened to be in London at the time, to see whether there were any means of avoiding the permanent closure of the Albany works.

The Premier was in London at that time but made absolutely no effort to contact the Borthwicks manager. He may well argue that he had no time during his busy schedule for such a visit. But even a phone call could have been arranged without very much time being wasted. It was of course interesting to note that during the Premier's visit to London he did find time to attend a stamp auction.

More importantly, on the very day on which the Premier returned to Western Australia after his overseas trip he was interviewed about the Borthwick situation. He was reported in *The West Australian* of Monday, 27 May 1985 as having said—

The package of measures proposed by the Arbitration Commission had been rejected by the Company.

After initial objections it had been accepted by the workers.

I have already given the House the verbatim recommendation made by the arbitration commission, which shows that what the Premier said is quite wrong. The Premier went on to say—

But by then Borthwicks was insisting on an unequivocal commitment not to strike in any circumstances.

Worse than that, workers were being asked not to take any industrial action and to forfeit their right to be consulted on anything.

But the Company had always intended closing.

Nothing could have been further from the truth. In fact the matter was very succinctly summed up by the company executive referred to earlier, Mr Brian Milton, in a telex to *The West Australian* on 27 May 1985. He said—

If the Premier finds it necessary to stoop to such remarks immediately after a long flight from Europe, he must be very worried. He could be worried because the closure had clearly not been a pre-

meditated action by management, but the result of the prolonged strike and non co-operation of the AMIEU.

He went on to explain that because Borthwicks had \$2 million worth of product in its freezer, if it had been the company's intention to close down the works permanently, the first thing they would have done would be to remove the meat from their freezer.

The Borthwicks dispute has been going on for months and months. The Government knew full well what was happening, but did absolutely nothing about it. The union leadership let the members down badly. I think it is a disgrace that the Premier allows himself to make such blatantly untrue comments without checking their accuracy at all.

He made the same statements on his radio programme, the talk-back show with Bob Maumill, on the first Monday morning after he arrived home from his trip.

The whole thing was a farce. All the Minister for Industrial Relations could suggest as his contribution to it—and that after the company had announced its intention to permanently close, and not after the announcement had been made, but after the decision had been made—was for an independent mediator.

Mr Bryce: When was that?

Mr WATT: Two days before the decision was announced.

Mr Bryce: I am talking about the month of the year.

Mr WATT: I am not sure of the date—it was in May or something like that.

Mr Bryce: You owe the man an apology.

Mr WATT: I do not owe that man any apology. He owes the people of Albany an apology.

The closure of Borthwicks has had a profound effect on the rural sector of the Albany region. It is basic to the argument that if a competitor is removed from the marketplace, it will impose further difficulties on the rural sector.

Prices at auction are obviously going to be lower both for sheep and cattle when all factors are taken into consideration. For the benefit of the member for Stirling I make the point that Borthwicks made a commitment to handle cattle in 1983, although predominantly sheep were handled. It would be totally inconceivable to imagine the closure not having had some effect on the farming region of Albany, remembering that Albany relies very heavily on its farming region. So it can be seen that the

closure of Borthwicks has had, and will continue to have, a disastrous effect on the former employees, the farmers, the small business people and the economy generally of the region.

#### *Amendment to Motion*

This closure should never have happened, and the Government, through its failure to act, stands condemned. For the reasons I have outlined, I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

But regrets to inform Your Excellency that—

- (1) Through its failure to intervene in the industrial dispute at Thomas Borthwick and Sons abattoir which has resulted in its permanent closure, the Government has failed to support the people of the region by:

- (a) contributing to the direct loss of more than 350 jobs in the region;

- (b) contributing to an economic downturn in Albany and the region through a reduction of \$5 million per year into the local economy through lost wages;

- (c) adversely affecting the prices for sheep and cattle by the removal of a market competitor, causing additional hardship to an already troubled rural sector in the region;

- (d) the failure of the Minister for Industrial Relations to visit Albany or attempt to settle the dispute until after the company had made its decision to permanently close;

- (e) the failure of the Premier while he was in London, to attempt to make any contact with the executives of Thomas Borthwick and Sons;

- (f) continual misrepresentation by the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Relations of the recommendations made on 23rd April, 1985 by the full bench of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission; and



(g) continuing to support by investment of taxpayers' funds the Robb Jetty abattoir, and to direct business there, contrary to its own expert advice.

(2) The Government's handling of the Borthwick dispute is typical of its impotence in dealing with militant unionism and its failure to support the rights of ordinary workers.

**MR COURT (Nedlands) [3.53 p.m.]:** In seconding and supporting the amendment moved by the member for Albany I firstly congratulate the member on the clear and precise way he outlined the events leading up to the closure of the Thomas Borthwick and Sons' abattoir and the problems which have occurred in Albany as a result. We have just witnessed the member for Kalgoorlie give a remarkable performance in joining with the Premier, the Minister for Industrial Development and the Minister for Industrial Relations and going on with a little more of this business bashing. It seems that over the last few months members opposite have decided to bash Borthwicks about the head. This is particularly so of the Deputy Premier, who is determined to really kick this company and to say as the member for Kalgoorlie did, that it was involved in a conspiracy to close the abattoir. Only one conspiracy has been involved in this whole sad debacle and that is the conspiracy between Mr Payne of the AMIEU and the Government to have the abattoir closed.

Something really is amiss in our meat industry when we see this debacle involving Borthwicks being closely followed by the current debacle at Mudginberri, something we debated the other day. One gets the impression that in this country some people think we have the luxury of being able to control and monopolise the world market for meat and being able to sell our product whenever we please. That is not the case. It happens to be a very competitive international marketplace, so what has been occurring in this industry, what we have seen being done by the union and the Government, is very concerning. Members of the union and of the Government seem to have a smile on their faces, as though they have achieved something positive by driving Borthwicks out of business. In fact, what has happened is an absolute insult. We have seen three Government Ministers and now the member for Kalgoorlie bash Borthwicks over this whole operation.

As the member for Albany has just made very clear, what has happened in Albany is a very serious incident. Not only is the meat industry in this State being put into difficulty, but also we realise that what has happened is also occurring in other industries, which highlights the fact that this Government is prepared to sit back and allow a militant union leadership to succeed in destroying not only a particular business but also the jobs that went with it. This is happening too often. The problem at Borthwicks was given a lot of publicity, but many other businesses are being faced with the same sort of pressure and they too are not receiving the Government's support.

The fact that the Government sat back and allowed the Borthwicks dispute to get to the stage where the abattoir had to close is really nothing short of an act of political suicide by this Government. It should understand that over the years Albany's local industries have had to face severe problems. Albany had to face problems with the closure of the whaling industry and it is now facing problems with Hunts Foods Pty Ltd being in difficulties. As the member for Albany has just explained, these difficulties affect not only those people in the fishing industry, particularly those who fish for tuna, but also those involved in the pea growing industry and who have made some big personal commitments this year in spite of not being fully paid for their production for last year. All in all, things in Albany are not too good.

I thought that this Government, instead of being negative and sitting back and allowing the Borthwicks dispute to get out of hand, would have decided to take positive action to overcome the problem. Instead, it did the opposite.

We are forced to consider the role of our industrial relations system. The member for Kalgoorlie and other Government members go to great lengths to tell us what a great system of industrial relations we have in this country, this system of centralised arbitration they believe is so capable of handling these types of disputes.

What a lot of rubbish! Over a period of two to three months we have witnessed just how our industrial relations system has worked. The sad thing is that the parties that won out on this occasion in Albany were the militant union leader and his few militant supporters and a Government prepared to sit back and do nothing.

The majority of workers at Borthwicks would have willingly negotiated directly with their employer, and their employer wanted to negotiate with them. Members opposite do not seem to understand that when a business has suffered considerable losses for a few years, it faces a very difficult job to stay in business. Often a financial decision must be made: the firm has no choice but to close down.

Mr Bryce: Are you going to explain that Borthwicks has lost big money internationally?

Mr COURT: I am talking about Borthwicks' Albany abattoir, and now the Deputy Premier wants to kick Borthwicks a bit more. The company might be making a lot of money elsewhere. I hope it is. I would have liked to see it make a lot of money in Albany. The more profit it could have made in Albany the more jobs would be available for Albany people. But members opposite do not understand that type of thinking.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Burkett): Order! The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier will desist with their continual interjections and allow me and other members to hear the member for Nedlands.

Mr COURT: The majority of workers at Borthwicks would have liked to negotiate with their employer; but Mr Payne, from the AMIEU, did not like that; he did not want a voluntary work agreement negotiated by those two parties. Such militant union leaders seem to think that when the third party gets involved it will be a better arrangement—they can retain their power structure in the system.

Of course, we saw what happened in this case; it is a game of brinkmanship by the unions. The only problem was that the jobs of approximately 300 to 400 people were at stake. If the situation at Mudginberri of employees being able to have their agreements formalised under an award, had existed at Albany, Borthwicks would have still been in operation today.

In Western Australia in many areas we have moved to the corporate State attitude; the Government now seems to want to control and run abattoirs. The Government is certainly comfortable doing deals with the union concerned; so comfortable in fact that it is prepared to sit back and allow Albany to lose that major industry. The only person who really misses out in this whole scheme is the worker himself. He or she does not seem to fit into the Government's plans.

Mr Brian Burke: We have done our best to promote WA's economy.

Mr COURT: I am talking about Borthwicks in Albany. The Government has been very successful in destroying the company's operations there. The Government seems quite keen to defend its actions in Albany. The fact that the business has closed down and its employees are out of work does not seem to be of much consequence to the Premier, the Deputy Premier, or the member for Kalgoorlie.

Mr Taylor: That is nonsense.

Mr Brian Burke: Don't you agree that generally we have been supportive of business?

Mr COURT: No, I do not. I will outline what I think of the Government's progress in the last two years when I have the opportunity to speak to the motion. The Premier might want to divert the argument but he cannot divert attention from the fact that the Government has failed in Albany. The role played by the Minister for Industrial Relations in this matter was quite despicable because at the end of the day the Minister was prepared to support the militant union leader involved. He gave no assistance or hope to those workers in Albany who simply wanted to continue working. He was prepared, together with other members of his Government, to sit back. An amazing thing occurred afterwards; I cannot believe that the Premier, the Minister for Industrial Relations, and now the member for Kalgoorlie, want to kick the company involved.

Mr Taylor: I was just kicking you, not the company. I made that quite clear.

Mr COURT: No, the member for Kalgoorlie is kicking the company and the Deputy Premier and the Premier are only too prepared to continue kicking the company. Members of the Government, especially the Premier and the Deputy Premier have treated Borthwicks with contempt. I include the member for Kalgoorlie in this comment. They have also told untruths in this matter. When they realised they were on a loser they started twisting the story and for the member for Kalgoorlie to now come out with such absurd statements really is quite unbelievable.

Mr Taylor: Absolute truth.

Mr COURT: That is not right at all. For the member for Kalgoorlie to say that the company wanted to close the abattoir and had every intention of closing it is absurd. Of course, in the end the company had no choice but to close the

abattoir. However, that decision was the furthestmost thing from anyone's mind for the duration of the dispute. It was not a problem which arose during the two months prior to the abattoir's closure; the trouble had been brewing for some years. I believe the Opposition played a commendable role in trying to prevent the closure of this abattoir. This was not after the abattoir closed and we reached the stage of the Minister for Industrial Development trying to find a buyer for the abattoir. This was before it closed, and we, as a shadow Cabinet, were prepared to publicly come out with suggestions to try to help resolve this matter.

Mr Bryce: Sabotage; that is what it was.

Mr COURT: It was far from sabotage; it was the opposite. We were publicly prepared to spend time in Albany with the parties concerned. The Deputy Premier knows only too well the types of suggestions that we put forward. If Borthwicks were going to pull out, we were very keen for something to happen and for the operations to continue. If there was to be a change of ownership, we would like very much to have seen a local owner. It was not a matter of privatising the abattoir because it was already a private abattoir. We wanted to go a step further and localise the abattoir, giving the local people a chance to become involved. Of course, no-one could accept taking over the operations of that abattoir with militant union leaders such as Payne, with his track record, standing over his head. It would have been sheer lunacy for someone to take it over in that situation. That is why the Mudginberri dispute has become so significant in this case. If employees at Borthwicks were operating under the same award as applies at Mudginberri, the company's operation would be very successful.

The Opposition certainly did its bit to try to help things. The Opposition tried to keep its operation going. We wanted the company and the workers concerned to be able to negotiate directly so that they could reach some agreement, leaving aside the third parties involved, such as Mr Payne. If he had been taken out of the dispute an agreement would have been reached and the company's operations would have continued.

Mr Troy: What caused Borthwicks to close down previously? Come on; go through it carefully.

Mr COURT: The member for Mundaring now wants to join his colleagues in saying that Borthwicks had closed down previously; they have closed down now, and that is a good thing

as far as he and the Government are concerned. We are debating the point here that there were plenty of opportunities for Government members to make sure that that abattoir did not go out of business. The seriousness of the situation is highlighted by the fact that they remained silent and did nothing while all this was going on. If the Premier wanted to talk to the heads of the company, who, the Deputy Premier says were making millions of dollars around the world, he had plenty of opportunity to do so as he happened to be at their headquarters in London. He had every opportunity in the world to go right to the top and to try to negotiate a suitable agreement.

Mr Bryce: I said they were losing millions in many different parts of the world.

Mr COURT: The Deputy Premier seemed to imply that something could be done. Look at their operations elsewhere.

It was not good enough for the Premier, while all this was happening, to speak on shows such as the Bob Maumill radio show. In this case did he approach the heads of the company in London? It was to the credit of our leader that he took advantage of the situation of his being there and to negotiate and discuss this matter.

The Government should have a better understanding of just how serious matters are overall in the rural scene. I suggest to the Deputy Premier, while he continues with this episode of business bashing, that he read yesterday's *The Australian Financial Review* because it contains an excellent summary of some of the problems which are arising in the rural industries. It highlights some very serious problems, particularly in regard to commodity prices. I think the Deputy Premier would have to agree that some of the predictions about wheat prices this year are very worrying.

In all areas of rural production we must remain efficient and productive. Members opposite, the unions involved, and the employers themselves, will all have to accept some changes to make sure that they remain competitive. Here we have a case where these people have the opportunity to sell their products. We have the problem that one of our abattoirs closed down. Now we have the very serious problem at Mudginberri where we are losing contracts.

What happens when we cannot provide the products? The orders and contracts are immediately snapped up by other countries which have the capacity to fulfil them.

It was sad to read recently that we could not supply a certain wheat contract and it was immediately taken up by Argentina at a lower price than we could offer. There are plenty of countries which want to supply our products. Instead of members opposite being involved in what seems to me to be a conspiracy around Australia to bring the meat industry to its knees they should be taking positive action to ensure that we continue to become more competitive.

Several members interjected.

Mr COURT: If members opposite believe they have won by adopting this attitude in this situation I point out it is a silly attitude. If they believe they can indulge in the luxury of bashing Borthwicks publicly it is a sad situation. That company has had to close operations, and 350 people in the town are out of work. That town has plenty of other problems without this Government closing a meatworks down.

Members opposite talk about Australia having to export or perish. That is true; we must export more and we must become more competitive. But members opposite seem to be making sure that the rural industry in particular just cannot get on with the job it wants to do.

I want to conclude by urging the Government not to sit back and say, "Well, the abattoir has closed and the people are out of work." I should like the Government to keep negotiating to see whether an arrangement can be reached whereby the workers in Albany—not with that third party, Mr Payne, involved—are allowed to reach agreement with either the owners or new owners on terms and conditions under which this operation can become profitable again.

The Premier, the Deputy Premier, and the Minister for Industrial Relations all had an opportunity to keep this works going. Now we have the absurd situation where the Deputy Premier and his department firstly tried to sell the works locally and offered Government assistance to reopen the Albany works—they did that to keep Robb Jetty going—when a few months ago the abattoir was open and operating. Now they expect to put in taxpayers' funds to find a buyer to reopen it. They will have difficulty as long as they make sure that the new owners have to work under this industrial relations system. I support the amendment.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Premier) [4.13 p.m.]: The Government rejects the amendment. It is mischievous, ill-founded, ill-directed, and wrong. It is as simple as that.

Mr Bradshaw interjected.

Mr BRYCE: If the member wants to start the chain of interjections I will take great pleasure in demonstrating to him and his colleagues that they should be ashamed to support such a poorly thought-out and abysmally presented amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion. They will have egg all over their faces when we finish explaining exactly how far the Minister for Industrial Relations went in the course of his responsibilities to do everything humanly possible before the announcement was made to close the works.

Mr Court: All he did was go to Maylands.

Mr BRYCE: The difference in style is truly amazing! The member for Nedlands in particular, and his leader find it difficult to understand that because the Minister for Industrial Relations did not walk in like a bull into a china shop, as the member for Nedlands would do—God help us if he got within a bull's roar of the Industrial Relations portfolio—and did not publicly denigrate people or publicly bang heads together, at the same time he was working to find a solution to this problem; they jumped to the conclusion that the Minister was not doing anything. The naivety of members opposite is beyond definition.

Mr MacKinnon: He did not even go to Albany to talk to the people who were losing their jobs—people whose whole life was on the line.

Mr BRYCE: The tears of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are crocodile tears, just like those of the member for Albany who kicked his own constituency. Members opposite are helping to hold the town of Albany to political ransom because they want to have some fun. They are about to discover that they are right onto the back foot with the public of this State because this Government has the runs on the board. The level of industrial stoppages in this State is down dramatically; the Opposition is going nowhere, and it has nothing to condemn the Government for. So it has decided it will come into this place week after week during the Address-in-Reply debate, and it does not matter who is used—it is the people of Albany today, the people of an isolated community in the Northern Territory last week. They will be the people of some other defenceless com-

munity next week. They will all be the victims of the Opposition's desperation to find a political issue.

I encourage members opposite to thrash about and lash out in this way to suit themselves for as long as they like because the only place they are going is deeper and deeper into the political abyss. The tactics they are using were discredited about one-and-a-half decades ago. I suggest that by the end of this decade they will wake up and realise they cannot play around with people's livelihoods and seek to have a little political fun to suit themselves while other people pay the price.

Mr Blaikie: Why didn't you go to Albany? It has taken you five minutes to tell us a lot of other things. You are the Minister for bashing Borthwicks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! The member for Vasse will come to order.

Mr Blaikie interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the member for Vasse to come to order three times. I do not intend to stop the member from interjecting during this debate, but if he does so again in a disorderly manner I will warn him and I will have to take action after that. Members are well aware that I do not like disorderly interjections. I do not object in any way to interjections which add to the flavour of the debate, but I will not tolerate continual disorderly interjections.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Nedlands, the Leader of the Opposition, and his deputy spend a great deal of time in this place condemning the workers of Western Australia. They make the same irrational error of judgment as people who sit in judgment on marital disputes who would argue that it is always the husband who is at fault. Looking at the two fundamental sides of a relationship, whether a commercial relationship in this sense or a marital relationship in the sense of the analogy I have drawn, how utterly ridiculous it would be for anybody to sustain the view that it was always the husband or the wife who was responsible for a marital break-up. Day after day and week after week members opposite have been asserting that it is always the workers of Western Australia who are at fault.

Mr Bradshaw: Rubbish! It is the unions.

Mr BRYCE: Now they seek to distance themselves from criticism.

For the sake of the record, I would like to demonstrate the absurdity of this amendment. I repeat that it is ill-founded, ill-directed, mischievous, and wrong.

The first paragraph of the amendment states that the Government has failed to intervene in the industrial dispute. I ask members to take special notice of the use of the word "intervene". The conservatives who sit opposite relish the opportunity to intervene, bang heads, name names, get right into the middle of the industrial dispute and inflame it, and derive a great deal of satisfaction from doing so. They have been doing it for decades. That is reflected in the frame of mind of the person who drafted the amendment. It is alleged that the Minister for Industrial Relations did not do what was expected of him in the situation. Members opposite know that the company requested the meetings. It is a pity that the member for Nedlands is not here. Maybe some of his mates sitting opposite will tell him about this. The member has set himself about the task of defending the company. It was that company which requested that discussions between the Minister for Industrial Relations and it about this issue be conducted in Perth, not in Albany. Only the circus operators sitting opposite tripped over themselves to get to Albany to obtain Press coverage, and to stir and exacerbate the industrial dispute in Albany. They actually thought it would do them some good because they know that the electors in the electorate of Albany will vote out of office their elected representative.

To put the record straight for the sake of the parrots sitting opposite who used the argument—

Mr Bradshaw: You people are the parrots.

Mr BRYCE: I ask the member to examine the facts. He should examine how many times meetings were held between the Minister and senior officers of his department and the company and the union representatives who were involved in the dispute. Meetings were held for many months prior to and in the weeks leading up to the final decision by the company.

Mr Blaikie: How many times?

Mr BRYCE: The member can count them because I will give him the dates so that he does not maliciously misrepresent me.

Mr Blaikie: Also give me the number of times you went to Albany and the dates.

**Mr BRYCE:** The member for Vasse exasperates me and other members on this side of the Chamber from time to time. He does not grasp the reality of what would have happened if the Minister for Industrial Relations had gone to Albany to attend the discussions and the company's representatives were here in Perth. Discussions would have had to have been carried out by telephone which would have proved very expensive.

Again I make the point that the company requested the Minister, time after time, to hold the discussions in Perth. Let us consider the number of times they met. On Tuesday, 26 March, the Minister met with the company in his office. I am talking about March; the company made its announcement on 17 May. On Tuesday, 26 March, the Minister met with representatives of the company to discuss the problems being faced by the company, and the company advised the Minister that there was nothing that he could or should do and that the meeting was being held to keep the Minister attuned to what was going on. I will not name the company representatives who attended, but I have their names on file. Senior representatives of the company, Borthwicks, attended.

On Thursday, 4 April, the Minister again met with the company. On Monday, 15 April, the Minister met with the union representatives. On Monday, 22 April, the Minister again met with Borthwicks. On Wednesday, 8 May, the Minister met with representatives of the Western Australian Meat Commission in his office. On 9 May, representatives of the Minister's office again spoke with Borthwicks about certain facets of the dispute. On Tuesday, 14 May, representatives of Borthwicks' management and representatives of the union met with the Minister and his officers, again to investigate various possibilities for resolving the dispute.

**Mr Laurance:** Why did the Government not say the unions should abide by the rules?

**Mr BRYCE:** Look, Johnny-come-lately was not in the Chamber when the discussions began so he should not embarrass himself and his colleagues further by demonstrating his irrelevance to the argument. Members should understand that Opposition members have asserted, from the introduction of the amendment, that the Minister for Industrial Relations did not meet with the company and did not seek to intervene and play his role as Minister until after the company made public its announcement that it would close the abattoir. That announcement was made on 17 May. I have already given the Chamber a list of the

occasions on which the Minister, in his office, met with representatives of both sides of this dispute.

To take matters a little further, on 14 and 15 May, for almost two entire working days, meetings took place—how can members opposite present to this Chamber an amendment framed on such ignorance unless they are wilfully determined to gain some political mileage or just be malicious in terms of their presenting to the public their views that the Minister was not doing his job—

**Mr Laurance:** Why could he not achieve anything? It closed down.

**Mr BRYCE:** That is this Johnny-come-lately's problem. He was not sitting here and listening to the nonsense. If I were him I would leave my place in this Chamber and would not have the temerity to support the amendment. I would find it very embarrassing in his position. We all know he is perfectly capable of recognising the difference between truth and blatant lies and he does not use the truth very often.

This issue is, without doubt, one of the most serious that has confronted established and so-called traditional industries in this State.

I will not suggest that one party in this dispute is at fault or that another is at fault because I know that members sitting opposite suggest that for different reasons. We happen to be the Government of this State. We have done a very sound job in this field. The record speaks for itself. Members opposite feel a little uncomfortable in having to face the evidence as it is presented.

In relation to the vitally important question of the introduction of new technology into industry, it is inevitable that there will be anxiety for the people comprising management and the work force. The introduction of new technology into this plant and the failure of management and the work force to agree upon a plan for the introduction of that technology eventually led to the decision to close the abattoir.

Now is a perfectly appropriate time, I believe, to tell members about the Leader of the Opposition who acted out his little role and trotted off to the head office of Borthwicks in London. He and the Parliamentary Liberal Party have a cute relationship with the management of Borthwicks. They were leaking and supplying confidential telexes to one another and were passing information that was part of the process between the Government and the

company. The Leader of the Opposition pretended, the day before the decision, that he had a solution to the problem. Of course he did not. It was all a great hoax and it was cooked up in Western Australia long before the Leader of the Opposition left on his overseas trip.

The truth is that there are some fundamental weaknesses in this State in the traditions of management and the work force at play—some we have inherited from Britain. Some of the worst features of British management and work force organisation are plaguing this country at this very moment. I believe there are some people in the work force who are not acting rationally and who are not making decisions in the best interests of the work force. Some people in management are adopting nineteenth century British attitudes which are class-dominated and which prevent them from sitting around a table and doing the same as that which is being done by the Swedes, the Finns, and the Norwegians in order to resolve similar problems.

We have evidence of a first-class problem confronting Australian industry and it will not be solved or ameliorated in any way by the splay-footed politicians like the Leader of the Opposition who, because he is frustrated, is using and abusing the member for Albany and one of the true forms of employment to do it.

I no longer believe that the Leader of the Opposition makes any capital from these issues. He is so far down the gurgler in terms of credibility within the community that no-one believes him or takes any interest in him, particularly his own shadow Cabinet and colleagues. It does not do the Leader of the Opposition or his party any good to believe that they can drag themselves out of the political mire by grabbing one company after another and using it as a political football. I am astonished that a person like the member for Albany was sucked into this rescue operation by the Leader of the Opposition. I am also astonished that the member for Albany could stand in this Chamber and kick his constituency and be part of the conspiracy between the Leader of the Opposition and some of the principals in that company.

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [4.32 p.m.]: The Government is obviously very sensitive about its terrible failure in relation to Thomas Borthwick and Sons (A/asia) Ltd and it has good reason to be sensitive.

The Deputy Premier has just been on his feet ranting and raving and telling untruths and the Minister for Agriculture was trying to leap to his feet, but we cannot avoid the simplicity of the situation.

Several hundred people who used to have a job in Albany no longer have one and several hundred people in Albany no longer have a job at Borthwicks because the company is no longer operating. That is the starting point. The second point is that the families of the people employed at Borthwicks are no longer supported and they no longer have any security for their future in that town because there is nothing on the horizon to indicate where they are likely to find any future in Albany. In fact, what is happening is that the Government is moving from Borthwicks to Hunts Foods Pty Ltd which has secured debts of \$5 million and goodness knows the value of unsecured debts.

Let us run through the situation as it was and is in relation to Borthwicks at Albany. The Government should be very sensitive about it because it is one of its tremendous mistakes. It has allowed that industry to die and all the Government's ranting and raving cannot alter the fact that it not only allowed it to die, but also it was instrumental in having it fail.

Let me point out to the Deputy Premier and to the member for Kalgoorlie, because they have made wild accusations about the conspiracy between the Opposition and Borthwicks, that that company was prepared to talk to the Opposition about the issue only after it found that it could not get any help from the Government. The company discovered from talks with the Minister, Hon. Peter Dowding, that he was talking to militant unionists who were causing the problem and that he was not prepared to give any backing to the authority of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, or try to get anyone to see reason. Therefore, so much for the Government's conspiracy theory and for the truth in what the Deputy Premier and member for Kalgoorlie are saying in their despicable allegations that the company was conspiring with the Opposition.

The member for Kalgoorlie says that the company was conspiring with the Opposition. I ask him what we were conspiring to do and whether it was to bring the operations of Borthwicks to an end and to make sure the company lost its money. The allegations by the member for Kalgoorlie and the Deputy Premier beggar description.

Let us look at the simple facts. From the material on the public record there is absolutely no doubt that Borthwicks wanted to continue their operations and to succeed at Albany. Over a long period the company had attempted to get its operation into a profitable mode. The company was prepared to spend considerable funds in addition to what it had already spent in order to bring in new equipment that would make the operation profitable, if it was able to obtain the co-operation of its employees.

That is the first fact and I challenge the Government to say that Borthwicks did not want to continue their operations. Is the Deputy Premier saying that Borthwicks wanted to stop their business operation in Albany?

Mr Bryce: Borthwicks was prepared to shut it.

Mr HASSELL: I am asking the Deputy Premier to say whether he is alleging that Borthwicks did not want to continue their business operations in Albany.

Mr Bryce: You are really devastating.

Mr HASSELL: The Deputy Premier is not prepared to say that because the simple truth is that Borthwicks wanted to continue their operation, but obviously it had to be profitable, and not being the Western Australian Development Corporation, the MTT, or Exim, it had to have a profitable operation to survive. It did not have the opportunity to have its losses guaranteed endlessly by the taxpayers. Therefore, it was seeking to introduce changes and alterations to make it profitable and it was having difficulties in its work force because the employees were concerned about some aspects of the changes it was making.

I had discussions with representatives of Borthwicks in Albany and in London, and on both occasions I was very much aware of the possibility that perhaps certain things were being said on the public front which were not necessarily true. Therefore, I made it my business, when speaking to the management of Borthwicks in Albany and to their directors in London, to be blunt in asking the question whether they wanted to go on with the operations at Albany or whether they wanted to close the business. It is absolutely clear in my mind that there was no question of the company wanting to close its operations. It had spent money to upgrade its plant and it had a big investment in the business. The company had plans to spend money to buy more equipment and it had been negotiating to make

changes to its business practices, particularly in the boning room, in order to increase activity, to be profitable and to stay in business.

That is what business is about. It is about making a profit. If a business goes on losing, as this operation had obviously done, it will not survive. It wanted to become profitable and to find a way to do that.

There is no doubt in my mind that the men and women employed at Borthwicks in Albany wanted the company to survive, and they were prepared to settle the dispute, even though they had their differences and difficulties.

I did not have just a few minutes' talk with these people, I had extensive talks with them. I went down to the picket line on the waterfront at Albany and I discussed it with several men and women on that picket line, and spent some time doing it.

When I completed those discussions, realising that the conditions for a useful outcome from the discussions were somewhat inadequate when standing on a picket line in the open with a number of people milling around, arrangements were made through the member for Albany for the representatives of those working people to meet me for further discussions that night at the office of the member for Albany.

Those discussions took place, so no-one could suggest we did not have proper and serious discussions with those people. They were really asking for some help because they wanted to solve the problem. They wanted to overcome the difficulties so that they could keep their jobs and their industry in Albany going. It was very clear that what was desperately needed was for those people to be brought together with the management around an arbitration commission conference table with a commissioner who was genuinely committed to finding a solution; who was prepared to sit in Albany until a solution could be found.

It was also necessary to exclude from that conference the militant union leaders in the form of Mr Alex Payne particularly. He was hell-bent on making sure there was no solution. That was as clear as a bell. It did not matter to whom one talked or to whom one went in Albany, in Perth, in London, or anywhere else; the one person who under no circumstances wanted a solution was Mr Alex Payne, the secretary of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union.



Furthermore it was equally clear Mr Alex Payne was receiving the backing of Hon. Peter Dowding. The Minister, just as he did in Bunbury the other day, was working for the disruptive elements; he was not working for the good of the town or for the good of the industry. There is no doubt about that. The company gave up on Mr Dowding. He would not help it. The company gave up because it was receiving no assistance in terms of upholding the agreement and arrangements which had been reached in the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

This dispute at Borthwicks is a classic example of the way in which the arbitration system in this country is failing. Not only did the commissioner concerned absolutely fail to put in the time and effort that he should have at Albany; not only did he fail to make the orders necessary to get the people back to work; but also he denied the working men and woman at Albany the opportunity to have their say because he did not create the circumstances in which they could have a secret ballot.

When the Chamber of Commerce and the other people trying to have this dispute sorted out set out to have a secret ballot because they knew that the majority of working men and women would vote to go back to work, the whole system was so slow and complicated and so bogged down there was no possibility of achieving a secret ballot. In the absence of a secret ballot, those working men and women were stood over by Alex Payne and his cohorts so that finally the whole situation collapsed and the company closed down its operation.

The Government is now trying desperately to find a buyer; it is desperately trying to work away in the background to see whether something can be done to sort out the mess of its own creation.

Let there be no mistake about the simple facts in this case of Albany and Borthwicks: The company wanted to go on. It wanted to become profitable so that it could survive in Albany. The working men and women in Albany wanted a solution.

Does the Deputy Premier deny they wanted a solution? Does he say the working men and women did not want a solution? Is that what the Deputy Premier says?

Mr Bryce: Three hundred people were mesmerised by one terrible person!

Mr HASSELL: The men and women in Albany desperately wanted a solution because they knew that the future of their town, their

jobs and their families was at stake. It was the working men and women who should have been given a real chance in a secret ballot to determine their future. But the arbitration system and Alex Payne and his cohorts conspired to make sure that the rights of the working people were not protected.

There is a remarkable similarity between the disastrous policy of this Government and the arbitration system in relation to Borthwicks and the current dispute in relation to Mudginberri. The Mudginberri dispute is characterised by a similar set of circumstances. The people want to work; the people are prepared to carry out an agreement which they have entered into voluntarily. Those people want to get on with the job; they want to take the opportunities presented to them by the voluntary work contract to earn the extra money that they can at Mudginberri abattoir. The employer at Mudginberri wanted to give them the work and fulfil his export contracts.

Just as in the case of Borthwicks, what is stopping the work taking place is—

Mr Bryce: One man.

Mr HASSELL: It is the militant union leaders who are working against the interests of the working people. They are trying at all costs to uphold the situation in which they have power and privilege over the workers and in which they give no protection to the working people.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Let me remind the Leader of the Opposition that I have waited for some time because I wanted to see whether he intended to touch on Mudginberri in a peripheral way or to go on. Mudginberri has already been questioned in this House and it has been the subject of an amendment. I am going to allow him to continue, but it is to be for a very brief period, and then he must get back to the amendment.

Mr HASSELL: With respect, I would have thought that paragraph 2 of the amendment covers the situation. I am trying to show the similarity between the Borthwick dispute and another dispute. There are remarkable similarities. The direct relevance of that to Western Australia is that the very man we are talking about, Mr Alex Payne, who was instrumental in bringing about, with the support of this Government, the demise of Borthwicks and the end of the jobs down there, has been threatening Western Australian farmers, Western Australian meat producers and exporters

with direct industrial action if they are put in the position of doing anything but supporting the militant unions at Mudginberri.

There is a direct interrelationship between the dispute at Borthwicks in Albany and the dispute that is currently in play at Mudginberri. The State Government has refused to give its backing and support to the working men and women at Borthwicks, just as the Federal Government has refused to give its support to the working men and women at Mudginberri. Instead, the Federal Government has tried to conspire with the unions to have a final decision of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission overset in order to see whether the commission can be made to bring down a different decision at the end of the day, which would allow the militant unionists their victory.

This amendment is about the militants and the way in which they are running this country; it is about the failure of Government to stand up to the militants who are not prepared to support, and, in fact, are actively opposed to, the interests of the working men and women of this country. The militants are people whose interests have ceased to bear any kind of relationship to the interests of the people they claim to represent. What is happening in this kind of dispute—what has happened at Borthwicks and Mudginberri, and what is happening on the construction sites throughout this city—is what is happening at Bunbury and at Geraldton in relation to the tugboat owners in that town. In these disputes we are seeing a situation in which militant unionists are trying to dictate the terms of trade and are trying to dictate what people will do. That dictation has been extended not only to the bosses—whom the unionists hate and despise, and whose success they want to undermine—but also to the working men and women of this nation whose job opportunities they are denying and taking away. One can cite example after example.

It has come to the point where no longer are the Federal Government and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria prepared to put up with the Builders Labourers Federation—one of the most militant of the militant trade unions—and there are moves afoot to deregister it. However, in Western Australia the State Government is giving its backing to the BLF, carrying out arrangements with that union to try to keep it in business and looking respectable. That is simply in line with the activities of this Government at Mudginberri, in relation to John O'Connor, in relation to the

dispute at Bunbury, and in relation to one dispute after another, whenever one sees a conflict between the interests of people in this State and other interests.

**MR EVANS** (Warren—Minister for Agriculture) [4.53 p.m.]: The deceit and hypocrisy of this Opposition has never before been revealed so starkly as it has been in this amendment this afternoon. A breath of rationality and sanity was introduced by the Deputy Premier and I think it put paid to a great deal of the misinformation presented from the other side of this Chamber. I refrain from describing what was said as lies; there may be some grounds for its emergence—probably ignorance, which would be typical of this Opposition. There was nothing more calculated to undermine the prospects of Borthwicks reopening and the town of Albany being aided in the manner suggested by the member for Albany—that is, by receiving the assistance that the region so desperately needs in terms of jobs. Did not the Leader of the Opposition wax eloquent on what those jobs meant to the economy of the district and everything else? What a hollow sham!

I make the point that the 300 jobs dependent on the reopening of Borthwicks have just received a nasty jolt from the Opposition. Nobody seems to have made the point that Borthwicks is now advertising on a worldwide basis to determine whether its Albany works can be reopened. There has been at least one firm expression of interest and there are others too. A decision is expected within a couple of weeks in respect of this firm expression of interest. I understand that the companies concerned will tomorrow discuss aspects of work and industrial relations with the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union. Alex Payne—about whom we have heard some defamatory remarks from those opposite—appears to be the only person involved, along with Government officials, and he is being flown by the company to the Eastern States to conduct these discussions. To that end, he has a significant role in the overall negotiations and I hope that these negotiations are successful. The histrionics and the distortions of the Opposition this afternoon were some of the most despicable and cheap political moves seen in this House for a long time. Instead of support, the initiative of the Opposition is merely undermining—and it is doing it as hard as it can—those negotiations. The

people of Albany are the ones who will suffer and I hope that the member for that district feels proud of that fact.

The analogy of the Deputy Premier was correct. He made the point that no single partner in any dispute is blameless; it takes two to contribute to a dispute, as he very succinctly indicated. It is not my role to apportion blame in a dispute of this kind, but I would like to make the point that this is one occasion when Commissioner Coleman went and spoke to the parties for six hours and at the end of the day the company was prepared to accept his recommendations. On the basis of a letter from the company, the Commonwealth Employment Service considered that the situation was one of a lockout, and that is why it paid out social security benefits.

Let me come back also to the behaviour of the Opposition, expressed not only in terms of the subject of Borthwicks but also on Mudginberri. The Opposition is trying to say that it is concerned with the well-being of workers and the economy of this State. What rubbish! The Opposition is indulging in cheap political hypocrisy and I would recount one incident that sums this up. It is something that I have not made a point of broadcasting, but now I think it deserves to be shown the light of day. I remember very vividly some years ago while waiting in a corridor of this building, two conservative members—the Liberal Party was in Government at the time—appeared. They were engrossed in a conversation concerning an industrial dispute at Robb Jetty that was current at the time.

They were very concerned that the dispute should not end. They went on to say that some way had to be found of provoking it and of "stirring it up", to use their exact words. That was the interest of those conservative Ministers. So much for their interest in the farmers they supposedly represented; so much for their interest in the workers; so much for their interest in the State's economy. That is precisely what took place.

Those opposite feel very proud to be associated with people of that kind. This demonstrates very clearly their attitude, because their own political survival can be ensured only with the provocation of industrial disputation, with the creation of disharmony and abrasion between sections of the community, between country and city. That is the only chance they have, and they know it. They will stop at nothing to achieve their ends. The comparison of the policies and methodologies in the area of

industrial relations between the Government and members opposite has never been more clearly displayed.

The figures quoted by the member for Kalgoorlie revealed very clearly that the number of industrial disputes have been halved in recent years. On a national basis one has to go back to 1966-67 to find figures like them. This has not been a matter of accident but of good government. The record for Robb Jetty shows that industrial disputations have been halved over the last two years. That has been achieved by good government, by a sound and reasonable approach to industrial relations. This cannot be denied.

I will end by putting paid to the lie by the member for Albany.

Mr Laurance: That is unfair. Withdraw that.

Mr EVANS: I am happy to withdraw, but I make a correction to paragraph (1)(g) of the member's amendment and suggest to the member for Albany that he take the trouble to read the Treloar report before making further statements about it. The report is an excellent document which makes the point that while Treloar was deliberating on purely economic grounds, he did make the suggestion about the Robb Jetty abattoir that Governments must also have regard for other factors and considerations—economic and social—and the provision of a service works, and the number of farmers who insist not only through their organisations but also individually that a service works must be maintained in this State in the interests of the primary industries, in particular the cattle and sheep breeders of WA.

I wonder whether the Opposition is prepared to set out its view on a service works and indicate whether it is intending—if it ever gets the opportunity—to dispose of Robb Jetty. It had better come out and tell the farmers just how it feels about this and what its policies are in that regard.

I reiterate the point that the figures indicate a considerable reduction in disputation in the meat industry, something which has been a tremendous step forward for this State. I join with the Deputy Premier in condemning this amendment and urge members to throw it out.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [5.05 p.m.]: What a pitiful attempt we have just seen by the Minister for Agriculture to try to denounce our amendment. The Government must be in a very weak position indeed to put up this hapless Minister to defend its position. The Government is throwing him to the wolves. I

feel sorry for him. It is remarkable for the Government to be seen to hide behind this Minister when this industry is struggling from crisis to crisis under his administration.

When we ask ourselves who is the most powerful man in the agricultural portfolio today, we have to say that it is Alex Payne, not this Minister. Alex Payne pulls the strings and this man jumps. Is that not a sad situation for a Minister of the Crown?

We know the Government has said that he is expendable. It does not know whether he will survive the next election. He has been put on the chopping block to try to justify the Government's ineptitude in this matter because it knows he is expendable. I feel sorry for him, with his not being long for the Government benches. This has been one of his last acts before his political demise.

The Government has a terrible record when one realises that it is an elected Government which is unable to call the shots in an industry that is at the moment being run entirely by the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union. That is exactly what is happening. The Government is standing by. It is fiddling while Rome burns. If ever there was a situation when a solution should have been worked out, it was here with the Thomas Borthwick and Sons' abattoir.

Let us consider all the circumstances involved in the closure of Borthwicks. We had an umpire, the Industrial Relations Commission. The parties went there and the commission made a decision which the parties went along with. The company agreed. If members look at the transcript of the case they will see that the Industrial Relations Commission said that the company bent over backwards to help. It even provided documentary evidence of a confidential nature which the commission said was most surprising to have been made available. The commission said that it was unique in its experience for a company to be prepared to go so far as to discuss its own profitability in order to explain to the workers what a difficult situation it was in. The company put its cards on the table and should be congratulated for doing so.

The commission made its decision. The work force generally accepted it. The company agreed. The commission set the record straight and arrived at a solution which was agreed to by the work force. In those circumstances one would think that a solution could have been arrived at.

A solution could have been arrived at but for one thing: We did not have a fair Government. That was the only missing link. That is why this amendment is before us today. We are not attacking the people of Albany; we are supporting them. So here we have the elements that were required for a successful solution.

What got in the way? It was the AMIEU. The Government was limp-wristed and lily-livered. It laid down before the AMIEU. The meat industry union dictated to the workers in Albany and to this Government the terms and conditions it considered to be acceptable. Other terms and conditions were acceptable to the workers and the company. This is the record of industrial relations under this Government.

The Government crows about this record, but let us look behind the statistics. What we find is that this Government has no say at all in industrial matters. It is the second rung of government. The first rung of government in this State is the militant unionists; they are the ones who are leading the Government by the nose. If they decide that a decision reached by various parties is unacceptable, that decision will not work and will not be accepted.

What should the elected Government do in those circumstances? What it should do is to be fair and listen to both sides of the argument. It should adopt a rational and responsible position.

But can the workers of this State rely on this Government? No. Can the companies of this State rely on this Government? No. In every situation such as the one at Borthwicks, where the various parties agree, where the workers want to continue and to overcome the problems, where the parties have come to an agreement with the Industrial Relations Commission, where the workers want to retain their jobs, where they want the plant to be retained, but where the union leaders decide that the solution is not acceptable, the Government lies down and does nothing.

That is the industrial record of this Government, and trumpet as it might, there is no getting away from those facts. If there had been a dispute between the company and the work force that could not be overcome and could not be sorted out by the Industrial Relations Commission one could expect the plant to close. But the major parties, including the commission, reached a compromise; it was not acceptable to the unions so it was not acceptable to the Government.

Let us look at the Government's position. Apart from the Minister for Agriculture—who can be discounted as a non-event because every time he gets involved things get worse in the agricultural industry—let us consider the Minister for Industrial Relations. He goes from disaster to disaster—"Disaster Dowding". He made a hash of the Minerals and Energy portfolio and got shifted to Town Planning. He could not get his chopsticks in order and foundered on the Chinese restaurant affair. He had to be moved from that portfolio and has gone right down to the Industrial Relations portfolio. Now he is changing Houses in order to get away from the Legislative Council where he must be taking a battering. He is transferring his unpopularity from one House to another. We welcome him with open arms. As it will be after the election when he gets here he will not have a portfolio at all, but one is left to wonder which shadow portfolio he will have when he gets to this House.

Everything he has touched has turned rotten. Why can he not stand up to the unions and say, "We are going to accept a compromise situation"? The unions tell him every time what to do. He is a lackey of the militant unionists. Sure, he may have meetings in his office, but he is hiding behind his desk waiting for instructions from the unions. That is all one can say about the charade the Deputy Premier went on with when he spoke this afternoon. Why not go to the work force and say, "I am an elected member of the Government; I am here to see people get a fair go; we are behind the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and if you reach a decision it can be carried through"? That does not happen at all. The Minister for Industrial Relations ran away and hid in his office. He said, "I can do only what the unions tell me to do."

That is the disgraceful record of the Government in relation to Borthwicks and Albany. The same thing will happen anywhere else a dispute arises if the unions say so.

Let us look now at the second part of our amendment which states that the Government's handling of the Borthwicks dispute is typical of its impotence in dealing with militant unionism. We have example after example of the Government running scared from militant unionists in this State. The dispute at Borthwicks fits the pattern, and it has been amply demonstrated at Mudginberri. That is another example of the workers wanting to work, the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission arriving at a decision to suit all parties,

and the union going out and picketing the works. That had to stop. The Government could not permit a situation in which people who want to work are allowed to work. The Government cannot have that! Not a dictatorial, socialist, totalitarian Government such as we have here. It cannot allow workers to work when they want to on terms which they have decided. The workers might have some say!

This is a socialist Government. Nothing is too good for the representatives of the workers. They are allowed to dictate terms to the workers who are not allowed to reach a compromise with the company and the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in relation to their own work. Not this socialist Government; it has to bow to the wishes of one or two people who say, "We will picket you if you decide to work. You have to stop work. You may be able to lower the cost of production and earn a wage you want, but that will never do." That would show other abattoirs are running inefficiently. The unions could not have that; it would not protect their position. Who are the people the Government is protecting?

Leave granted to continue speech at a later stage of the sitting.

Debate thus adjourned.

## TRANSPORT: PRIVATISATION

### *Personal Explanation*

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Leader of the Opposition) [5.15 p.m.]—by leave: In his answer to question 66 on notice today the Minister for Transport said this—

I am sure the community, as I do, see the MTT as a worthwhile contributor to the well-being of the people of Perth and are amazed at the latest reported announcement of the Opposition party's leader that he intends to sell the city's public transport system. I do not think the public will want to turn back the clock of progress 28 years to the previous decrepit system.

I am a very strong supporter of the policies we are putting forward for privatisation in a number of areas, but I am simply amazed that since I carefully explained some policy options—

### *Point of Order*

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: Far from making a personal explanation the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to debate a matter which is not rightly before the Chair. I would be the last to

try to inhibit the Leader of the Opposition; that is not generally in the interests of the Government. But I do think that if personal explanations are to be treated in this fashion we will have a string of them which will confiscate question time from the Opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the Premier has a point. However, it is not for me to preclude anybody from making a personal explanation, and the House has given the Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to make such an explanation. However, I would not like to see personal explanations utilised for debating particular questions when other opportunities are available to members. In those circumstances I think the Leader of the Opposition should very quickly draw his remarks to a conclusion. Members in future should consider very carefully when they ask for the opportunity to use the time of the House for personal explanations that they do so for that purpose only.

Mr HASSELL: I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for the opportunity to complete what I set out to say. It is a personal explanation. The written answer given to the question is quite wrong in its statement of what I said. I wish to correct that and put on record that not only has the Minister for Transport given a completely wrong statement in an answer to a written question as to something I said, but also the Premier did the same in a radio programme on Monday. They are both wrong, it should be recorded.

[Questions taken.]

*Sitting suspended from 6.03 to 7.15 p.m.*

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FIFTH DAY

##### *Amendment to Motion*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

MR LAURANCE (Gascoyne) [7.16 p.m.]: Prior to the dinner suspension I indicated that the whole Borthwick's dispute is typical of the industrial relations record of this Government. When one sees the capitulation of the Government on that occasion, when one looks at some of the other unsavoury characters who have been supported and assisted by this Government—like Mr Fagan, Mr Binstead, Mr J. J. O'Connor and others of that ilk—then I think it is fair to say it is quite obvious that the path we are treading with this Government is very similar to that being followed in Sydney. It was only yesterday that shootings took place in Sydney between rival gangs of union thugs, and I predict that exactly that situation will apply

here in Western Australia soon. These people are above the law; even when the law convicts them they are let off by this Government. We know that certain people who have been assisted by this Government are industrial thugs. They are people capable of such violence as occurred in Sydney yesterday, and it will not be very long, if this Government has its way, before there will be violence of that nature in our State.

Mr Taylor: You would love that.

Mr LAURANCE: Not at all. These are the people the member supports, I have raised this matter here in the Parliament before. Let us take the situation of Mr Fagan, a person who had a bad back, and who was convicted of assault.

Mr Terry Burke: What about the amendment?

Mr LAURANCE: I am talking to the second part of the amendment—militant unionism and the Government's impotence in dealing with it. The Government is not only being impotent in dealing with these militants, but it is actually supporting them. When it comes to a dispute, the ordinary, decent working people of this State are not supported by this Government at all. But the thugs are, and even if they are convicted by a court, they are let off by "Nolle" Berinson! I predict that even if an industrial murder were committed in this State, the perpetrator of that crime would be let off by this Government. That is how bad this Government is. That is what will happen—shots will be fired in the night. We have seen such occurrences in Sydney between the BWIU and the BLF, and we have seen the first signs of it here. One has only to look at the "Free Norm" banners hanging on every building site in Perth; one has only to see the Eureka Stockade flag flying proudly from every building site. I believe it is treasonable to fly that flag. Government members should demand that it be taken down. I will tell members of an occasion on which I saw that flag flying once before.

I saw that flag flying outside the US Navy base at Exmouth 10 years ago at the end of a long march. Demonstrators tore down a makeshift flagpole with the Stars and Stripes flying from it; they threw the Stars and Stripes flag on the ground and spat on it, defiled it, and set fire to it. They put a Eureka Stockade flag in its place.

##### *Point of Order*

Mr TAYLOR: What the member is saying has no relevance to the amendment before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: On amendments like this I am prepared to let members roam around to cover points made by interjection. On this occasion an interjection caused the member to respond by way of the remarks he is making now.

*Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr LAURANCE: I am speaking directly to paragraph two of the amendment which deals with the Government's capitulation to union militants in this State. I repeat my point about flying that flag on building sites being a treasonable act.

It is interesting that while those demonstrators years ago went to Exmouth to protest against the US involvement there no violence occurred until the Eureka Stockade flag was flown and they defiled the United States flag. Australian ex-servicemen, particularly those who had served alongside US servicemen in Vietnam, reacted violently against the demonstrators because they defiled that country's flag. It is defiling our country's flag to fly the Eureka Stockade flag from our building sites with "Free Norm" banners alongside it.

That is the sort of action this Government condones. The amendment is logical and starts by saying that when workers and management go to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and make an agreement satisfactory to all parties this Government frustrates it because it toadies to union thugs. They are people who are capable of carrying out the same sort of militant, violent action we saw in Sydney yesterday. Shots will be ringing around this city before long if the Government does not take a stand. This Government is elected to represent the people, not the Fagans of this world. That man Sean Fagan walked across a building site and disrupted a concrete pour, costing thousands of dollars. He then found he had a bad back and went off on workers' compensation. When he wanted to work for the Government the then Public Works Department refused to have anything to do with him. He is a malingeringer, a trouble-maker and an industrial thug.

Then the Premier told the department to employ him. I raised the matter two years ago. The Government said, "No, we did not say he had to be employed. The Premier did not say that." The very next day a piece of paper arrived at my office in Parliament House with a copy of a letter sent to departmental heads from the under Secretary for Works saying the Premier had instructed that Mr Fagan must be employed. He was employed for two days, this

industrial thug, and then went off for a year on workers' compensation even though the Public Works Department knew he had a record of back trouble and had assaulted another unionist while on compensation for that trouble.

That is the sort of person the Government protects, not the ordinary working man. It protects industrial thugs. Binstead is exactly the same sort of person. This Government has intervened to assist him in his work. It assists those people if they attempt to take violent action. That is exactly what will happen under this Government. When violent action occurs, as it must, it will be a natural consequence of the course this Government is pursuing. It will let the perpetrator off. That is what the Attorney General will do; that is his record. A person charged with an industrial crime in the criminal court goes before the court and is convicted—

Mr Bertram: Who was convicted?

Mr LAURANCE: O'Connor was convicted and he was let off.

Mr Bryce: He was not convicted.

Mr LAURANCE: He was charged. He was sent for trial and the Government let him off. The Government would not let the process of justice take its course. That is the truth.

Mr Bryce: Run as hard as you like; you are going nowhere.

Mr LAURANCE: The Deputy Premier is going somewhere; the skids are firmly under him. Despite his protestations and those of the member behind him, the skids are under the Government. Members opposite have only to read the polls to know that they are history. One of the reasons is that although members opposite are elected as the Government of the people, for the people, they stand for the Fagans and Binsteds of this world. They are the people who give the Government its instructions. If the Government is told to give them a job it does so. If people like them commit murder the Government would let them off.

The people of Western Australia need to understand that that is the Government's record in industrial relations. That is what will occur because everyone will realise that the Government is not prepared to stand up for the ordinary working man in this State. The Minister's record is pathetic in half a dozen different portfolios. The Government keeps shifting him around, but no matter how often he is shifted the Government will not get a credible record on industrial relations.

**MR D. L. SMITH (Mitchell)** [7.27 p.m.]: Some rain must be falling in the Carnarvon area because the mud in the Gascoyne has been brought down here. It is typical of what we have come to expect from the Opposition. Members opposite have slung insults and tried to heap mud on the Government to build their mud castles, hoping somehow or other it will look impressive. But at no stage during the whole of this debate have they suggested how they would have handled the Borthwicks matter in a different way.

Rather than take their approach I want to look at the substance of the amendment. I have quite a degree of sympathy for the mover of the amendment, the member for Albany. In my view he is a decent, well-motivated fellow—

**Mr Laurance:** Don't be so patronising.

**MR D. L. SMITH:** Unfortunately his position in the Opposition seems to be lowly regarded, as do his arguments. When one looks at the member for Albany and compares him with some members who occupy the front benches on the other side one is left wondering why he has been passed over and is not sitting on the front bench. He was the only nomination for preselection for his seat, yet the Opposition—

#### *Point of Order*

**MR LAURANCE:** A point of order was raised a few minutes ago that the subject matter was not relevant to the debate. The Speaker ruled that it was. My point of order is that the preselection procedures for the seat of Albany have precious little to do with the amendment before the House.

The **ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Burkett):** Enough tolerance has been shown to both sides in the debate that has taken place on this issue this afternoon and this evening and I am prepared to allow the member for Mitchell to continue on the line he is presently taking.

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

**MR D. L. SMITH:** Members on this side of the House are left wondering why, as the only candidate his re-indorsement was not approved and nominations were recalled in the hope that the Liberal Party could attract another candidate. It was only when no other candidate came forward that the Liberal Party endorsed his nomination. The relevance of that is the Liberal Party's treatment of the member for Albany parallels its treatment of Albany. I regard Albany as being one of the most attractive and most likely to be developed areas of West-

ern Australia, yet every time I have been to Albany, except over the last 12 months, I have been confronted by a total loss of morale in the local business community.

**Mr Watt:** Haven't you been there in the last 12 months?

**MR D. L. SMITH:** I have been and I will tell the House about my findings in due course.

The lack of morale in Albany has resulted from the treatment of Albany by successive conservative Governments during the nine years prior to the Burke Government coming into office. The Opposition's appreciation of Albany, its problems and its people seem to parallel its treatment of the member for Albany.

With regard to paragraph 2 of the amendment with which the member for Gascoyne dealt for some time, I do not wish to say more than this: The history of both the Federal and State Labor Governments' performance shows that the number of strikes and the loss of time incurred through strikes is the lowest for a number of years. It is almost half that which prevailed under the preceding Liberal Government.

Several members interjected.

**MR D. L. SMITH:** The cry goes up from the other side that the Government is giving in to unions. If this Government had given in to unions one would expect the growth in real wages in this State and nationally over the last two years to be quite out of proportion to that which preceded it. In fact, the growth in wages under Labor Governments has slowed right down as part of the national accord and this has seen the economy of this nation and this State improve dramatically. The State and Federal Governments have directed the economy on a path which has resulted in international economists saying that the Australian economy is the one most likely to grow this year, even though we have had record growth over the last two years.

**Mr Blaikie:** That is why farmers are going broke.

**MR D. L. SMITH:** I am pleased that the member for Vasse raises the matter of the state of the agricultural economy because it has a great deal to do with the position of Borthwicks. The problems that confronted Borthwicks have a great deal to do with those problems facing the abattoir industry in Western Australia. The main problem has been the fall in numbers of cattle, sheep, and pigs being



processed through the abattoirs. As a result of this lack of throughput none of the abattoirs can work efficiently or operate profitably.

Let us refer to the statistics to ascertain when the fall-off in numbers of cattle, sheep, and pigs being processed through abattoirs occurred. I intend to ask for the incorporation in *Hansard* of the cattle figures shown in a graph prepared by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The graph shows the meat and milk cattle numbers in Western Australia for the period 1965 to 1984. It can be seen from the graph that the cattle numbers peaked in 1976 which was about two years after the previous Liberal Government came into office in this State. After 1976 there was a dramatic downturn in numbers which continued unabated until 1983-84 when the rate of increase started to fall off. Most members in this House will know that the 1984-85 figures will show an increase in cattle numbers.

The reason the fall-off occurred in 1976 was that there was no profit for farmers in beef production. Beef prices were at their lowest for a number of years in 1976 and that caused a massive turn-off of cattle from farms which resulted in profits for the abattoirs, but none for beef farmers. This situation continued unabated until this Labor Government came into office. However, a number of abattoirs and farmers were facing insolvency when the Burke Government took office.

In the same document as the statistics to which I have referred is shown a similar situation with regard to sheep and pig numbers. The reason for the rapid fall-off in sheep numbers is that no-one could make money out of sheep and wool under the previous Liberal Government and farmers had to resort to cropping programmes, which led to the downfall of farmers in the wheatbelt. Farmers had to crop more of their properties and reduce the number of sheep they ran.

Mr Bradshaw: Are you saying that the previous Liberal Government caused the downturn?

Mr D. L. SMITH: I am saying that they are the things which happened while the previous Liberal Government was in office. The problem began in 1976 and from then until 1983 no action was taken by the Liberal Government to try to save this industry. The reason for this was that the previous Government believed it should not intervene in any industry including the rural industry but it should sit back and let free enterprise take care of itself. They watched

the industry slip into bankruptcy and this has resulted in the closure of many abattoirs. The previous Government sat back and listened to its city-based advisers saying that everything was all right in the Terrace and that it should not worry about the bush.

Let us refer to what this Government has done in country areas. In Bunbury it has established the South West Development Authority, and has given it financial muscle and manpower to enable it to do the job it is doing. The Government has set about producing for Albany the same sort of policy documents that gave us "Bunbury 2000" and this will set Albany afire with development. If a Labor candidate is elected to represent Albany at the next election this Government can set about doing in Albany what it has done in Bunbury.

If one looks at the country areas of Western Australia one can ask: What is different about Esperance? It has Labor representation. What is different about Geraldton? It has Labor representation. What is different about Port Hedland, Karratha and Kalgoorlie? All the prosperous areas in rural Western Australia have Labor representatives and they are all working hard for their electorates. I certainly will not forget about Mandurah, because it is the fastest growing centre in Western Australia.

I refer to another interesting quote from the Australian Bureau of Statistics for 1983-84. It shows that the number of producers in the agricultural industry rose by two per cent; that is, from 16 918 at 31 March 1983 to 17 200 at 31 March 1984, thus reversing the steady decline which had occurred since 31 March 1980.

So in 1984, the first year of Labor Government, the number of farmers working the land increased by two per cent, the first increase after a steady decline over the preceding three years. One might wonder why, with the cries coming from the rural sector, people are being attracted back into farming. It is because over the last two years, beef prices have been as high as they have been for over the last 10 years and beef farmers are making a profit at long last. The returns for Western Australian dairy farmers in 1983-84 were as high as for any dairy farmers in Australia.

This Government, as a result of the inquiry into the Lamb Marketing Board and the meat industry generally, has been taking positive steps to advance the interests of the beef industry. It has established the herd improvement service at Bunbury, something which was not done by the previous Government. Under the

previous Government there was an organisation called the Artificial Breeding Board. That had to be abandoned in place of the Herd Improvement Service.

There has been the effective depreciation of the Australian dollar, which has produced higher returns for all farmers involved in the export area. The reason for the depreciation of the Australian dollar was the terrible economic policies of the previous Liberal Government in Canberra.

Let us look at the Budget which has just been announced. After years of representations to previous conservative Governments, the Federal Government has abandoned the dual inspection system for export abattoirs, thus producing savings and economies for the export abattoir industry—the industry in which Borthwicks were involved. If there had been those sorts of improvement, that sort of attention to the economy of the industry, Borthwicks would have been saved; Borthwicks would still be operating. The present position is the result of years of neglect and lack of action and interest by a city-based party, the Liberal Party.

The other aspect of the Federal Budget has been the reduction in the cost of diesel fuel which farmers use. There has been a reduction in the cost of imported headers, changing them from a tariff item to a subsidy item.

Mr MacKinnon: What about the fact that petrol has gone up 10c per litre, and it is still going up?

Mr D. L. SMITH: Petrol has gone up due to an import parity system devised by the previous Federal Liberal Government.

In the bush over the last 12 months there has been a sudden realisation on the part of the rural community that the Liberal Party has let it down, that the Country Party has let it down, and the people involved are having to go out and provide their own fighting fund because they believe they cannot get service from the Liberal and Country Parties whom they traditionally regarded as their allies.

Look at the relationship between Ian Sinclair and Ian McLachlan. Why is it farmers have to raise \$2 million to do their own fighting? Why is it they are talking about forming their own political parties? It is because they have come to an appreciation they have had no service from the Liberal and Country Parties, and they are still a little afraid of the Labor Party because of the traditional hatreds members opposite have tried to inculcate over a number of

years. Farmers are gradually coming to a realisation that this Government is doing all right.

Let us look at irrigation changes in my own electorate. These are an essential component of beef and milk production. Under the previous Liberal Government those charges escalated by about 100 per cent in the space of four years. In the three years of this Labor Government, in the first year the increase was 16 per cent, in the second year nothing, and this year it was a three per cent increase. Farmers know they are getting good representation and they know they are getting good government.

Profitability is returning to the farming industry with the result that farmers are now increasing their stock numbers, and with the increased numbers there will be a return to profitability for those who are left in the abattoir industry. This support for the rural community has not just been in the Bunbury area but also in the wheatbelt areas with the deregulation of transport for wool and part deregulation for fuel. These are all things where those in the country with open minds know we have done these things which are of benefit to them. Farmers are starting to return to farming, as is evidenced by the statistics I read out in relation to the number of farmers in 1983-84.

Inside the next three years, after we are returned and farmers have forgotten about the malice, the dissension, and the ructions from members on the other side of the House—their only policy is trying to introduce conflict. Whether it is between black and white or between red and blue, that is the standard mode of operation for the Opposition: To sow dissension so that no-one will realise it has no policies. When an appreciation of that fact occurs there will be an even larger number of country people represented by good Labor members.

I oppose the amendment. I ask leave to lay the graphs to which I have referred on the Table for the attention of members.

*The paper was tabled for the information of members.*

**MR BRADSHAW** (Murray-Wellington) [7.46 p.m.]: I support the amendment. It is an amendment which certainly has some substance and some of the points brought out are quite relevant to the Town of Albany in particular.

The member for Mitchell has just carried on about how great the Labor Party has been to the rural people of Western Australia. It is of

interest that a couple of months ago the Minister for Agriculture was down in Dardanup. The farmers there said they had never been worse off than they are under a Labor Government. The member for Mitchell represents a farming area, but he has the deceit to come here and say that the people in the country areas—

Mr Pearce: You should talk about deceit. You have been dishonestly making statements about the schools which are likely to be built in your area.

Mr BRADSHAW: I have not. I have only put out Press releases on evidence I have had or on letters I have received.

Mr Pearce: You were given a statement by my director of planning to say a school was being considered at Clifton Park and you put out a statement to say one would be built.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRADSHAW: I am not talking about schools in my electorate at this moment.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The member for Murray-Wellington has the call; no-one else.

Mr BRADSHAW: Perhaps we can return to the subject in hand. The Deputy Premier earlier this afternoon carried on in his usual waffling way to try to distract members from the real issue coming up with no substance in his talk on this amendment. He is trying in his usual fashion to denigrate and put down the Opposition. There is no substance whatsoever to back up his statements.

It is quite interesting that the member for Mitchell mentioned abattoirs and the fact that cattle numbers have gone down. I agree with him that cattle numbers are down, and it is largely because militant members of the AMIEU are not prepared to come up with a compromise or a reasonable solution so that the people in Albany can return to work. It makes one wonder at the mentality of some of these people.

The Government has no real worry or concern for the people of Albany. Government members come into this place and play their charades and claim that they are definitely worried about Albany and its people, but they have given little help in the problem of keeping the Borthwicks abattoir open. It is too bad that the reputation of this State will suffer overseas, and it is too bad about the effects the closure of Borthwicks will have on the town of Albany.

The militant unionists have been trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the Albany workers by saying, "You are doing the wrong thing by keeping the abattoir open." The fact is that the abattoir must be kept going if workers are to have jobs and their wives and children are to be kept in a style of living which they are entitled to enjoy in Western Australia, or Australia for that matter. It is too bad that the militant unionists have had their way and it is sad that this Government is prepared to back the union without trying to solve some of the problems of Albany by compromise.

Borthwicks have been running at a monumental loss; the signing by the workers of a no-strike clause for two years would perhaps have enabled the company to run into the black.

Mr Watt: The no-strike clause was recommended by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Mr BRADSHAW: As the member for Albany says, it was recommended by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. However, the union will not accept what the commission recommended. It decided to go out on strike and it was too bad that the workers had to put up with being hoodwinked.

It is possible that they were not hoodwinked into believing the union's lie. It may have been that the workers were intimidated into striking. This seems to happen quite often in these voting situations. People are not game to put up their hands and vote the wrong way. I am sure that if a secret ballot had been held at Albany people would certainly be working at Borthwicks today; I am certain that most workers would have preferred to work instead of going on strike. A similar situation occurred at Harvey. People were not prepared to brave the intimidation of a union picket line. Again, another example would be the situation in Bunbury in which some of the waterside workers went on strike. The port was shut down because the fellows who tied up the ships would not do their work. What did the Government do? The Minister for Industrial Relations went down to Albany to sort the whole thing out and merely managed to prolong the strike because he sided with the union over what the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission had recommended.

It is interesting that last night the Waterside Workers Federation halted loading live sheep. The members of the union did so for a pathetic reason—it began to rain. They had only 300 sheep to load onto the ship and, as they can

load up to 4 000 or 5 000 sheep a day, that represented only five or 10 minutes' work. It started to rain so the waterside workers decided to knock off for the night.

Mr Parker: They are entitled to do so under the award; it was not a strike.

Mr BRADSHAW: Whatever the situation, they stopped work 10 minutes before they could have finished loading the ship. This meant that the truck drivers had to take those sheep back to the feeding lots and unload them, and load them again this morning. I noticed that there were 12 to 14 semitrailers loading sheep this morning. I daresay that the sheep could have been loaded by 10 o'clock this morning, but it was still pathetic that it took another 24 hours to do the loading.

Mr Parker: Maybe that law should be changed, but it is currently the law under the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Mr BRADSHAW: Nevertheless, the men stopped work late yesterday and did not start loading until 10.00 a.m. While we have this sort of disruption to the loading of our export products, the credibility of this State goes down. Costs, on the other hand, are going up all the time and, in particular, court costs are at record levels. The people of this State are paying for it.

The Government says that the Minister for Industrial Relations had to go to Albany. What a lot of rubbish! Admittedly, the workers of Borthwicks may have wished to have a consultation in Perth while the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission tried to talk some sense into their heads and to talk them into going back to work. The workers are not the only ones who will suffer. Their wives and children and the town of Albany itself, not to mention our reputation overseas, also will suffer.

I support the amendment.

MR WILLIAMS (Clontarf) [8.00 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the member for Albany.

Mr Pearce interjected.

Mr WILLIAMS: Here we go again: The pathetic and anaemic body with its rapidly moving, big mouth! Why does the Minister for Education not just concentrate on his job? He is the most unpopular Minister for Education in several decades. He criticises everyone else when he should be concentrating on his own work.

Prior to the last election we were flooded with a tirade of comments from the then Opposition, the present Government, telling the elec-

tors that if Labor were elected to power it would keep prices down, and it would ensure industrial harmony and a lessening of industrial disputations. They were the promises Labor made to the community, but what has transpired since it was elected to Government?

The fortunes of politics happened to be on Labor's side, because when it came to office a wage restraint package was working perfectly and helping to slow down inflation. However, as soon as it gained office the MTT workers decided to try on the Government. They said that unless they got a wage increase—notwithstanding the wage restraint—they would go on strike. The Government capitulated straightaway and gave them \$14 a week, and there was no strike. Surprise, surprise! So much for wage restraint. The unions had taken over straightaway.

What was the next thing the Government decided to do? The previous Government had decided to deregister the Builders Labourers Federation, and in conjunction with the Federal Government and the Victorian Government it had acted to ensure that proceedings were taken against that union. But what happened under this Government? It decided to withdraw from the deregistration proceedings. This Labor Government, this upholder of law and order and decency, withdrew from that deregistration proposal directed at the BLF. What an absolute disgrace. By so doing it gave the union thugs, those fellows who love their fisticuffs, the go-ahead to do what they wanted to do, which was to go into the workplace and do their damndest.

Mr Dans, the Minister for Industrial Relations at the time, decided to refuse to act on the provisions of the then Industrial Arbitration Act which would protect the people in the workplace. This meant that the unions could use their standover tactics and demand that people join unions and do everything else they wanted done. When a worker dared to complain, what should have happened is that inspectors should have been sent out to inquire into the complaints. However, Mr Dans decided that was not on. When he was asked in another place why he was not sending out inspectors, he replied, "I will not use that filthy legislation." What an absolute disgrace.

The Labor Government then decided to introduce its Industrial Relations Bill. We all know that that Bill was written by Mr Jim McGinty and other union advisers to the Government. It was a Bill designed to give control of the workplace to the militant union

leaders; it was designed to destroy subcontractors and to render contracts virtually useless.

The Government also endeavoured to repeal a part of the existing Act which had protective sections in it to cater for standover tactics in the workplace, but fortunately our people in another place decided that move was unacceptable.

I move now to comment on Mr John O'Connor from the union movement and the case of a truckdriver in Geraldton. What a disgraceful incident that was. There we were with Mr O'Connor virtually charged and indicted for threatening the truckdriver, when what do members think happened? As soon as the Labor Government came to power, Mr Berinson said, "No, a charge against Mr O'Connor will create too much industrial disputation, so I will withdraw it." That gave the unions immunity from the law. It gave militant union leaders a licence to embark on standover tactics and to carry on in their usual way.

Consider the next incident in which Mr O'Connor was involved; that is, the Argyle dispute, a dispute between two unions. Although the workers had the backing of the Industrial Relations Commission, Mr O'Connor called them out on strike and for weeks there were industrial problems caused by bloody-minded union organisers, and this on one of the largest and most important projects in the State. These are the sorts of things the State has had to put up with since Labor came to power.

The Building Workers Industrial Union has run riot since then. The whole object of this union is to break down the subcontracting system. If the subcontractors can be broken the union will have complete control. To try to achieve this end the union members went on strike and bullied subcontractors. Do members remember the incident at Safety Bay where the unionists went on-site and pushed down half of a brick wall? Mr Todd from that union assaulted one of the decent workers and was eventually charged and fined \$700 for his troubles. This is the sort of thuggery these people get up to.

I might add that at this stage while all this was going on the Government did nothing; it stood back and did absolutely nothing.

Mr Barnett: Was the man charged and fined?

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes.

Mr Barnett: Then you can't say that nothing was done.

Mr WILLIAMS: But the Government did nothing to stop these incidents. The police took action, not the Government.

Mr Tonkin: What else should we have done?

Mr WILLIAMS: The Government should have stepped in and pulled the unions into gear and told them to behave themselves. But the Government did not do that; it let the unions carry on willy-nilly.

Let us now consider Mr Binstead, this man with the terrible reputation who has caused all sorts of delays on the technical school site and at airport buildings. His stance is opposed by building supervisors and leading hands at his latest site. They do not want him on the site. But what happened? The Minister decided it was not correct that he should be sacked, so he had him reinstated.

Mr Bradshaw: Of course, not because he is a union official!

Mr WILLIAMS: Of course not.

So again the unions are in control. But the Government fell into a bit of a hole here because the other workers opposed his reinstatement. The Government ignored them. All the decent workers have now sent Mr Binstead to Coventry. The supervisors and the leading hands have done the same. Do members know how this man gets paid if he is on site? He has to be paid by courier because the other decent workers will not handle his pay.

At present he is on 1½ weeks' leave. Do members know why? It is so he cannot interrupt concrete pours because the men have to get on with the job. What a disgrace this is. I believe the leading hands and foremen had a meeting on site to see what they could do about Mr Binstead. The Builders Labourers Federation bully boys, with their tin helmets and hammers in their belts, attended in force and the decent people became scared and closed the meeting. They held a meeting in secret elsewhere. That shows the extent to which the BLF will go and the sort of people who are running that union.

Somebody said the number of strikes had been reduced since the Burke Government came to office. The facts are these: From 1 February to 9 July this year 65 full days have been lost through strike action in the metropolitan area. There have been 110 interruptions to building sites by the BLF amounting to 65 full days. One can imagine the loss of wages to decent workers who have been stood down because the bullies decided they were going to strike.

It is not only the builders who lose work, but also the suppliers. When it is considered in the long run over a 12 month period, such action has an effect on the cost of building. The cost goes up because of the continual strikes. That affects the consumer's ability to buy. As a result more money is taken out of circulation and that is reflected in consumer spending. So it has an adverse effect right down the line, and it is affecting the Western Australian economy today. This is all because of the nonsense of the BLF. It is time that union's militancy was broken.

I would like to conclude by referring to the Bunbury Port Authority. After the Federal Arbitration Commissioner, Mr Coleman, gave a ruling that all members on the site were to be AWU members there was a scene at Bunbury with one Minister saying, "Yes, they should be members of the AWU", and another Minister saying at the same meeting, "No, they should be members of the Waterside Workers Federation."

Mr Grill: That is absolute rubbish!

Mr WILLIAMS: I have touched a nerve because that is precisely what happened; they could not decide. The matter is likely to flare up again this week; it is not settled.

Mr Taylor: You would love that!

Mr WILLIAMS: Of course not. We want people to work. We do not want strikes; we will not have a bar of them. Members opposite are carrying on because we have struck a nerve; we are ramming it home. The BLF and the nonsense the Government is allowing it to get away with will cost the Government the next election. When we get back into Government we will meet the BLF head-on if necessary and clean it up so that this is a decent society to live in where people can work in peace.

MR McNEE (Mt Marshall) [8.15 p.m.]: I did not think I would have to stand up in this House and point out this Government's record again. It has been mentioned several times tonight, but I repeat that the Government stands for the bully boys. They have all been named this evening. The Government also stands for jobs for the boys, and there are plenty of them. It has shown the public where it stands; there is no doubt of that.

There exists in the community a despondency the like of which I have never seen. There is a will out there, too, which says that the people want to get rid of this Government.

The Government does not stand for the people; it stands for the union bullies and jobs for the boys. Let there be no mistake about that.

The member for Mitchell carried on at length about the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures. But when he was speaking about falling sheep numbers in the 1970s he did not say that they were the driest years the State had seen. People could not feed the sheep, so naturally the sheep numbers decreased because that situation was forced on farmers. It almost happened again this year, and unfortunately it has happened in some areas. It was almost a bigger disaster than presently exists.

The Government has attempted to blast Borthwicks and paint the company as the bad boys. Of course the Government is up to its old tricks of bashing the bosses again. I doubt very much that the Government can get away with that because it cannot make its case stick. If Government members had any intelligence they would not try to make it stick because Borthwicks is a company well experienced in butchering and the operation of abattoirs. Was it not strange, if the company planned to close the abattoir, that it did not move the meat out first? I would have thought that a company with its experience would most certainly move the meat first if it intended to close the abattoir. That would be the first stage of the operation, but the company did not do that. Was it not interesting to note that when it reached the decision that it had to close the abattoir it asked for a no-strike clause? It asked Payne and his gangsters to go to work and stay at work. Is that too much for an employer to ask of an employee who is receiving four or five weeks' holidays, 17.5 per cent annual leave loading, and a workers' compensation arrangement which is generous in every respect? Is it too much for an employer to ask a prospective employee that he turn up for work each day? Is that too much? According to the Government it is.

It is not surprising to learn about the attitude that people have towards this Government.

When Borthwicks wanted to move their meat from their works, what did Mr Payne say? I wonder whether members of the Government know what he said. He said that he would see the meat rot before he permitted the abattoir to shift it. He is the man this Government supports—a Government which consists of a left-wing socialist crowd temporarily running the State. Members of the Government are the type of people who support those sorts of people.

The Government said it was not interested when the Opposition wanted to debate the Mudginberri dispute. It also did not agree that an employer should make arrangements with an employee concerning employment and that such problems were a long way away. The Government conveniently forgot the utterances of its friend, Mr Payne, but of course it would do, because it is a supporter of his and it has to dance to his tune. As I have said before, Mr Payne is the organ grinder and Government members are the monkeys and they will continue to dance as long as Mr Payne grinds the organ.

Mr Pearce: Tell us about parity pricing.

Mr McNEE: I do not think Government members should speak too loudly about the price of fuel. I do not think they should talk about parity pricing either. In fact, if I were a member of the Government I would hang my head in shame if it wanted to talk about the price of petrol. I remind the House that members of the Labor Party came into my electorate prior to the last election and, among promises of water schemes and other schemes, they said that the price of petrol in country areas would be reduced if the Labor Party was elected to Government. In fact, they said that a Labor Government would ensure that the price of petrol in the country would be equal to the price of petrol in the city. We know what happened. We also know what happened to interest rates. In fact, the Government increased interest rates and the price of fuel and let us not forget that.

Mr Pearce: What about parity pricing?

Mr McNEE: I would rather talk about petrol pricing. It is an important matter and this Government has done nothing about reducing the price of petrol. We came to this Parliament to pass special legislation—

Mr Court: What about the price of vegetables?

Mr McNEE: The price of vegetables in the Pilbara is shot to bits. I think the hurricane lamp will be burning quite brightly in the Pilbara—there is no doubt about that.

However, I ask whether we should dwell on petrol prices or on this Government's performance in other areas. Let us look at this Government's performance in regard to interest rates, because it is very interesting. We have the highest interest rates on record.

### *Point of Order*

Mr EVANS: This is becoming unbearable. Surely it has nothing to do with the amendment before the House.

The SPEAKER: I refer the Minister for Agriculture to the often-spoken words of a Speaker: He might have a point of view, but he has not got a point of order.

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

Mr McNEE: It appears that the Minister for Agriculture has not got the message because what I am saying has a lot to do with the amendment. I am referring to the Government's contribution to the direct loss of more than 350 jobs in the Albany region and that is only the beginning. I have also been talking about high interest rates which will cause more lost jobs. Only yesterday I spoke to two businessmen from my electorate who told me that they will have to close their businesses before Christmas and as a result a number of people will be out of work. Of course, the number certainly will not be as high as the number of people out of work in the Albany region as a result of the closure of Borthwick's.

The reason for businesses closing relates back to the feeling of despondency in the community about which I spoke earlier. Let us look at the Government's contribution to the downturn in the Albany region. Surely the Minister for Agriculture has the message that he is presiding over the worst crisis the agricultural industry has ever experienced. Unfortunately, from the Minister's actions he still has not got the message.

People who believe that farmers have been treated fairly by the Federal Government would be surprised to learn that only yesterday I spoke to farmers about the petrol bonus they will receive from the Government. One farmer told me he would receive \$400 and another told me he would receive \$600. However, they will be required to pay the dumping duty on DAP fertiliser which will be in the order of \$3 500. That is the sort of assistance this Government and the Federal Government is giving the farmers, yet the Minister sits in his seat and utters platitudes about his understanding of the rural industry and has the temerity to suggest that what I am saying has nothing to do with the amendment. It has plenty to do with the amendment and this Government completely fails to understand the situation which prevails. However, the Opposition will keep working away at the Government until it does understand.

Government members do not appreciate that the rural industry is really at the crossroads and needs some support. They must turn their attention away from the union thugs and forget about jobs for the boys. Those people trying to provide real jobs in this country must be given help.

The Government fails to understand that Borthwicks killed between 360 000 to 370 000 sheep annually and that its closure has effectively taken another competitor out of the market. As a result, that takes another buyer out of the market and it also lessens the competition between those people who have stock for sale.

The best one can say about the sheep market is that it is holding its ground. One of the problems confronting it is that there is not a great deal happening in the export trade, and that brings me to another interesting point: The recent inquiry by the Senate committee into the export of live sheep resulted in some classic recommendations.

This Government no doubt will support it. Unfortunately there were no Liberals on that Select Committee; perhaps there should have been. It suggested that the holding pens and feed lots should be covered and that carriers should be overhauled or withdrawn. They will be withdrawn and they will find another market.

It was suggested also that the people should be employed as Australian stockmen, and the Australian stockmen, of course, would be required to join the Seamen's Union. They would then be under the control of the same bashers that we have been discussing this evening. I do not think they would have a great deal of success, but these are the problems with which this industry is faced.

I would like to point out to the Government that it has almost certainly failed in its duty to the people of Western Australia, and more particularly, to those people in the region of Albany, where no doubt the economy will be greatly depreciated by something like \$5 million a year in lost wages. That will have a very serious effect on the area and a deleterious effect on the entire region. Not only 350 jobs will be lost, but a considerable number more will be in jeopardy.

Government members have failed to make contact by visiting the town. Whilst in London the Premier could have contacted the principals of the company, but he made no attempt to do so. It would seem to me the

Government has decided it is in its best interests, and perhaps in Mr Payne's too, to ensure that Borthwicks' abattoir is closed. The Government has made a futile effort to say that was Borthwicks' wish, but I am sure that is not the wish of the company and this Government must stand condemned for the lack of action taken in the Borthwicks dispute.

I support the amendment.

**MR CASH (Mt Lawley) [8.32 p.m.]:** I rise to support the amendment moved by the member for Albany. We have heard a condemnation of this Government for its handling of industrial relations. The problem we have is in having the Government recognise that 350 employees at Albany have lost their jobs as a result of the inaction of this incompetent Government. Much as that hurts the Government to hear, it remains a fact. It will be placed on the record books of the Western Australian Parliament.

Mr Wilson: Beat it up!

Mr CASH: I do not have to beat it up, I am stating facts which regrettably help neither the Government nor the Opposition. They certainly did not help the people of Albany who have lost their jobs as a result of the inaction of this Government.

Mr Speaker, you will recall that for some years Borthwicks made it very clear to the union members who worked in their industry that the company was suffering a fairly tight operation and it was certainly not making profits. It invited the unions from time to time to discuss working conditions with them, and I understand a certain amount of progress was made in that area.

Recently, Borthwicks' London head office reviewed the Albany operation and it became absolutely clear that if the unions were to continue in the vein that they had in the past, Borthwicks' Albany operations would have to close. As a result of that, Borthwicks' management in Albany called in the unions.

Alex Payne is the general secretary or president of the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union. He was invited to discuss, with senior management of Borthwicks, just where the company and the unions—and when I say the unions I mean the 350 employees—were going, or where they would end up if there was not some sort of spirit of negotiation or compromise in this deal.

Borthwicks went as far as opening their books to the unions to make it quite clear that the company was suffering financial losses. It



was obvious, as a result of the pressure being applied by the London head office, that that loss could not be sustained for a lengthy period.

Mr Pearce: Are you supporting high-rise developments on the Scarborough foreshore?

Mr CASH: It is typical of the Minister for Planning, that as I stand here and make the point of the Government's incompetence in the Albany crisis, he should want to raise the issue of high-rise buildings in Scarborough. I shall respond to his interjection, recognising it is not part of the amendment, but I will make the point to the Minister for Planning, that before he talks about high-rise development in Scarborough, he should get his facts straight as to who was supporting high-rise buildings in Scarborough before the last election.

Several members interjected.

The Minister for Minerals and Energy is quite right. Every time the matter came before the Stirling City Council, I supported it. The Minister for Planning should recognise that certain members of his Government also supported high-rise development in Scarborough, but others came into this place and denied the support that they had given in another place.

The Minister should not start talking about high-rise development when he does not know his facts. He has had enough troubles and made enough mistakes in the last couple of weeks to last him a lifetime.

The Minister will recall that *The West Australian* newspaper recently reported that the Minister had forgotten to attend a particular function because he had slept in. For a Minister of the Crown—

Mr Blaikie: That is how they run the State.

Mr CASH: That is quite right. Albany is a typical example of how wrong things are going.

Another example that the House should recognise is the fact that the Minister for Planning has for some time tried to bring pressure on the Rajneeshees in the south-west—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pearce: You said they should not close the school—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mt Lawley must confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr CASH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I accept that I have strayed, but I can assure you it is as a direct result of the interjection of the Minister for Planning.

As I said earlier, Borthwicks invited the unions to come forward and inspect its books so that they could recognise the plight the company was in. Whether the Government wants to recognise it or not, there is no doubt that the company and its employees had to work as one if they were to succeed, but the unions, through Mr Alex Payne, decided that they would go their way and that they would move in for the kill. They could smell the company was going down, as dogs and cats can smell the blood on the killing floor. They decided to move in for the kill and get rid of Thomas Borthwick and Sons in Albany, even at the cost of 350 jobs. And that is exactly what happened.

The members of the union, as you will be aware, Mr Speaker, tried to get the message through to the executive of the union that they wanted to work; they had a lifetime ahead of them in Albany, and if the union was to continue on the course it had set for itself they were finished, both financially and socially, as far as the town of Albany was concerned.

What happened? The unions decided to go in for the kill and 350 men ended up losing their positions. As the member for Albany has already stated, the loss of work for those 350 employees cost the region of Albany something like \$5 million per annum. That is not something the Government can be proud of.

Mr Watt: There was a multiplier effect in indirect wages.

Mr CASH: As the member for Albany says, the direct wages attributable to those particular men must have had a multiplier effect in the region as a whole, so losses were considerably higher than that \$5 million. Where was Mr Tom Butler when all this was happening? I recall the Premier telling this House that Mr Butler, the number one union man, would solve any disputes which arose in Western Australia in the future.

Mr MacKinnon: Butler was with the Minister for Industrial Relations working on how to get his preselection votes.

Mr CASH: It is regrettable, but, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said, Mr Butler was in fact working with the Minister for Industrial Relations in an attempt to gather votes for the Minister's preselection for the seat of Maylands so that in due course, when he arrived here, he could take on the leadership.

At the time of the crisis at Borthwicks in Albany, while the Government did nothing, the Leader of the Opposition was in London. I

understand that as soon as he heard of the crisis and the final statement of Thomas Borthwick and Sons, the Leader of the Opposition made an appointment with the management of Borthwicks in order to discuss the problem. That is more than can be said of the Minister for Industrial Relations, who remained in Perth throughout the crisis hoping that it would go away and that if it did not, hoping that at least the 350 employees who were to lose their jobs would go away.

I assure the House that those people who lost their jobs in Albany will not forget the incompetent way that this Government attempted to carry out its responsibilities towards them. I suppose that as the election approaches we can expect all the fancy promises in the world from this Government to the people of Albany, but I can assure the Government that the people of Albany have been bitten once and it is most unlikely that they will respond to any deals that this Government might wish to set up.

In paragraph 2 of this amendment, the member for Albany describes the general impotence of the Government in dealing with militant unionism. I refer to the poor record of this Government when it comes to standing up for workers' rights, and perhaps it is opportune to mention that this Government has been standing up for, and giving in to, the left wing for so long that it does not now know any other method of dealing with industrial relations problems. I will provide some examples to the House.

Members will recall the J. J. O'Connor affair which has been canvassed tonight. The people of Western Australia, while they may not forget what this Government has done to them in respect of Albany, will certainly not forget the O'Connor affair in which the Attorney General of this Government, acting no doubt on the instructions of Government members and also under pressure from the left wing, entered a *nolle prosequi* to prevent the charges against him being heard in open court. Then there was the affair of Mr Fagan; in that case members will recall that that particular gentleman was ordered by the Government to be found a job in the PWD. Once he had found that job, Mr Fagan went off on workers' compensation only a week later. I understand that he has now been on compensation for nearly 12 months.

Let us now turn to the problem of Mark Binstead. Members will be aware that Mr Binstead is an executive member of the Builders Labourers Federation in Western Australia and he was employed on the new

Perth Technical College site until he was dismissed for abusing a foreman. Rather than recognise that the abuse of a foreman or a supervisor constituted grounds for dismissal, the Government turned around, and having regard for Mr Binstead's position in the BLF and the way the BLF is able to treat this particular Government, decided to jump as high as the BLF wanted it to. The BLF responded by saying, "We want you to reinstate our executive member and we do not want any problems from you as a Government."

Within a few hours of this ultimatum the Minister for Works—and he is a man for whom I have a great deal of respect—was put under pressure from his fellow members of Cabinet and decided that in fact Mr Binstead should be reinstated. The papers show very clearly what then happened. All the foremen and supervisors who were not prepared to take this sort of steamrolling by the Minister for Works on behalf of the Government decided that they too would go out on strike.

The Minister for Works and the Minister for Industrial Relations both panicked at this stage. Mr Binstead was reinstated to his position because of actions taken by a particular Minister, and then the foremen and supervisors of this State also went out on strike, thus totally panicking both the Minister for Industrial Relations and the Minister for Works. These two Ministers rushed into a meeting with the supervisors and the foremen, the outcome of which was that everyone concerned was prepared only to say, "We won't be saying anything and we just hope that the Press doesn't get hold of it." However, the Press did get hold of it because it was a very important issue, and the unions that represented the foremen and the supervisors—I think it was the Civil Service Association—claimed only two or three weeks ago that this particular job had blown out in cost terms by about \$1.5 million. In this particular instance, the union made it very clear that the reinstatement of Mark Binstead had cost an estimated \$300 000. That is a disgraceful situation. The Minister for Works may say what he likes, but it is a well-documented amount. The problems currently occurring on the Perth Technical College site are a direct result of the actions of the Minister for Works and the lack of action by the Minister for Industrial Relations.

I was at a luncheon recently at which the Premier was asked a question in respect of the BLF. The question was: Would the Government be prepared to send a cable to the Federal

Government giving it support in its attempt to deregister the Federal BLF? The Premier decided at that stage that things were getting a bit too hot, and he said something to the effect that it was not a State issue and he should not become involved in it. He went on to say that there were probably only three or four troublesome members of the BLF in Western Australia so it would really be inopportune for the State Government to take any action against them.

I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that if this Government is dinkum about bringing the unions under control, it should tomorrow send a cable to the Prime Minister advising him of its support for the deregistration of the Federal BLF. More than that, if this Government is dinkum in what it says, it should introduce a Bill into this House to deregister the State BLF. There is no question that it can be done or that it should be done.

I have clearly shown that this Government stands condemned for its inaction in respect of the Albany meat crisis. It stands condemned for the way in which it kowtows to the left and is prepared to run away from the real problems in Albany. I hope that rather than continue to knock the Opposition's response to union activity—as this Government is always wont to do when it comes to unions—perhaps we might move together in trying to improve industrial relations in WA.

I support the amendment.

**MR CRANE (Moore) [8.51 p.m.]:** Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr Pearce: Do you have a position on parity pricing?

Mr CRANE: I will ignore that remark because it is not something contained in the amendment.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is an excellent idea and I will protect you for at least the period it takes you to outline the context of your speech.

Mr CRANE: Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker; but I assure you I do not need any protection from idiots.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is very difficult to protect you if you use that sort of language.

Mr CRANE: In supporting the amendment moved by the member for Albany, I indicate from the outset that I very earnestly appreciate his motive for doing so. He is a member concerned with his electorate—as we should all be concerned for our own electorates—and there is no doubt, as he is aware, that the crisis

created by the closure of Thomas Borthwick and Sons' abattoir at Albany is one of the most serious crises faced by that region in a long time.

We are facing extremely difficult times at present, and those of us who, for some reason or other, have had any experience of the meat industry, will realise that it is a very delicate operation and at most times not a very profitable one. Of course, some of us have gained our experience of this industry not only from practical experience, but also as a result of inquiries we have made since being in this place.

The very fact that Government abattoirs have needed to be subsidised over the years by Governments of all persuasions indicates that what I have said about the delicate state of the industry is true. The member for Mt Lawley very clearly and concisely explained the situation which pertained at the Borthwicks plant. Borthwicks were performing on a very tightly-strung operation, which comes as no surprise to those of us who understand the industry.

It was extremely important for Borthwicks that there be harmony within the works as well as full production if the firm was to trade itself through these difficult times, and times have been difficult. Selling meat on the world market is not as easy as some people would have us believe.

Following disputation at the abattoir, Borthwicks appealed to the workers to give their support, help, and consideration. That plea for help was refused by Mr Payne, the head of the AMIEU. The fact that he would not work together with the management at this crucial time and try to find a way in which the works could continue to operate was an indication of the absolute disregard shown by some of the militant union leaders, of which Mr Payne is well known, certainly to those of us in the primary industry area. He has been known to us for many years.

As a result of his actions we now find that 350 jobs have been lost from the Albany area. We have been told that this is a loss of \$5 million from the town's economy, added to which is the loss of other benefits created by that previous employment. An area such as Albany cannot afford to lose that type of money; the people of the area cannot afford to lose 350 jobs. The people who work at Borthwicks lived in the area; they did not live elsewhere and merely come into Albany to

work. This Government stands indicted for not trying harder to alleviate the problems when they became apparent.

The world situation for marketing meat is very serious. The economy is in such a delicate state that it is incumbent on us all to co-operate in all such matters as those we are now considering.

The fact that the Leader of the Opposition was prepared to have discussions with executives of Thomas Borthwick and Sons in London is indicative of his concern for what was happening in Albany. The Premier was in London at that time also and it would have been appropriate had he approached the Leader of the Opposition and arranged that they should both meet with the representatives of Borthwicks in London and discuss ways to overcome the problem in Albany. The Premier could then have been able to discuss how the Parliament itself could help the Government to save this firm, which had been operating in Albany for many years and which had provided an invaluable service, particularly to the meat industry. We should all know the problems facing the meat industry, particularly the sheep industry.

The Federal inquiry into the shipping of live sheep has produced a worrying report. We should all understand the problems we have had to face from time to time with disputations over whether live sheep should be shipped from WA or whether they should be killed here and then sent overseas as meat. Those of us at least who have studied the industry and made it our business to understand it know that the market place wants live sheep.

However, all the time we must face this opposition from people who insist that they can run our industry better than we can. No other person can run a business as well as the person involved. He knows his business, he understands the problems associated with it, and he feels for his business. However, in the rural industries we always have to put up with the indignity of unions trying to tell us how we should do our job. No-one should have the right to interfere with another person's right to earn a livelihood.

Notwithstanding that, the AMIEU, under Mr Payne—a real pain in the neck—brought about the loss of 350 jobs in Albany. God only knows what those people and their families are doing now.

The Government could have been more active and it should have endeavoured to ensure that the delicate operation conducted by Borthwicks was helped in order to continue. There are a lot of ways in which Borthwicks could have been helped.

One of the conditions Borthwicks wanted, a not unreasonable condition, was that there should be industrial peace at the works. Anyone who has operated a business for himself or managed one for someone else knows that a business cannot operate unless there is industrial peace.

There must be cooperation between workers and management. That is what Borthwicks were asking for. The company had had discussions, and I believe the workers themselves, or the majority of them, wanted to cooperate. Yet the opportunity was denied them. As a result of this denial, 350 workers lost their jobs and the Albany area has lost a minimum of \$5 million per annum. There is very little hope that the abattoir will be able to open again in the future. Sure, there is always talk of people who want to take it over, but who in his right senses would want to put the investment required into an abattoir there knowing that he has to negotiate with the same stubborn people who caused Borthwicks to close in the first place? Would anyone in this Parliament put up the millions of dollars which would be required to open such a works and to run it? No-one in his right senses would do so unless he could be guaranteed industrial peace. That was denied to Borthwicks.

Therefore, I believe without being too critical that this Government failed in its responsibility to ensure that such industrial peace would be guaranteed. We know there is very close affiliation between the ALP and unions. We do not argue against that, and we do not condemn unions. As a matter of fact, I have a very high regard for the working man. By that I mean the man who works. I believe I am a working man; I have worked all my life, and I have worked hard. I believe I fit the category of "working man". I am also a man who works.

The problem arises with people who do not accept their responsibilities. They have not even the intelligence to appreciate that any business must make a profit if it is to continue to employ them. All the people who have worked for me have always seemed to enjoy themselves when we experienced a good season. They have always received a little more out of it and they have felt a part of the business. I know I am in the rural industry, and

when the crop is a good one, these workers feel they had something to do with making it good, and they did. They entered into the spirit of things, and that spirit must be encouraged in all businesses between management and the working man. Unfortunately we run into trouble when militancy is allowed to raise its ugly head and is not controlled by Governments whose responsibility it is to create a healthy environment in which business can operate. This has happened in this case.

It is claimed in this amendment that the Minister for Industrial Relations did not even bother to go to Albany. That is a very sad state of affairs and a serious indictment of the Minister concerned. It was suggested he was busy trying to get himself endorsed. I do not know whether that is right. If it is, it strongly suggests he has his priorities in the wrong place. I do not want to pursue that side of the argument; if it is correct I would lose any respect I had for the Minister.

The Government must stand condemned for not having met its responsibilities to make sure no stone is left unturned to help business when it has problems. We cannot afford now in Australia, let alone in Western Australia, to lose any business at all; business employs people. We always talk about the unemployment problem, but everyone will be unemployed if there are no businesses.

Governments have a very sad and bad record of employing people. Sure, they employ a lot of them but they do not get their money's worth. The responsibility of Governments and Oppositions must be to co-operate in cases such as this and to help a business like Borthwicks when it is running into trouble to steer itself through the troubled waters and return to profitability. The company must be profitable, or must have a chance of becoming profitable, for it to be able to continue to employ people. Therefore I support the amendment put forward by the member for Albany. I can understand his concern because in a way he is responsible for those people down there. It is his area and he feels for them very closely just as we feel for our constituents. That is as it should be; as a good member he must feel that. He is obviously concerned or he would not have brought this matter here today. We should not condemn him for what he has done but commend him and give him support. I have not been as hard on the Government tonight as I might have been; I have pointed out a failing on its part. I am hopeful that in doing so the Government will take up the point I have made

and join the Opposition in times such as this—troubled times—so that we may jointly assist all businesses to employ more people and be more prosperous.

We should not be spending our time here trying to tear strips off each other. We are not elected to this place to do that. We are elected here to make a better Western Australia for Western Australians. In this instance a greater effort could have been expended to give Borthwicks an opportunity to survive.

With regard to paragraph 2 of this amendment, I agree the Government must stand condemned in relation to other cases in which it has obviously given its support to militant unionism. The John O'Connor case is one which will not go away. Like an unwanted pregnancy, the Government will not lose that case; it will not go away. As someone said in the Press the best thing for the Government to do is to get under the table for a week. The Government will need to be under the table for a lot longer than a week on that issue. It was a very serious miscarriage of justice. It is the Government's responsibility to uphold the law and the course of justice. A serious miscarriage of justice occurred when the Attorney General removed the case from the courts on his own initiative. The Government will never talk its way out of that, nor will it ever stop us from reminding the people of Western Australia of the dastardly thing it did. It was one of the most serious breaches of responsibility it has been my misfortune to see since I was elected to this place. I support the amendment for the reasons I have given. I would hope in future there could be a great deal more co-operation between the Government and the Opposition, because if we are to succeed in Western Australia, if we are to get this country back on its feet, we can only do so by co-operation with each other and the encouragement of business which will employ the people.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I just want to advise members that this is the twelfth or thirteenth speech on this very same subject. As a consequence of that, I wish to draw the attention of members to Standing Order No. 142, which most members will know refers to tedious repetition. It is not my intention at this stage to say that we have been given a number of speeches which do tend to tedious repetition, but it is beginning to be that way. I am not going to retard any speakers from now on, but if members refer to a subject which has already been handled by most speakers and then do not leave that subject fairly quickly and discuss

new material, I will draw their attention to that fact and I would then like members to go onto new material. I think that is only reasonable.

**MR BLAIKIE (Vasse)** [9.11 p.m.]: Thank you for your comments, Mr Deputy Speaker. I can assure you that I will certainly not be repeating myself when I give my address on this very important amendment.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! It is not a matter of repeating oneself. The Standing Order says one must not repeat what other people have said either.

**Mr BLAIKIE**: This is a very important amendment, and I think that probably, for the edification of the House and because it is now some hours since the debate first started, it would be proper for me to read the precise terms of the amendment.

The member for Albany has moved that words be added to the motion, and I believe it is important that I do restate this because some members of the Government would have forgotten precisely what the amendment is all about.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: I do not think this is new material. I will allow the member to restate the question, but please do not abuse that opportunity for the remainder of your speech.

**Mr BLAIKIE**: I have no intention of doing that. What I will do is to precis the amendment moved by the member for Albany. He expressed his concern about the closure of the Thomas Borthwick abattoir at Albany, and he is very concerned about the unresolved industrial dispute that resulted in its closure. The member for Albany is also concerned that this closure has caused a direct loss of jobs to the region, and an economic downturn of the community which has in turn affected the demand for cattle and sheep in the area. More importantly, however, the member for Albany has also indicated the failure of the Minister for Industrial Relations to visit the town of Albany to settle the dispute until after the company had made its decision to permanently close the abattoir. He also indicated that the Premier was in London and that while there, the Premier made no attempt to contact the company, the head office of which was in London.

The member for Albany made the challenge that there were continual representations by both the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Relations on the recommendations that were made by the full bench of the arbitration

commission. He also said that by continuing to support the investment of taxpayers' funds in the Robb Jetty abattoir and directing business there contrary to its own expert advice—

**Mr Taylor**: Tell us something new. Come on!

Several members interjected.

**Mr Evans**: Are you opposed to the Robb Jetty service works?

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! Order!

**Mr BLAIKIE**: The final part of the amendment moved by the member for Albany referred to the Government's inept handling of the Borthwicks dispute, which is typical of its impotence in dealing with militant unionism and its failure to support the rights of ordinary workers. That is a very important amendment, moved by a member representing a regional area—namely, Albany—and it seeks the support of the members of this House in transmitting to His Excellency the Governor the fact that the Government has failed in its obligations and its duties of office.

I want to comment on some of the speeches that have already been made this evening, and I wish to rebut some of the arguments that have been advanced. The member for Mitchell made a number of comments in relation to the town of Albany. He said that he had visited Albany on a number of occasions in the last 12 months, and he always found it had a fairly low morale. The member for Mitchell indicated, not only unprofessionally but without any understanding at all of what was happening in Albany, that this is all due to the local Liberal member of Parliament. I submit that nothing could be further from the truth. If the member for Mitchell had any degree of honesty—

**Mr D. L. Smith**: If you had been listening, I did not say the member for Albany, but the Liberal Party. I was not talking about the last 12 months, but the period preceding that. You were either not in the House or in your usual form, you were not listening.

**Mr BLAIKIE**: The member for Albany has done a sterling job in representing his electorate and his constituents. As I was saying earlier, as far as this debate is concerned—and I listened quite diligently to the comments made by the member for Mitchell—it is quite obvious that the member for Mitchell finds the truth relatively strange. He indicated that the morass that has come over the town of Albany has been caused by the previous Liberal Government.

Mr Crane: They are only casual acquaintances.

Mr BLAIKIE: The member for Moore has indicated that the truth and the member for Mitchell are only casual acquaintances. I am prepared to accept that. What the member for Mitchell has failed to understand is that the firm of Borthwicks has closed, and closed permanently. Hunts Foods Pty. Ltd. has gone into receivership. Some 350 people have lost their jobs, and this is causing great concern. The member for Mitchell then went on to the accolades. He said that when one looks at what is happening in Bunbury and how Bunbury is booming, that it is only because members like the member for Mitchell are representing the town. He did not give wide comment on the member for Bunbury! He went on to say that the Australian Labor Party looks after Esperance and Kalgoorlie. I want to put the record straight and rebut these comments made by the member for Mitchell because far too often he gets away with comments that are not correct and which are certainly an abuse of the truth.

When one compares Bunbury with Albany it first of all needs to be understood that there is a regional population in Bunbury some three times greater than the regional population of Albany. The member for Mitchell very effectively overlooked that point. He also overlooked the fact that there is a mineral sands industry in the Bunbury region; there is a woodchipping industry using the port of Bunbury; there is an alumina industry using the port of Bunbury—I might also add that these were all developed by previous Liberal Governments. These are some of the things that have happened within that general Bunbury region because of a Liberal Government.

There is no point trying to compare Albany with Geraldton by saying that Geraldton is booming simply because it has a Labor member. That is not facing facts. Look at the rock lobster industry in that town and region. I venture to say that if there were a downturn in the rock lobster industry, it would have the same disastrous effect on Geraldton as has been experienced by the town of Albany with the closure of Borthwicks. A similar effect would be felt in that town. It is simply not right to say that the reason the Albany region is in its current demise is because of the inactivity of former Liberal Governments or because the town currently has a Liberal member; and the reason that those other places I mentioned are

booming is because they happen to be represented by Labor members on a temporary basis.

I want to raise a point about Kalgoorlie. It has a gold industry, and surely to goodness the member for Mitchell would be honest enough to agree that if the gold industry went into a demise the end result for Kalgoorlie would be the same as the effect on Albany with the closure of Borthwicks.

I am putting the record straight because the member for Mitchell attempted to mislead the House, and he would have misled the House if I had not risen to put the record straight.

I now refer to Esperance. Esperance, for the time being, has a temporary Labor member—after the next election that will change. But in many ways Esperance is a regional centre with great similarities to Albany and, again, it is very dependent on agriculture. If there were an agricultural depression in the Esperance region, that would have a profound effect on the Esperance town. It is simply not good enough for the member for Mitchell to come in here mouthing off political jargon or Burkespeak and blaming the demise of the town of Albany on previous Liberal Governments or on the region's current member of Parliament. It is unwarranted, unfair, and totally untrue.

The Deputy Speaker has asked that I do not indulge in repetitious arguments. I am following his direction.

It is also very interesting to note, when one looks at the towns of Bunbury, Geraldton, and Kalgoorlie, that what the member for Mitchell did not say was that although those towns happen to be represented for the time being by Labor members of Parliament, each of them has quite significant Government building programmes going on. Of course, the member for Mitchell would not say that that is political patronising at its worst. But it would be interesting to see how the town of Albany could prosper, or at least gain some benefit in its current demise, if the Government decided to have an expanded building programme in the town to help it over its current problems.

The current State Housing programme in Bunbury and Busselton is certainly a bonanza under this Government, but it is further damnation against the Burke Government for not paying sufficient attention to the town of Albany; all the way down the line the town of Albany has missed out. Part of the reason that this closure has taken place and that the re-

sponsible Minister has refused to go down to Albany to resolve the dispute is because the seat is held by a Liberal member of Parliament. I believe that to be closer to the truth of the matter.

A very substantial Government motivated building programme has been going on in the centres of Bunbury, Kalgoorlie and Geraldton. In regard to Government office blocks in Bunbury there is the magnificent Austmark building which will cost trillions of taxpayers' dollars in housing and relocation. In Geraldton a building programme is under way involving hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars, yet not a cent is going into Albany.

The people of Manjimup get whatever they want because they have the Manjimup mouse looking after them; Heaven help them, nothing else will.

My time is coming to a close and I certainly do not want to cover any arguments that have already been advanced by members tonight. I will cover my ground very carefully. I might seek an extension of time because I have thought of some new matters I wish to raise.

The member for Mitchell was also quite free with his comments about farmers doing so well under the Labor Government—my God, under Labor! By the time this Labor Government has finished they will be absolutely well under with Labor, they will be well down under Labor.

The member for Mitchell had the audacity to say that the dairy industry in WA is booming under the Australian Labor Party. I will be polite and tell him that I will take that excerpt from his speech and I will send it with my compliments to every dairy farmer in WA. I will invite him to put his comments on it as well and I will even pay for the postage. The dairy farmers of this State are not absolutely ecstatic with the miserable rises in the price of milk which they get under the Labor Government. The mighty Manjimup mouse roared again, and the dairy farmers are still in trouble; yet the member for Mitchell has the audacity to say that prices are doing well under a Labor Government. They are going right under with Labor.

Mr Evans: Who sets the prices for milk, an independent committee?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLAICKIE: I am speaking to the amendment. I am relating the arguments that have been advanced already, and I am following your absolute direction, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could I give you one more direction? It may be that the member for Mitchell said some of those things to which the member is referring.

Mr BLAICKIE: He said all of them and a few more.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is unfortunate that at that time I was not in the House so I am unable to say whether that is true or not.

Mr BLAICKIE: You were very fortunate, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you were not in the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. What I can say though is that the member's comments certainly do not appear to relate to the amendment that we should be debating. I am not going to stop the member from answering arguments that have been put, but if he spends all of his time doing that and his remarks do not relate to the amendment, I will probably stop him.

Mr BLAICKIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I will certainly acknowledge your ruling and I will very quickly go through my final points regarding the comments made by the member for Mitchell.

One of the most tragic parts of all of this is that a meatworks has closed in Albany. We have seen complete inactivity by this Government, yet members of this House have the audacity to say that agriculture is doing well under this Government. What has happened? Fuel prices have gone up; wages and costs have gone up; there is more money for the workers; and the workers are working fewer hours and causing lower returns for agriculture. We have seen farmer rallies around Australia and in WA, yet the member for Mitchell tends to ignore those things.

Finally, this matter has been of great concern to the Albany region. This abattoir was very important to the town of Albany. Many speakers have canvassed all the reasons that the abattoir closed—the fact that the union movement walked in with its jack boots and used its muscle and said it was going to close. It really put the pressure onto this company, and the company has said "We cannot continue to meet your demands. We will close our doors", and it has done that precisely. Not one Minister of the Crown travelled to Albany while that dispute was under way.

May I give members the other side of the coin as to what would be the case if the situation had been completely reversed? Can members imagine the situation of the Premier going



to London and wining and dining at one of the more plush and lush clubs at which he likes to dine, particularly the exclusive ones frequented by the gentry of London, and then making an announcement that the Government had clinched a big deal with a multinational meat company to come to WA? Can members imagine what would have happened if the situation had been in the reverse in regard to the current Albany closure?

If the Premier made the announcement today that a multimillion dollar abattoir would go to Albany, a cavalcade of Ministers would go to Albany telling the people how good the Government was, how 400 jobs would be provided, the effect the abattoir would have throughout the community, the estimated hundreds of people who would be involved in the construction stages, and how it would be very good for everyone. So much for the example!

One of the interesting things about this Government is that it is the "Good news Government"! This Government only likes to tell people the good things that will happen. However, whenever the trade union movement is involved, it backs off and will not get involved at all. When the Government is expected to make the tough decisions, when it is expected to go into a trade union office, or to the meatworkers' union and say "You are doing the wrong thing by this community. Back off because this Government will make certain the law applies to you and you have no right to take the action you are taking", neither the Premier nor any of his Ministers are prepared to take that action.

That is what the argument is all about. This Government is prepared to come forward and take all the credit for what is going on in the community. However, when it is supposed to govern and to act like a responsible Government it abdicates its responsibility. It takes the soft option. It takes that option because it is a soft Government. It is a soft Government because it is absolutely controlled by the trade union movement. The Government waits until it gets the message from the trade union movement to act, as it did in relation to Albany when it was told to back off because the unions were going to close the town's abattoir simply because the member of Parliament happens to be a member of the Liberal Party. Those are the facts as I see them.

I support the amendment moved by the member for Albany.

**MR STEPHENS** (Stirling) [9.31 p.m.]: There is no question that the closure of the abattoirs at Albany is a serious blow to the town of Albany and its surrounding region. That would be bad enough in itself, but it is worse because years ago another important industry to the economy of Albany was closed. I refer to the closure of the whaling station. That was closed in the time of the Fraser Government.

**Mr Blaikie:** What a shocking decision that was.

**Mr STEPHENS:** It certainly was. It was an indication of the power of the Eastern States in deciding the future of the Western Australian economy and the economy of the town of Albany. It is well known that Mr Fraser took the action to appease the conservationists in the cities on the east coast of Australia. Little consideration was given to the economic impact on Albany. We can argue whether it was a good thing or a bad thing to stop whaling. However, a unilateral decision against whaling will not help the whales because they are still being killed by other countries. Albany should have been allowed to continue until there was a total world ban on whaling.

That was a serious blow to the town of Albany, and the closure of Borthwicks compounds that threat. The possible closure of Hunts will also seriously affect the economy of Albany.

This amendment, like a previous amendment, is essentially about industrial relations. There is no question that industrial disputation is the most serious problem facing Australia today. I believe that the Commonwealth and the State Governments should direct their energies towards improving the mechanism whereby industrial relations can be solved. There is not much point in political involvement in every dispute that arises. To my knowledge, political involvement in industrial disputation has never solved anything. I think the Government's role must be to set up an efficient mechanism whereby the disputants can resolve their problems to the mutual benefit of the country.

Our balance of trade is such that we cannot, much longer, afford the luxury of internal fighting between unions and employers. Anyone who follows economic trends will see what is happening to our trading results and will realise also that we are sliding into economic ruin. Part of the problem is brought about by our

poor industrial relations. I am not arguing that the workers are always wrong and the boss is always right. We have to have a mechanism.

Mr Bridge: You know where you are wrong? A couple of years ago, what you are saying now might have made sense because there was dispute after dispute. At the moment it is recognised that the number of disputes has reduced considerably.

Mr STEPHENS: That is not the point. I listened to the member for Kimberley make his point. However, the number of disputes in itself does not have a great impact on our trade. The point is that the unions are not prepared to accept that the altered terms of trade facing this country require a fresh look at their share of what is available. The Mudginberri dispute proves that. There, the employers and the employees came together and drew up an arrangement whereby the employer was better off because he reduced his costs and the employee was better off because he increased his take-home pay. The unions said that was not on and those workers have been expelled from the union. That is what is important when we look at trade.

Mr Bridge: We have always called for a lessening of disputation in this country. All I am saying is that we have that, yet you are still complaining.

Mr STEPHENS: We still have problems. Unions should be concentrating on wages and conditions and taking a responsible approach. They should not be trying to gain more than their fair share as they are doing. Unions are becoming involved in political disputes. Already unions are becoming involved in the South African dispute—I will not develop that argument. Bans have been placed on South African ships and threats have been made to take the bans even further. It is the Government's role to make decisions with respect to foreign policy. It is not the role of the unions to usurp the Government's powers. That is what we have to overcome by legislative action so that we have a mechanism whereby genuine industrial disputes can be solved amicably to the benefit of the nation. The unions should be told clearly that they must not usurp the Government's powers in external affairs or in any other matter. They should remain responsible only for the unions' affairs.

Paragraph (f) of the amendment states—

continual misrepresentation by the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Relations of the recommendations made

on 23 April 1985 by the Full Bench of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission,

I recognise that this is a Federal award. However, the point I am making is relevant to either Federal or State legislation. My understanding is that it was only a recommendation and could only be a recommendation because there had been no compulsory conference. Had there been a compulsory conference, the commission could have made a binding recommendation which would have ensured that a decision was made, had the unions been prepared to abide by that decision. I think we should legislate to ensure that, where there is a dispute, the commission should intervene and make a judgment.

The National Party of Australia believes that we should have a fresh start and hold a full-scale Royal Commission to diagnose all the problems of unions and management. That would be the first step towards solving our poor industrial relations.

I believe that would be a responsible approach. However, if this Parliament is not prepared to follow that suggestion, and it has indicated that it will not follow it because it has opposed moves by the National Party to implement such a move, it should at least carry out a bandaid approach in order that the commission could make decisions which would be binding.

After all, Borthwicks was fair and reasonable, and it put its case clearly to the union which had the opportunity of considering it; but the union chose to ignore one point made by Borthwicks. The union accepted all points except one—that the union should be prepared to forego its right to strike for 12 months. In order that it could operate fairly and profitably, Borthwicks wanted a guarantee that the union would not be responsible for industrial strife in the company for 12 months. I believe that was a reasonable request, particularly in the light that Borthwicks had made knowledge of their financial situation available to the union; and if the union had been responsible it would have accepted it and the condition placed on it.

I do not know whether the union thought that Borthwicks were bluffing or whether Mr Payne had a vested interest to see that Borthwicks were closed in the interest of the workers in Perth, but for one reason or another the union bosses recommended to the workers

in Albany that they not accept the condition; and that is the reason this matter is being debated tonight.

The members of the National Party are prepared to support the amendment to the motion, but it is a pity we are not supporting a substantive motion that would have come up with a solution to the problem. I believe that would have been preferable rather than supporting a motion which, even if carried, will not solve the problem.

Tonight I have listened to every speaker on the amendment to the motion, and not one of them has come up with a positive approach. To be effective in criticism we should come up with a positive alternative.

Several members interjected.

Mr STEPHENS: I was just challenged as to why I have not moved an amendment. I am prepared to concede that in this situation I have not been able to come up with a positive mechanism by which this dispute could have been resolved before Borthwicks were closed. I know that politicians became involved, but it did not achieve anything. As I said earlier, I am not aware of any industrial dispute that has been solved by political action and I do not think we will ever see it. Let us have a legislative approach—a mechanism which will ensure that disputants can resolve disputes.

I cannot add to my remarks except to say that the dispute was not about the question of wages. It is my understanding, and it rather surprised me, that in the boning section of Borthwicks some of the skilled boners were earning \$30 000 or more per annum; and this involved working for only eight months a year. Therefore, it was not a question of wages. The high cost of handling the mutton in the meatworks may indicate why the export trade is in difficulty. It may be very difficult for the abattoirs to meet the world market competitively.

I know that in the past we have had problems where unions have tried to stop the export of live sheep. There is no question that the live sheep trade gives a better return to the farmer than does the mutton trade. I believe that if unionists want increased work they should increase efficiency and reduce the unit cost so that the abattoirs can compete competitively on the market for the sheep available and not have to resort to restrictions.

We support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

#### Ayes 17

Mr Blaikie	Mr Laurance
Mr Bradshaw	Mr MacKinnon
Mr Cash	Mr McNee
Mr Court	Mr Mensaros
Mr Cowan	Mr Stephens
Mr Coyne	Mr Thompson
Mr Crane	Mr Trethowan
Mr Grayden	Mr Watt
	Mr Williams

(Teller)

#### Noes 23

Mrs Beggs	Mr Hughes
Mr Bertram	Mr McIver
Mr Bridge	Mr Parker
Mr Bryce	Mr Pearce
Mrs Buchanan	Mr Read
Mr Terry Burke	Mr D. L. Smith
Mr Carr	Mr Tonkin
Mr Davies	Mr Troy
Mr Evans	Mrs Watkins
Mr Grill	Mr Wilson
Mrs Henderson	Mr Taylor
Mr Hodge	

(Teller)

#### Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Old	Mr Gordon Hill
Mr Clarko	Mr Jamieson
Mr Tubby	Mr Brian Burke
Mr Hassell	Mr P. J. Smith
Mr Spriggs	Mr Burkett
Mr Rushton	Mr Tom Jones
Mr Peter Jones	Mr Bateman

Amendment thus negatived

#### Motion Resumed

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Tom Jones.

*House adjourned at 9.49 p.m.*

# QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## 21. Postponed.

### TRANSPORT CHARGES

#### Increases

#### 48. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) What fares, fees, rates, charges and licences have been increased in each of the transport agencies in his portfolio for the financial years—

- 1983/84;
- 1984/85;
- 1985/86 estimate?

(2) What percentage increase do these represent with the previous year?

(3) What was the sum collected from these increases, and expected to be collected from the increases, in the present year?

Mr GRILL replied:

#### TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Parts (1), (2), and (3).  
No increase for any of the years in question.

#### TAXI CONTROL BOARD

Part (1)	1983-84 %	Part (2) 1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Licence Fees	Nil	Nil	6
Meter Testing and Inspection	Nil	Nil	33
Drivers' Registration	Nil	Nil	8.57
Identity Photographs	Nil	Nil	25
Lease Agreements	Nil	Nil	20
Plate Fees	Nil	Nil	14.3

Part (3)  
Additional revenue expected to be collected from increase \$80 000

#### METROPOLITAN (PERTH) PASSENGER TRANSPORT TRUST (Average Increase)

Part (1)	Part (2) 1983-84 %	1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Adults	14	6	Nil
Children	14	6	Nil
Pensioners and other Concessions	32	11	Nil
Scholars	Nil	17	Nil
School Specials (1st 40kms)	Nil	15	Nil
(40kms)	Nil	17	Nil
Bus Charters (1st 40kms)	Nil	15	Nil
(40kms)	Nil	17	Nil
Ferry (4 hr. charter)	Nil	19	Nil

Part (3)  
Additional fare revenue expected to be collected from increase \$1.595 mill. \$0.910 mill. Nil

#### WESTRAIL

Part (1)	1983-84 %	Part (2) 1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Country Passenger Fares	10	2.8	—
Freight	—	—	—
Gypsum	—	6	5
Talc	—	6	5
Fertiliser	—	10	6
Wool	—	10-15	6
Oil in Tankers	—	7	3-6

Part (3)  
Additional revenue expected to be collected from increase 470 000 \$2 559 000 (-165 000) due to bulk service discounts

#### MARINE AND HARBOURS

Part (1)	1983-84 %	Part (2) 1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Pilotage	13	15	8
Conservancy Dues Commercial	8	—	—
Jetty Charges	—	—	—
Wharfage, Handling, Haulage	10	—	5
Private Boat Registrations	18	—	7
Survey Fees and Associated Charges	17	—	10
Examination Fee	15	15	5
Slipway Charges	—	—	10
Berthing Permits	—	—	50
Jetty Licences	—	150	—
Fishing Industry—Conservancy Dues	—	—	—
Fishing Industry—Pen & Mooring Fees	—	165	—
Other Charges	10	—	—

Part (3)  
Estimated additional revenue to be collected from increase \$82 000 \$600 000 \$353 000

#### FREMANTLE PORT AUTHORITY

Part (1)	1983-84 %	Part (2) 1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Pilotage	14.5	8.0	6.0
Handling	10.0	8.0	6.0
Wharfage	10.0	8.0	6.0
Tonnage Rates	15.0	8.0	6.0
Mooring	9.5	8.0	6.0
Crane Hire	10.0	8.0	10.0
Storage	—	8.0	6.0

Part (3)  
Additional revenue expected to be collected from increases \$1 947 000 \$1 893 000 \$1 293 000

#### STATESHIPS

Part (1)	1983-84 %	Part (2) 1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Freight Rates	—	—	—
Scheduled Rates East West	6.5	5.0	5.0
Scheduled Rates North West	—	—	5.0
Contract Rates East West	4.0	2.6	6.0
Contract Rates North West	4.0	2.6	6.0

Part (3)  
Additional revenue expected to be collected from increases \$631 000 \$498 000 \$1 019 000

#### ALBANY PORT AUTHORITY

Part (1)	1983-84 %	Part (2) 1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Tonnage Rates	26.6 (No. 3 Berth only)	13.5	Nil
Mooring and Unmooring Charges	15.7	13.2	Nil
Wharfage Charges	14.2	5.8	Nil
Handling Charges (Avg.)	10.3	—	Nil
Port Improvement Dues	—	12.0	Nil

Part (3)  
Additional revenue expected to be collected from increases \$220 000 \$106 000 Nil

#### BUNBURY PORT AUTHORITY

Part (1)	1983-84 %	Part (2) 1984-85 %	1985-86 %
Tonnage	8.3	—	Nil
Wharfage	14.0	27.1	Nil
Handling	4.7	9.5	4.3

Part (3)  
Additional revenue expected to be collected from increase \$84 560 \$118 350 \$29 700

PORT HEDLAND PORT  
AUTHORITY

Part (1)	1983-84	Part (2) 1984-85	1985-86
	%	%	%
Pilotage	11.3	3.3	Nil
Tonnage	10.3	Nil	Nil
Wharfage	11.7	4.5	Nil
Handling	12.0	4.9	Nil
Haulage	12.9	5.7	Nil

## Part (3)

Additional revenue expected  
to be collected from increase \$429 000 \$114 000 Nil

## ESPERANCE PORT AUTHORITY

Part (1)	1983-84	Part (2) 1984-85	1985-86
	%	%	%
Handling	61.3	6.0	6.0
Berthage	10.0	6.0	27.4
Harbour Improvement	10.0	6.0	—
Wharfage	10.0	7.1	12.4

## Part (3)

Additional revenue expected  
to be collected from increase \$53 964 \$53 351 \$134 240

## GERALDTON PORT AUTHORITY

Part (1)	1983-84	Part (2) 1984-85	1985-86
	%	%	%
Handling	16.67	—	—
Wharfage	—	7.14	1.34
Tonnage Rates and Harbour Improvements	—	5.10	6.58

## Part (3)

Additional revenue expected  
to be collected from in-  
creases \$20 500 \$185 000 \$91 100

## TRANSPORT AGENCIES

*Financial Results*

49. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) What was the estimated deficit and actual result for each year of his transport portfolio agencies for the year ended 30 June 1985?

(2) What was the sum estimated and actually received by the Metropolitan Transport Trust from Treasury for the year ended 30 June 1985 for social services and other purposes?

Mr GRILL replied:

	Estimated Deficit \$	Actual \$	
(1) Year ending 30 June 1985			
Port Hedland Port Authority	—	363 000	*
Geraldton Port Authority	—	356 336	*
Esperance Port Authority	—	100 519	*
Albany Port Authority	—	525 682	*
Bunbury Port Authority	—	1 945 981	*
Fremantle Port Authority	2 384 129	922 614	
Statships	15 367 000	15 866 000	
Marine and Harbours (Cash basis)	—	522 000	*
Westrail	59 000 mill	55 000 mill	
Transport Commission	Nil	103 952	*
Taxi Control Board	32 000	7 076	*
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust	36 723 000	35 283 182	

\* (surplus)

(2) Amount received for year ending  
30 June 1985 (also see question 66)  
for Social Services 28 234 000 27 759 000  
for Concession Fare Recoup 7 421 000 7 421 000  
for Contribution 36 723 000 35 283 182

Total \$72 378 000 \$70 463 182

## TRANSPORT AGENCIES

*Deficits*

50. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

What was the estimated deficit as at  
30 June 1985 for—

(a) Metropolitan Transport Trust;

(b) Westrail;

(c) State Ships?

Mr GRILL replied:

(a) Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger  
Transport Trust (also see question  
66)—\$35 283 182;

(b) Westrail—\$55 000 000;

(c) Statships—\$15 866 000.

## TRANSPORT: RAILWAYS

*Suburban: Losses*

65. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) What was the total loss on metropolitan passenger railway services in 1984-85?

(2) What was the total loss on the Perth to Fremantle passenger rail service in that year?

(3) What was the actual amount of Social Welfare concessions in 1984-85 in respect of the Perth to Fremantle passenger rail service?

(4) What capital expenditure was incurred on the Perth to Fremantle railway line and associated facilities in that year?

- (5) What was the number of passenger journeys made on the Perth to Fremantle passenger rail service in 1984-85?

Mr GRILL replied:

Audited results for the 1984-85 financial year are not yet available but subject to any adjustments that may be necessary in this regard, the following applies regarding the Leader of the Opposition's questions—

- (1) Preliminary figure \$9 470 million.
- (2) Refers to answer to question 64 (2) and (3).
- (3) Refer question 64 (2) and (3).
- (4) \$39 057.
- (5) The ticketing system does not enable the number of passengers on an individual suburban rail line to be calculated. I am able to inform the Leader of the Opposition, however, that the last survey, a one-day count of passengers on and off at all stations for all trains on the Fremantle line on Wednesday, 17 April 1985, indicated 8 994 passengers were carried on the day. This is within one per cent of the previous year's figure (9 086) for a similar survey, indicating that usage of trains on the line is being maintained at good levels.

It would appear that the 17 per cent of people attracted to public transport as disclosed by the November 1983 "independent" survey of passengers following the reopening of the line, are continuing to use the trains, which is significant.

#### TRANSPORT: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

##### *Financial Result*

66. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What was the actual deficit/surplus of the Metropolitan Transport Trust in 1984-85?
- (2) What were the actual amounts of Social Welfare concessions in 1984-85 to bus and rail services, respectively?

- (3) Not including recoups and subsidies from the State Government, what were the actual incomes derived in 1984-85 by the Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust from—

- (a) bus fares;
- (b) rail fares; and
- (c) other fares?

- (4) What were the numbers of passenger journeys in 1984-85 with regard to the following Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust services—

- (a) buses;
- (b) trains; and
- (c) ferries?

Mr GRILL replied:

I am delighted the Leader of the Opposition has given me the opportunity to answer his questions on the performance of the MTT. I am sure the community, as I do, sees the MTT as a worthwhile contributor to the well-being of the people of Perth and is amazed at the latest reported announcement of the Opposition party's leader that he intends to sell the city's public transport system. I do not think the public will want to turn back the clock of progress 28 years to the previous decrepit system.

It is fitting for me in fact, at this time, to commend the MTT and its management and employees on the financial results of the year just concluded. Although the final audited figures are not yet available, I am pleased to announce that the expenditure for 1984-85 in real terms is lower than the previous year, as is the Government's real contribution to the MTT. Bearing in mind the constraints imposed by the Government on fare increases last year and again this year, and the escalation of costs outside the control of the MTT, the result is a creditable performance and one which this House should acknowledge.

Turning now to the Leader of the Opposition's question, I would emphasise that the following figures are subject to audit—

- (1) Deficit was \$35.283 million.
- (2) Social welfare payment
  - Bus \$17.944 million
  - Rail \$9.815 million

- (3) (a) Bus fares \$19.508 million  
 (b) Rail fares \$4.417 million  
 (c) Other fares \$0.129 million

---

\$24.054 million

---

(4) MTT passenger journeys—

- (a) buses 49.075 million  
 (b) trains 9.306 million  
 (c) ferries 0.399 million

---

58.781 million

---

### STATE FINANCE

#### *Contributions: Government Corporations*

69. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Referring to the second last paragraph on page two of the Government's press release on State charges (reference p85-245), what was the value of financial contributions to the Government for 1984-85 from—

- (a) the Western Australian Development Corporation;  
 (b) the Western Australian Exim Corporation; and  
 (c) the Western Australian Diamond Trust?

- (2) What are the estimated levels of financial contribution from each of the abovementioned sources for 1985-86?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) (a) The Western Australian Development Corporation paid the sum of \$10 493 to the State Development Fund pursuant to section 11(2) of the Western Australian Development Corporation Act;  
 (b) nil;  
 (c) nil.  
 (2) The estimated level of contributions of the nature referred to will not be finalised until completion of the 1985-86 Budget.

### STATE FINANCE

#### *Borrowings: Liability*

70. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

- (1) What was his liability for 1984-85 in respect of loan capital less redemptions under the Borrowings for Authorities Act 1981?  
 (2) On behalf of which bodies did he borrow moneys under the terms of the Borrowings for Authorities Act—  
 (a) in 1983-84;  
 (b) in 1984-85?  
 (3) What amount of money was borrowed under the terms of the Borrowings for Authorities Act in respect of each body at (2) and for what purpose was each borrowing made?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The Treasurer of Western Australia's liability under the Borrowings for Authorities Act 1981-82 as at 30 June 1985 was \$574 026 559.61.  
 (2) and (3) The funds borrowed under the Borrowings for Authorities Act were on-lent to semi-Government authorities to enable them to carry out their capital works programme. The authorities for which funds were raised and the amounts borrowed in respect of each authority, for 1983-84 and 1984-85, were as follows—  
 (a) 1983-84

Authority	Amount \$
Albany Port Authority	850 000
Art Gallery of Western Australia	300 000
Bunbury Port Authority	400 000
Commissioner of Main Roads	800 000
Conservator of Forests	2 600 000
Country High Schools Hostels Authority	450 000
Esperance Port Authority	550 000
Fremantle Hospital Board	1 250 000
Fremantle Port Authority	1 500 000
Government Employees' Housing Authority	2 000 000
Industrial and Commercial Employees' Housing Authority	86 000
Joondalup Development Corporation	1 481 000
Library Board of Western Australia	17 600 000
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust	2 110 000
Metropolitan Region Planning Authority	1 500 000

Authority	Amount \$	Authority	Amount \$
Metropolitan Water Authority	66 604 900	Royal Perth Hospital Board	24 864 100
Perth Dental Hospital Board	1 000 000	Rural Housing Authority	500 000
Princess Margaret Hospital for Children Board	1 800 000	Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Board	5 300 000
Rottneest Island Board	700 000	State Housing Commission	7 169 000
Royal Perth Hospital Board	1 800 000	Swan District Hospital Board	1 345 267
Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Board	1 800 000	University of Western Australia	300 000
State Housing Commission	1 800 000	Western Australian Alcohol and Drug Authority	50 000
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission	2 300 000	Western Australian Building Authority	87 951 000
Western Australian Fire Brigades Board	1 140 000	Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission	800 000
Western Australian Government Railways Commission	17 671 100	Western Australian Fire Brigades Board	30 000
Western Australian Meat Commission	1 220 000	Western Australian Government Railways Commission	51 750 300
(b) 1984-85		Western Australian Meat Commission	1 530 000
Albany Port Authority	140 000	Western Australian Technology Development Authority	6 000 000
Albany Regional Hospital Board	1 099 381	Western Australian Tourism Commission	596 000
Armadale/Kelmscott District Memorial Hospital Board	2 405 508		
Augusta District Hospital Board	129 392		
Bentley Hospital Board	3 675 102		
Broome District Hospital Board	498 291		
Commissioner of Main Roads	4 100 000		
Conservator of Forests	12 650 000		
Country High Schools Hostels Authority	1 236 000		
Esperance District Hospital Board	825 085		
Esperance Port Authority	100 000		
Fremantle Port Authority	500 000		
Government Employees' Housing Authority	6 550 000		
Industrial and Commercial Employees' Housing Authority	1 545 000		
Industrial Lands Development Authority	6 000 000		
Joondalup Development Corporation	3 314 000		
Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital Board	3 736 109		
Lakes Hospital Board	966 700		
Library Board of Western Australia	10 937 000		
Merredin District Hospital Board	1 386 375		
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust	3 386 000		
Metropolitan Region Planning Authority	3 000 000		
Metropolitan Water Authority	40 178 600		
Mt. Henry Hospital Board	108 347		
Osborne Park Hospital Board	3 998 454		
Perth Dental Hospital Board	2 246 000		
Port Hedland Regional Hospital Board	1 410 989		
Princess Margaret Hospital for Children Board	5 000 000		
Rottneest Island Board	526 000		

The member should note this is only one aspect of the Government's borrowing programme, and should be viewed accordingly.

#### 96. *Postponed.*

#### WATER RESOURCES: RATES

##### *Revenue: Increase*

#### 109. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What percentage increase in revenue for water rates is expected to be received from the Shires of—

- (a) Harvey;
- (b) Waroona;
- (c) Murray; and
- (d) Mandurah,

for the 1985/86 year over the 1984/85 year?

- (2) What percentage of ratepayers' accounts have increased at a greater rate than the amount expressed by him that water rates in Western Australia would increase in 1985/86 in the Shires of—

- (a) Harvey;
- (b) Waroona;
- (c) Murray; and
- (d) Mandurah?



- (3) Have the above ratepayers been disadvantaged by the recent revaluations carried out in the above shires?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) It is assumed that the question relates only to water rates raised by the Water Authority of Western Australia and not to rates raised by the Harvey Water Board.

Revenue from water rates can vary significantly from one year to another due to a variety of reasons. Growth is a factor which can cause an increase in rate revenue, whereas revaluations can cause either an increase or a decrease, depending on movements in the property and rental market. The valuation effect is clearly evident in the reduction in revenue from Mandurah where property valuations have fallen significantly at the 1985 review. On the other hand, an improvement in the property market in the Shire of Murray has resulted in an increase in rate revenue amounting to 11 per cent and growth in the shire has increased revenue by a further 4 per cent.

- (a) Harvey—.2 per cent increase in revenue;
- (b) Waroona—3.8 per cent increase in revenue;
- (c) Murray—15.5 per cent increase in revenue;
- (d) Mandurah—10.7 per cent decrease in revenue.

- (2) Unfortunately the information requested is not readily available. To extract this information it would be necessary to write a computer programme to the detriment of other enhancements to the revenue billing such as the introduction of payment options for country ratepayers.

- (3) Towns within the Shire of Waroona were not revalued in 1985, and were last revalued in 1982. The general valuation as carried out by the Valuer General in the other shires in 1985 re-established the relativities between properties within the individual towns. It is not possible to determine whether ratepayers have been advantaged or disadvantaged by the general valuation. This would vary from ratepayer to ratepayer.

The percentage variation for these shires are influenced by the full year effect of growth in 1984-85 and anticipated growth in 1985-86.

## SEWERAGE: RATES

### *Revenue*

110. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) How much revenue does the Government expect to receive from sewerage rates in the 1985/86 year in Western Australia?
- (2) How much revenue was raised in the 1984/85 year from sewerage rates in Western Australia?
- (3) What revenue was raised from sewerage rates in the Shires of—
  - (a) Harvey;
  - (b) Waroona;
  - (c) Murray; and
  - (d) Mandurah,
 in the 1984/85 year?
- (4) How much revenue is expected to be raised from the Shires of—
  - (a) Harvey;
  - (b) Waroona;
  - (c) Murray; and
  - (d) Mandurah,
 in 1985/86 from sewerage rates?
- (5) What percentage of rate notices have increased above the number he has stated sewerage rates would increase by in the 1985/86 year in the Shires of—
  - (a) Harvey;
  - (b) Waroona;
  - (c) Murray; and
  - (d) Mandurah?
- (6) Have the shires mentioned above been disadvantaged by the recent revaluations?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) \$92.9 million.
- (2) \$82.5 million.
- (3) (a) Harvey—\$222 700;
- (b) Waroona—NIL;
- (c) Murray—\$127 100;
- (d) Mandurah—\$1 044 500.
- (4) (a) Harvey—\$234 100;

- (b) Waroona—NIL;
- (c) Murray—\$139 200;
- (d) Mandurah—\$1 138 900.
- (5) Unfortunately the information requested is not readily available. To extract this information it would be necessary to write a computer programme to the detriment of other enhancements to the revenue billing such as the introduction of payment options for country ratepayers.
- (6) The general valuation as carried out by the Valuer General merely re-establishes the relativities between properties and therefore in total the ratepayers of the respective shires have not been disadvantaged.

Increases in the sewerage rate revenue advised includes the full year effect of growth.

#### SEWERAGE EXTENSIONS

##### *Applecross*

112. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) Why was the deep sewerage extended to the area in the vicinity of Fraser Road, lower Ardross Street and The Strand, Applecross?
- (2) Who authorised this extension ahead of other areas of higher priority?
- (3) How much did it cost?
- (4) How many more houses were serviced by this extension?
- (5) Of the houses brought into the scheme how many have opted to connect to it?
- (6) What has been the findings from the review which had been requested by local ratepayers into the rating anomalies in this scheme?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) In 1975, under the then national sewerage scheme, the authority was required to determine priorities for infill sewerage in consultation with local authorities. The Melville City Council gave the area in question their highest priority based on age and failure rate of the septic systems. It was this high priority rating that led to the eventual sewerage of the area in 1982.
- (2) Perhaps the member forgets who was in government in 1982 and that this question should be asked of his col-

league, the member for Floreat. That member should be able to tell him that it was not placed ahead of other areas of higher priority but in fact waited seven years after it had been given a high priority.

- (3) \$809 145.
- (4) 166 lots are serviced by this reticulation area.
- (5) 75 lots had been connected as at mid June 1985.
- (6) The present method of determining the gross rental values of residential properties with high site values, due to some special feature of the land, does result in apparent inequities.

This matter is currently under review and I am confident that legislative amendments will be completed in time for the 1986-87 rating period.

#### INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: AWARDS

##### *Metropolitan Transport Trust: Bus Drivers*

116. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

Will he please table a copy of the regulations and awards under which the Metropolitan Transport Trust bus drivers are employed?

Mr GRILL replied:

The award under which the bus operators are employed is in the process of being reprinted. I will make a copy of the reprinted document available to the member when it is available next week, along with a copy of the Metropolitan Transport Trust Regulations.

The Road Traffic Act and the Road Traffic Code also apply to bus operators, as they do to all road users; and a copy can be procured from the Police Department.

#### TECHNOLOGY PARK

##### *Medical Incorporated: Relocation*

118. Mr COURT, to the Minister for Technology:

When will the firm Medical Incorporated be relocating to Technology Park?

Mr BRYCE replied:

Medical Incorporated and the State Government are in the process of negotiations which, when finalised will see the operations of Medical Incorporated relocated at Technology Park. The timing of such a move will depend upon how quickly the negotiations can be completed. In the meantime, Medical Incorporated has established interim facilities in West Perth from which it currently conducts its operations. Negotiations are expected to be completed later this year.

#### TRADE: EXIM CORPORATION

##### *Job Creation*

121. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

In what industries will Exim be creating 3 000 jobs this financial year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The various projects Exim is involved in will lead to a spin-off of job opportunities upon their commencement, across a broad range of industries. The member will be aware that commencement of projects in some industries leads to job opportunities in associated industries.

For example, Exim's activities to encourage increased airline services has contributed to job creation in the airline and tourist industries.

#### EDUCATION: TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

##### *Perth Technical College Site: WA Development Corporation*

137. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

- (1) Will the Perth Technical College site be transferred from the Education Department to the Western Australian Development Corporation?
- (2) If "Yes", what price is the Western Australian Development Corporation paying for the land?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Perth Technical College property is to be purchased by the Western Australian Development Corporation at a commercial price based on the full valuation estimated by the Valuer General.

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

##### *IBJ Australia Bank Ltd*

140. Mr COURT, to the Premier:

When will the Western Australian Development Corporation realise its \$23 million profit on the sale of its share of IBJ Australia Limited?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Pursuant to Section 24 of the Western Australian Development Corporation Act the financial results of WADC will be disclosed in its annual report for the financial year ending 30 June 1985, required to be laid before each House of Parliament before 1 October 1985.

#### LAND: NATIONAL PARKS

##### *Additions*

164. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

What additional areas of land, and in what location, have been either added to or created as new national parks in each year since 1980?

Mr DAVIES replied:

Year	National Park	Increase (hectares)
1980	Cape Arid	26 375
	D'Entrecasteaux	34 895
	Lecuwinn-Naturaliste	383
1981	John Forrest	69
	Lecuwinn-Naturaliste	2 254
	William Bay	33
1982	Hidden Valley	1 817
1983	Millstream	48 660
1984/85	Frank Hann	11 543
	John Forrest	2
	Walyunga	1.6
	Yalgorup	2
	Watherood	206
	Walpole-Nornalup	742
	Lecuwinn-Naturaliste	16
	Fitzgerald River	64
	Goongarrie	10
	Porongurup	110
	Lecuwinn-Naturaliste	318
	West Cape Howe	3 580

#### FORESTS

##### *Timber Mills: Closures*

167. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) Since 1983 how many timber mills using hardwood from State forests have ceased operations?
- (2) How many people have been affected by losing jobs as a result of mill closures?

- (3) Is the Government aware of any further closures and what action does it propose?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) None.  
 (2) Answered by (1).  
 (3) No. However, the resource currently available from State forest areas to three sawmills in the south-west is limited, and the sawmillers concerned have been advised that this resource cannot be guaranteed beyond 1985.

### FORESTS

#### *Shannon River Basin: Royalties*

168. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) What has been the—  
 (a) amount received;  
 (b) royalty earned,  
 from logs made available to the timber industry from the area known as Shannon Basin in each year since 1980?  
 (2) What percentage of the State total hardwood log production came from the Shannon Basin area in each year since 1980?

Mr DAVIES replied:

	KARRI (cubic metres)	MARRI (cubic metres)	JARRAH (cubic metres)
(1) (a)			
1983 Sawlog	20 585	—	11 558
Chiplog	10 294	23 702	—
1984 Sawlog	763	—	—
Chiplog	2 186	705	—

Figures for years prior to 1983 were given in answer to parliamentary question 423 of 16 August 1983.

	SAWLOGS		CHIP- LOGS
	KARRI	JARRAH	KARRI and MARRI
	\$	\$	\$
(1) (b)			
1983	204 820	110 148	107 087
1984	8 271	—	9 248

Figures for years prior to 1983 were given in answer to parliamentary question 704 of 17 August 1983.

- (2) 1981—3.06 per cent  
 1982—7.62 per cent  
 1983—5.38 per cent  
 1984—0.25 per cent.

### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

#### *Nine-day Fortnight*

172. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Would he detail those—  
 (a) salaried officers;  
 (b) wages staff,  
 in departments and agencies under his portfolios who work a nine-day fortnight?  
 (2) In each case what has been the cost of this employment benefit?  
 (3) Have any departments or agencies employed extra personnel, either salaried or wages, to "make up" for staff having a rostered day off, and would he detail?  
 (4) Would he state the effect, if any, to—  
 (a) services provided and expected;  
 (b) increased costs; and  
 (c) to what extent?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) The member will be advised in writing by the Minister for Industrial Relations in due course.

### FORESTS

#### *Shannon River Basin: Fire Damage*

181. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management:

- (1) With regard to the Shannon River Basin, will he provide—  
 (a) the total area of forest damaged by wildfire prior to 1974-75;  
 (b) the total area of karri forest damaged by wildfire prior to 1974-75?  
 (2) Also with regard to the Shannon River Basin, will he provide the area of—  
 (a) pure karri forest;  
 (b) mixed karri forest;  
 (c) jarrah forest,  
 that has been—  
 (i) selectively logged;  
 (ii) clearfelled?  
 (3) Will he please provide the area of karri forest in the following national parks—  
 (a) D'Entrecasteaux;  
 (i) declared;

170. *Postponed.*

- (ii) proposed;
- (b) Porongurup;
- (c) Leeuwin-Naturaliste?
- (4) Will he please specify which national parks containing karri have had—
  - (a) selective logging;
  - (b) clearfelling,
 occur in them prior to their declaration, and how much?
- (5) In relation to the 1985 fire in the Brockman National Park, would he please explain—
  - (a) where the fire originated;
  - (b) how the fire originated; and
  - (c) how many hectares of the national park were burnt?
- (6) In relation to an advertisement in *The West Australian* of 15 July 1985, in which householders were advised of their right to take one trailer-load of firewood free and without permit from State forests—
  - (a) why is the Department of Conservation and Land Management advertising the availability of firewood from State forests;
  - (b) how does the department ensure that householders will not remove more than one trailer load?
- (7) Will he please specify the areas of—
  - (a) karri forest;
  - (b) jarrah forest,
 logged in each one of the following national parks—
  - (i) Walpole-Nornalup;
  - (ii) Beedelup;
  - (iii) Leeuwin-Naturaliste,
 prior to their declaration?
- (8) For each one of the forest blocks—Beavis, Deep, Giants, Giblett, Hawke and Jane—
  - (a) what is the area of—
    - (i) karri forest;
    - (ii) jarrah forest;
  - (b) what is the area that has been logged in—
    - (i) karri forest;
    - (ii) jarrah forest;
  - (c) what is the area of karri forest in—

- (i) conservation MPAs;
- (ii) scientific MPAs;
- (iii) river and stream reserves;
- (iv) fire buffers;
- (v) wood production;
- (vi) road reserves;
- (vii) other (please specify)?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) (a) An estimate from 1973 photomosaics showed a total of 10 950 ha of fire damage in the basin;
- (b) of the above, 6 525 ha was confined to karri forest types.
- (2) Shannon River Basin (Areas in ha)
 

Forest Type	(i) Selectively Logged	(ii) Clear-felled
(a) Pure Karri	660	1 800
(b) Mixed Karri	1 040	1 580
(c) Jarrah	3 080	180
Others	460	—
Total	5 240	3 560
- (3) (a) Karri Forest in D'Entrecasteaux National Park (Area in ha).
 

	Pure Karri	Mixed Karri	Total
(i) Existing national park	100	100	200
(ii) Proposed national park	3 800	2 600	6 400
Total	3 900	2 700	6 600
- (b) Porongurup—1 700 ha
- (c) Leeuwin-Naturaliste—1 600 ha
- (4) (a) and (b)
  - (i) Leeuwin-Naturaliste—most of the forest was selectively logged. Some former freehold areas were clear-felled. No area estimate is available.
  - (ii) Porongurup—It is suspected that a very small area on the southern side was selectively logged. No area estimate is available.
  - (iii) Walpole-Nornalup—52 ha karri selection cut 92 ha jarrah selection cut.
  - (iv) D'Entrecasteaux—12 ha karri clear-felled.
- (5) (a) The fire originated in a farmer's paddock—Nelson Location 5065;
- (b) the fire escaped from a control burn on the farm;
- (c) 67 ha.

(6) (a) To direct the interested public to areas most suited to the operation; the advertisements assist public relations;

(b) generally, an honour system operated; random checks may be imposed.

(7) (a) and (b).

(i) As for part (4);

(ii) nil;

(iii) as for part (4).

(8) (a) and (b)

Block	Forest Type	Area	Cutting Status	Area
	Karri Area	3 090	Virgin Logged	2 000 1 090
Beavis	Jarrah Area	1 550	Virgin	990
	Karri Area	1 020	Logged Virgin	560 870

			Logged	150
Deep	Jarrah Area	1 850	Virgin	1 850
	Karri Area	2 110	Logged Virgin	— 1 230 880
Giants	Jarrah Area	340	Virgin	250
	Karri Area	2 300	Logged Virgin	90 2 120 180
Giblett	Jarrah Area	1 560	Virgin	950
	Karri Area	2 040	Logged Virgin	610 1 620 420
Hawke	Jarrah Area	2 030	Virgin	2 030
	Karri Area	3 820	Logged Virgin	— 3 660 170
Jane	Jarrah Area	2 590	Virgin	2 560
			Logged	30

(8) (c)

#### Management Priorities (ha)

Block	Conser- vation	River and Stream Reserves	Scientific	Road serves	Re-Forest Values	Hard- wood Pro- duction	Total	Burn- ing Buffer
Beavis	390	450	800	150	—	1 300	3 090	1 520
Deep	—	310	—	—	—	710	1 020	310
Giants	2 090	—	—	—	20	—	2 110	—
Giblett	—	160	1 100	50	—	990	2 300	1 340
Hawke	880	140	—	—	1 020	—	2 040	1 200
Jane	410	360	—	440	—	2 620	3 830	1 600

Please Note: Burning buffer areas are inclusive of management priority areas.

#### FISHERIES: LICENCES

##### *Professional: South Coast*

196. Mr OLD, to the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) What is the policy on the transfer of existing south coast estuarine professional licences?
- (2) Is he aware of the recent transfer of an existing south coast estuarine fishing licence for Wilsons Inlet as reported in the *Sunday Times* on 5 May 1985?
- (3) What are the reasons for this approval?
- (4) Was the transfer of the licence advertised in any newspaper?
- (5) Was the public made aware of the proposed transfer in any way?
- (6) Was the public given the opportunity to apply or tender for the transferred Wilsons Inlet licence?

(7) What were the reasons for an assistant being approved for the transferred Wilsons Inlet licence?

(8) Have any other south coast professional estuarine fishing licences either been approved for transfer or are under consideration for transfer?

(9) Have any other assistants been appointed to south coast professional estuarine fishing licence holders?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) The rules relating to the south coast estuarine fishery do not allow transfer of existing licences except when being handed down throughout the licensee's family. The rules provide for the Director of Fisheries to license assistants within the fishery.

- (2) The article on 5 May 1985 related to a family transfer approval granted in February 1978.

(3) to (9) Not applicable.

more detail about it, I will endeavour to supply him with the information he requires.

201. *Postponed.*

## BURSWOOD ISLAND

### *Plan*

197. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Would he lay on the Table of the House a copy of a plan showing land north of the Great Eastern Highway including Burswood Island showing the—

- (a) site where the casino is at present being constructed;
- (b) present Westrail reserve;
- (c) line and placement of Governor Hutt's channel, creating Burswood Island;
- (d) proposed alignment of the Burswood Island bridge and its associated road system;
- (e) freehold land associated with the cement works;
- (f) alignment of the former Goodwood racecourse;
- (g) proposed site for use of speed boat activities;
- (h) location of the former "Little" Bunbury bridge?

Mr McIVER replied:

Three separate plans showing the requested information have been forwarded direct to the member.

## TRANSPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### *Members*

200. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for Transport:

Will he please list the names of the members making up the Transport Advisory Committee and their occupations?

Mr GRILL replied:

I am not aware of any body called the transport advisory committee. If the member is able to provide me with

## ROAD: NARROWS BRIDGE

### *Widening*

215. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Transport:

Relative to his statement in November 1984 that consulting engineers had been commissioned to investigate the practicality of widening the Narrows Bridge—

- (a) have firm recommendations been received from the consultants in respect of the matter;
- (b) if so, what were the recommendations involved?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (a) and (b) An initial report has been received from the consultant. Further discussions are necessary with the consultant before a firm recommendation can be made by the Main Roads Department. I expect to receive advice from the Commissioner of Main Roads shortly.

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: SOUTH WEST DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

### *Press Conferences: Breakfasts*

218. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) Does the South West Development Authority hold, or has it held, Press conferences with a breakfast?
- (2) If so, how many have been held?
- (3) Who pays for the breakfasts?
- (4) If the Press breakfasts have been held and the South West Development Authority pays the bill, how much have these breakfasts cost?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 3.
- (3) South West Development Authority.
- (4) \$162.

## ABATTOIRS: MEAT

*Hamburger: Exports*

220. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How much hamburger meat is sold out of Western Australia to overseas markets?
- (2) Which country or countries buy Western Australian hamburger meat?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) The Australian Bureau of Statistics—Export commodity classifications 011.12.09 and 011.12.19—reported that 14 721.30 tonnes of boneless beef was exported from Western Australia in 1983-84. Such meat is suitable for manufacturing into hamburger.

- (2) The meat in the above commodity classifications was exported to—

Bahrain  
Barbados  
Belgium-Luxembourg  
Brunei  
Canada  
Hong Kong  
Japan  
Kuwait  
Malaysia  
Mauritius  
Saudi Arabia  
Singapore  
Taiwan  
Trinidad and Tobago  
United States of America  
Yemen

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES:  
ACCOMMODATION*Bunbury: Austmark Tower*

222. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister with special responsibility for "Bunbury 2000":

- (1) When is the Austmark Tower project expected to be completed in Bunbury?
- (2) How many parking bays will be provided in the Austmark Tower?
- (3) Which Government departments are moving into the Austmark Tower?
- (4) Does the Government intend to build, or have built, any more office accommodation in Bunbury?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Approximately May 1986.

- (2) 81 parking bays in office complex. In addition, 214 parking bays will be available as an alternative use with adjoining hotel complex.

- (3) Subject to final decisions—

Education Department  
Department of Conservation and Land Management  
Water Authority  
Smaller units from other departments.

- (4) Yes, as the need arises.

223. *Postponed.*

## HOUSING

*Home Purchase Scheme: Advances*

227. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Of the \$69 335 000 made available in 1984-85 for the Home Purchase Scheme and the advances to home builders account to be administered through the State Housing Commission, what amount was actually provided in the form of loans or advances to assist in home purchases?
- (2) How many loans or advances were made in 1984-85 from this budgetary allocation?
- (3) Of the \$104 084 000 General Loan Fund allocation for housing in 1984-85, how much was expended—
  - (a) as at 31 March 1985;
  - (b) as at 30 June 1985?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Of the \$69 335 000 proposed to be advanced for home loans in the 1984-85 General Loan Fund Estimates of Expenditure, \$23 176 000 was proposed for advances to the home purchase account and \$46 159 000 was proposed to be allocated to the State Housing Commission to provide loans to applicants to purchase a home.

Subsequently, \$5 480 000 of these funds were directed towards supplementing the Commonwealth funds provided for Aboriginal housing works, leaving \$63 855 000 available to applicants to obtain a loan.



\$58.3 million of these funds were either expended or committed at 30 June, 1985.

- (2) 1 600 advances were approved in 1984-85. Of these, 798 were expended before 30 June, 1985 with the balance committed but carried over for payment in 1985-86 financial year.
- (3) (a) and (b) The General Loan Fund Estimates provided for an allocation of \$104 084 000 to housing authorities. This encompassed allocations to the Government Employees' Housing Authority, Industrial and Commercial Housing Employees' Authority, and the State Housing Commission.

However the total capital works programmes for these bodies amounted to \$208 416 000, with the balance of the funds being provided from Commonwealth funding and/or internal funding sources.

The balance of funds in the State housing account at 31 March, 1985 was \$14.547 million and at 30 June, 1985 was \$56.107 million—made up of a mix of funds from State, Commonwealth, and internal sources.

At 30 June, 1985 the State Housing Commission's funds for home loans and other capital programme works were fully committed.

#### TOURISM COMMISSION

*Mr W. Gill: Employment*

228. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

Is Mr Bill Gill—

- (a) an adviser to;
- (b) a consultant of;
- (c) an employee of,

either the Government or the Western Australian Tourism Commission, and if so in any case, what are his total emoluments and what are his responsibilities in terms of work to be undertaken and time to be spent?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) to (c) Mr Gill is an adviser to the Western Australian Tourism Commission in his capacity as a member of

the Commission and receives the standard remuneration of \$3 000 per annum applicable to commissioners.

Mr Gill is also Chairman of the "Albany Tomorrow" study group and receives the standard daily allowance payable to persons serving on Government boards or committees.

#### PLANNING

*Metropolitan Region Planning Authority:  
Property Rents*

229. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Has the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority arranged for the supervision of its properties and the collection of its rents to be taken over by the private sector?
- (2) If so, what firm is involved and what remuneration is to be paid to that firm?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has called for registration of interest and has received 57 submissions which are currently being assessed.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS

*Boat Harbour: Hillarys*

230. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Of the \$13 million estimated capital cost of the proposed Hillary's boat harbour how much will be a public expense and how much a private expense?
- (2) Would he enumerate the details of the private expenditure?
- (3) What elements of the project will be privately operated?
- (4) What steps are proposed regarding the appointment of the private operators?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Approximately \$9 million will be public expenditure and \$4 million from the private sector.
- (2) Private expenditure will relate to the provision of mooring pen systems and land support services in lease areas.
- (3) As in (2).

- (4) The Government will seek an expression of interest from prospective developers-operators later this year.

231. *Postponed.*

## ARTS

### *Ballet Companies: Financial Assistance*

232. Mr RUSHTON, to the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) What ballet or dance companies other than the West Australian Ballet Company receive financial assistance from the Western Australian Arts Council?
- (2) In the year 1984-85 how much money was allocated for the purpose of grants to ballet and dance by the Western Australian Arts Council?
- (3) Of this amount—
  - (a) how much was granted to the West Australian Ballet Company;
  - (b) how much was granted to dance or ballet in the rural areas;
  - (c) how much was granted to other dance or ballet companies in Western Australia?
- (4) What "Dance in Education schemes" are presently being conducted in country schools, and, if any,—
  - (a) who is funding each of the schemes;
  - (b) how much is each scheme being funded;
  - (c) what styles of dance are being taught in each of the schemes;
  - (d) how many people are involved in and carrying out each scheme;
  - (e) are these schemes available for all country schools in Western Australia and are they available at the same cost as those in the metropolitan area?
- (5) Have members of the present Western Australian Arts Council attended performances by Western Australian dance companies other than the West Australian Ballet Company?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), which other dance companies have been attended?

- (7) Does the policy of the Western Australian Arts Council exclude funding for any other dance or ballet company other than the West Australian Ballet Company?

Mr DAVIES replied:

- (1) Still Moves Dance Laboratory (84-85) Kinetikos (84), 2-Dance (Dance-in-Education 85), plus a number of dance organisations and individuals.
- (2) \$467 916.
- (3) (a) \$418 095;
  - (b) no funds were granted directly to rural areas; however some grants are considered as statewide grants;
  - (c) \$32 195.

The balance of \$17 627 was mainly special purpose grants to dance organisations, ethnic groups, and individuals.
- (4) This question has been passed on to the Minister for Education whose area this encompasses.
- (5) Yes, both council and staff members attend dance performances.
- (6) Still Moves Dance Laboratory, 2-Dance, Daedalus, Kinetikos.
- (7) Due to limitation of funds the Western Australian Arts Council can only provide substantial general purpose annual grants to one ballet-dance company—i.e., West Australian Ballet Company. However, all dance or ballet companies or organisations are eligible to apply for special purpose funding.

## PLANNING

### *Old Tip Site: Manning*

233. Mr GRAYDEN, to the Minister for Planning:

What is the current position in respect of negotiations between South Perth City Council and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority regarding the old tip at the corner of Goss Avenue and Manning Road, Manning?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has agreed to lease the former tip site to the City of South Perth for parks and recreation purposes. I am advised that the draft lease documents will be forwarded to the council shortly.

#### EDUCATION: TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

##### *Perth College: Cost*

234. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) What was the initial budget cost for the new Perth Technical College?
- (2) What is the present estimated cost of this building?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) Initial commencement cost at 1 December 1983—\$14 520 000.
- (2) Estimated project cost at 31 July 1985—\$15 000 000.

235 and 236. *Postponed.*

#### WATER RESOURCES: RATES

##### *Due Date: Country*

237. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

Has the due date for the payment of water and sewerage rates for country consumers been advanced this year?

Mr TONKIN replied:

Yes, in some instances. Last year rate accounts were produced over a two-week period from 20 July to 3 August. The last date for payment in some instances was as late as 24 August.

This year rates were produced in two days commencing on 22 July. The last date for payment on the account was 12 August.

#### TOURISM COMMISSION

##### *Members: Appointments*

238. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Who are the current members of the Western Australian Tourism Commission?
- (2) When do the current appointments of each commissioner expire?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

(1)

(2)

Mr Len Hitchen	1 January 1989
Mr Basil Atkinson	31 December 1987
Mr Bill Gill	31 December 1987
Mr Ted Archer	31 December 1986
Mr Warren Tucker	31 December 1986
Mr Stephen Hales	31 December 1985
Mr John Osborn	31 December 1987

#### ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD

##### *Members: Appointments*

239. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Who are the current members of the Rottne Island Board?
- (2) When do the current appointments of each member expire?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The current members of the Rottne Island Board, all of whom except Mr C. Sanders were appointed by the previous Government, are—

##### *Appointment expiry date*

Mr D. Dempster	30/6/1988
Mr A. Ednie-Brown	30/6/1988
Mr M. A. Lewis	30/6/1988
Mrs P. Barblett	30/6/1986
Mr C. Sanders	30/6/1988

#### MR KEITH GALE

##### *Accommodation: Parmelia Hotel*

240. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government ever paid accommodation expenses to house Mr Keith Gale at the Parmelia Hilton?
- (2) If so, for what period of time and at what cost?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) Consultancy arrangements between the Government and Bittai Pty Ltd required Bittai's senior consultant, Mr Gale, to visit Perth and while over here, accommodation and reasonable expenses would be met by

the Government. On the occasions Mr K. Gale personally paid the hotel bill, he presented his account for recoup of the expenditure.

241. *Postponed.*

## LIQUOR

### *Licensed Stores: Returns*

242. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Racing and Gaming:

- (1) Have licensed stores been asked to complete a new and more complicated annual return to be lodged with the Licensing Court?
- (2) Does this format mean that the store proprietors must break down their figures into the actual litreage of all products that they buy?
- (3) Why has this change been made?
- (4) Has the Minister or the Licensing Court received objections to this new format?
- (5) Will the Minister ensure that this apparently new and expensive procedure is dispensed with?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) to (3) The Licensing Court has had the power under the Liquor Act 1970-1983 to request such information for a considerable span of time. The change in format has been considered necessary by the Licensing Court as a result of a decision to implement a computerised system for the assessment and collection of revenue.
- (4) Some concern has been raised in respect of the new format.
- (5) and (6) The Licensing Court is an independent judicial body responsible for any matter within its jurisdiction and is not subject to ministerial direction.

## HEALTH: ALCOHOL

### *Serenity Lodge: Financial Assistance*

243. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Since 1 July 1984 how much has been paid to Serenity Lodge in Rockingham?

- (2) On what dates were each of the payments made?
- (3) What were the conditions applying to each payment?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) \$40 220.
- (2) 13 June 1985 \$34 000.  
23 July 1985 \$6 220.
- (3) The standard "terms of agreement and conditions of grant".  
Funding for the "supply period" 1985-86 has been paid as per Clause 34 of the agreement.

## EDUCATION: PRE-PRIMARY

### *West Leederville: Maintenance Programme*

244. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he received a request for a repairs and maintenance programme to be undertaken at the West Leederville pre-primary centre?
- (2) If so, from whom was the request received?
- (3) When will the centre receive such attention?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The West Leederville Primary School Parents and Citizens' Association.
- (3) Before the end of September 1985.

## EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

### *Kununurra District: School Nurse*

245. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he received a request from the Kununurra parents and citizens association to approve the appointment of a full-time nurse to the school?
- (2) Has he agreed to that request?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) My department considers that adequate services are provided for the students at present at the school by community nurses and health workers. The situation of a full-time school nurse will be monitored.

## HOUSING

*Building Block: Hamilton Hill*

246. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What was the purchase price of the land at Lot 739 Ely Street, Hamilton Hill upon which the house referred to in question 3590 of 4 July 1985 was built?
- (2) What was the final construction cost of this property?
- (3) When was the property completed?
- (4) At what rental per week is the house currently being let?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Lot 739 Ely Street, Hamilton Hill, was part of the State Housing Commission's land holdings and therefore not subject to purchase on the open market. The land was, however, valued at \$15 000 at the time construction commenced.
- (2) The cost of construction to date is \$38 243.65, but there may be minor alterations to this figure for final administration costs which is determined following six monthly maintenance.
- (3) The property was completed on 20 June 1985.
- (4) The full assessed rental on the property is \$61.50 per week. The current rental tenant has been assessed as being eligible for a rebated rent.

## LAND

*Kununurra: Development*

247. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Will he list for me the land in Kununurra that is currently zoned and serviced and available for—

- (a) hotel/motel development;
- (b) caravan park development;
- (c) tourism development?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (a) to (c) Although the Lands Department currently has no sites available for the purpose listed in the question, it has been active in ensuring the provision of such sites, viz—

- (1) as a result of shire rejection of proposed tourist hotel sites, agreement has been reached between the Town Planning Board, the shire, and the department for the shire's consultant planner to make a study of lakefront lands to identify those which should be preserved and those which could be developed;
- (2) a recently released caravan park site was taken up and development is nearing completion;
- (3) a major lakeside tourist development site released some time ago has been developed to first stage and has scope for further substantial development;
- (4) a large site overlooking Lake Argyle leased out last year for the development of a major resort hotel is under active negotiations which may lead to commencement of construction.

## WA FLORAL ENTERPRISES PTY LTD

*Costs: Payment*

248. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

- (1) Who will pay the costs associated with the Western Australian floral exports joint venture which has now been abandoned?
- (2) Will Mr Barry Waldeck be reimbursed for the money he has expended on the joint venture?
- (3) If so, who will pay these costs?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) The ultimate user of the information gathered by Exim.
- (2) No.
- (3) Not applicable.

## DEFENCE

*United States Personnel: Visitors*

249. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

How many United States Service personnel visited Western Australia during the year ended 30 June 1985?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

11 819.

## MOTOR VEHICLES: GOVERNMENT

*Replacements*

250. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

How much was spent by the Government during the year ended 30 June 1985 on motor vehicle replacements?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Actual expenditure from the motor vehicle purchase and replacement trust fund on replacement motor vehicles for the year ending 30 June 1985 was \$14 032 048.

- (1) Mail is collected three times in each week by the Correspondence Despatch Office for processing and delivery. This method is used for the majority of the department's mail.
- (2) Mail is taken each day to the Pier Street Post Office for delivery by Australia Post.
- (3) A small number of items are sent by certified or registered mail.
- (4) Some items are hand-delivered or personally collected from the department.

## WORKS: BUILDING MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

*Staff*

251. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) How many people are currently employed by the Building Management Authority?
- (2) How many of these employees are involved in the day labour force?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) 1 680.
- (2) 1 145.

## SPORT AND RECREATION: FOOTBALL

*WA Football League (Inc): Payments*

252. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

During the year ended 30 June 1985 what payments were made by the Government to the Western Australian Football League?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

\$689 410 including \$653 495 to Subiaco oval; and the remainder being sports Instant Lottery funds grants.

## CORPORATE AFFAIRS COMMISSIONER

*Correspondence: Delivery*

253. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

How is correspondence from the office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs delivered?

Mr GRILL replied:

Four methods are used to despatch mail from the Corporate Affairs Department—

## EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

*Job Link: Projects*

254. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

Will the Minister detail for me the nature of those Job Link projects he listed in his answer to my question 2217 of 20 February 1985?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The member will be provided with the information by letter from the Minister for Employment and Training in due course.

## EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

*Skills West '85: Projects*

255. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

Will the Minister provide me with a list of projects that were funded during the year ended 30 June 1985 from the Skills West '85 programme?

Mr PEARCE replied:

The member will be provided with the information by letter from the Minister for Employment and Training in due course.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: BANKS

*Rural and Industries Bank: Property Holdings*

256. Mr MacKINNON, to the Premier:

What property is owned in St George's Terrace in total or part by the Rural and Industries Bank?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

Property owned by the Bank in St George's Terrace is—

- (1) Prudential Building at 95-99 St George's Terrace.
- (2) Branch premises at 101-103 St George's Terrace.
- (3) R&I Tower at Cnr St George's Terrace and William Street—joint venture with Austmark Ltd.

### TOURISM COMMISSION

#### *Boat Charter: America's Cup*

257. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) Is the Tourism Commission planning to purchase or lease a boat for use associated with the America's Cup challenge?
- (2) What will be the total cost commitment from the commission for the boat?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) and (2) The commission is not planning to purchase a vessel for use during the America's Cup defence period. However, consideration is being given to the merits of entering into a long-term charter arrangement to enable the commission to meet its obligations in this area, on the most cost efficient basis. Actual costs have not yet been determined.

### CRIME: SENTENCES

#### *Aborigines*

258. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Is there concern at the level of sentences imposed by courts on Aboriginal defendants found guilty of assault, breaking and entering, assault with a deadly weapon, and similar serious crimes?
- (2) Has he discussed the above situation with the Attorney General?
- (3) Will he consider seeking more severe penalties for Aborigines convicted of serious crimes?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) to (3) These are matters that would be more appropriately directed to the Attorney General and Minister for Prisons.

### CRIME: SENTENCES

#### *Standard*

259. Mr PETER JONES, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Attorney General in accord with the present level of penalties being imposed on persons convicted of serious crimes?
- (2) If not, what action is the Attorney General taking to ensure that the penalty fits the crime?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) and (2) The Government has already announced measures which are expected to lead to increased penalties for a number of serious crimes. These measures include amendments to the Criminal Code and the Offenders Probation and Parole Act, which will be introduced in the current session.

### COURT: LOCAL COURT

#### *Meekatharra*

260. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Has the Attorney General received a letter from the Meekatharra Branch, Kalgoorlie Central Division of the Liberal Party, regarding the status of the local court in Meekatharra?
- (2) If so, will the Attorney General place a stipendiary magistrate at Meekatharra as requested and supported by apparently justifiable reasons in the letter?
- (3) If not, will the Attorney General at least consider the appointment of further Justices of the Peace to alleviate the burden of the presently acting two Justices of the Peace?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The appointment of a magistrate to the Murchison area cannot be justified. In the six months to 30 June 1985, justices were called to preside in Meekatharra, on average, on ten days

per month. Most hearings were of short duration, with the longest being one hour and ten minutes.

Eight justices are recorded in the recent revision of the Commission of the Peace for Meekatharra—including persons resident on pastoral stations—and one nomination is under consideration.

Four persons—including three justices—have been appointed as members of the Children's Court.

#### EDUCATION: PRINCIPALS

##### *High Schools: Promotion by Merit*

261. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the recently announced "promotion by merit" policy encompass the position of secondary school principals?
- (2) If so, does this mean that discrimination against men would cease being part of the promotion policy to these positions and more meritorious men can be appointed even if there are a greater number of male secondary school principals than those of the fair sex?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) It is not accepted that the present promotion by merit scheme discriminates against men. The applicants for promotion by merit are evaluated by a superintendent and school-based staff on identical criteria. These evaluations are then assessed and recommendations for promotion made by a committee composed of a departmental representative, a Teachers' Union representative, and a third person who is independent of the department and the union.

#### ROAD: ROCHDALE ROAD

##### *Bypass*

262. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Transport:

When is the construction of the bypass road, aiming to eliminate the traffic flow on Rochdale Road, going to commence, and when is it going to be completed?

Mr GRILL replied:

Construction is expected to commence in November and be completed by August 1986.

#### TRAFFIC FLOW

##### *Indoor Sports Centre*

263. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Now that the Premier has announced the Government's firm decision to proceed with the McGillivray Park sports centre, can he state what studies, and with whom, have been commissioned or have been made regarding the density of traffic flow at various times of the day to be expected in connection with the Sports Centre?
- (2) What are the terms of reference of such studies?
- (3) What amounts have been budgeted for new access roads and for upgrading and widening existing roads to cater for the increased traffic flow in the areas of Mt Claremont, North Claremont, Swanbourne and Graylands?
- (4) Can he give assurances that there will be no imposition on quiet residential areas by increased traffic flows?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) to (4) It is understood the McGillivray Park sports centre proposal is being handled by the Minister for Housing, Youth Affairs, the Aged, Community Services, and Sport and Recreation (Hon. K. J. Wilson, MLA). It is suggested that this question should therefore be directed to his office for reply.



## TRAVEL AGENTS

*Registration: Legislation*

264. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Government wishes to register travel agents?
- (2) If so, will legislation be introduced during this current session of Parliament?

Mr TONKIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The matter is under consideration.

## EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

*Employment Strategies Fund: Expenditure*

265. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

How much money was actually expended on the State Employment Strategies Fund during the 1984-85 financial year?

Mr PEARCE replied:

\$3 641 345.30.

## ANIMALS: HUMAN CONSUMPTION

*Veterinary Products*

266. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What action is he intending to take with regard to possible misuse of antibiotics and other veterinary products used in animals for human consumption?
- (2) Does he intend to introduce any legislation with regard to the supply and use of antibiotics and other veterinary products used on animals for human consumption?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) The action is as outlined in the answer to a similar question on Thursday, 13 December 1984.
- (2) No, other than the proposed amendment to the Poisons Act referred to in the above answer. National residue surveys have failed to show harmful amounts of antibiotics or pesticides in meat offered for sale. Levels are usually below the limit of detection. I do accept, however, misuse of anti-

biotics and other veterinary products in animals can pose potential problems to public health and a cooperative effort is required by all in the industry, including pharmacists and veterinary surgeons.

## HOUSING

*Allocation: Annual*

267. Mr BRADSHAW, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What was the amount allocated for housing in Western Australia in—
  - (a) 1981;
  - (b) 1982;
  - (c) 1983;
  - (d) 1984?
- (2) How much was allocated for Aboriginal housing and what was the percentage of the total allocation in—
  - (a) 1981;
  - (b) 1982;
  - (c) 1983;
  - (d) 1984?
- (3) How much in dollar terms and percentage of income is the amount of money owed in arrears in—
  - (a) 1981;
  - (b) 1982;
  - (c) 1983;
  - (d) 1984?
- (4) What is the percentage owed in arrears for State Housing Commission rentals from concessions as against total revenue, and similarly for Aboriginals, in—
  - (a) 1981;
  - (b) 1982;
  - (c) 1983;
  - (d) 1984?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) The State and Commonwealth funds allocated to the State Housing Commission are as follows—

	State \$	Common- wealth \$	Total \$
(a) 1980-81	7 350	30 299	37 649
(b) 1981-82	8 850	27 317	36 167
(c) 1982-83	16 350	41 298	57 648
(d) 1983-84	24 040	51 006	75 046

- (2) The funds allocated for Aboriginal housing and the percentage of total allocation are as follows—

	State and Common- wealth \$	Percentage of Total Funds
(a) 1980-81	7 910	21.00
(b) 1981-82	7 875	21.77
(c) 1982-83	8 340	14.46
(d) 1983-84	10 849	14.45

- (3) The amount of arrears and the percentage to net annual rental income is as follows—

	Net Annual Rental Income Arrears as at 30 June		
	Percentage Arrears to Income		
		\$	\$
(a) 1980-81	34 041	282	0.82
(b) 1981-82	39 051	398	1.02
(c) 1982-83	44 375	1 011	2.27
(d) 1983-84	47 268	767	1.62

- (4) Value of rental arrears and percentage of rental arrears to net rental income for State Housing Commission and Aboriginal housing—

	State Housing Commission			Aboriginal Housing		
	Annual Net Rental Income \$	Arrears as at 30 June \$	Percent- age	Annual Net Rental Income \$	Arrears as at 30 June \$	Percent- age
(a) 1980-81	32 401	95	0.29	1 640	187	11.35
(b) 1981-82	36 744	118	0.32	2 307	280	12.15
(c) 1982-83	41 491	536	1.29	2 884	475	16.46
(d) 1983-84	44 226	348	0.78	3 042	419	13.78

268. *Postponed.*

## TAXES AND CHARGES

### *Increases: Revenue*

269. Mr HASSELL, to the Treasurer:

How much additional revenue is expected to be raised (that is, in dollar terms how much extra money is expected to be received) this fiscal year as a result of increases in charges announced recently for—

- (a) the State Energy Commission;
- (b) the Water Authority of Western Australia (metropolitan charges);
- (c) the Water Authority of Western Australia (country water, sewerage, irrigation and drainage charges);
- (d) the fuel franchise levy;
- (e) motor vehicle licences;
- (f) the Metropolitan Transport Trust;
- (g) Westrail;
- (h) Department of Marine and Harbours marine charges; and
- (i) the State Housing Commission?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (a) \$21 million;
- (b) \$2.75 million;
- (c) \$1.45 million;
- (d) there was no increase in the fuel franchise fee;
- (e) there was no increase in motor vehicle licences;
- (f) there was no increase in MTT fares;
- (g) the changes to various Westrail rates are offsetting and no additional revenue is expected to be raised;
- (h) \$260 000;
- (i) \$1.7 million.

## WORKS: BUILDING AUTHORITY

### *Borrowings*

270. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

Adverting to question number 193 of 22 August 1985 this question has been inadvertently mistyped: the Western Australian Building Management Authority should have read Western Australian Building Authority. In view of this I ask the Minister whether the reply he has given is still valid?

Mr McIVER replied:

In view of the phrasing of question 193, it was automatically assumed the member was advertising to the Western Australian Building Authority and not the Building Management Authority of Western Australia and the answer was provided accordingly.

# WORKS: BUILDING MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

## *Borrowings*

271. Mr MENSAROS, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has the WA Building Management Authority as a Government Department under the Public Service Act the right to borrow money outside the Loan Budget?
- (2) From which sources were the amounts specified in his reply to question 193 of 1985 borrowed?

Mr McIVER replied:

- (1) It is presumed that the question refers to the Building Management Authority of Western Australia; and if this is the case, the answer is no.
- (2) The borrowings referred to in question 193 of 1985 were raised by the Treasurer of Western Australia under the provisions of the Borrowings for Authorities Act 1981-82.

272. *Postponed.*

# EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

## *Community Employment Initiatives Unit: Report*

273. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Training:

- (1) Was a report prepared by way of a review of the first year of operations of the Community Employment Initiatives Unit of the Department of Employment and Training?
- (2) If "Yes", who conducted that review?
- (3) Will the Minister undertake to provide me with a copy of that report?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The Institute for Social Programme Evaluation, Murdoch University.
- (3) Yes.

# TRANSPORT: RAILWAY

## *Bunbury-Kwinana: Electrification*

274. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Private consultants Merz and McClellan and Partners and International Engineering Co. Inc. were reported to have commenced, in March of this year, a study of the economics of electrifying the Kwinana to Bunbury railway line: Has a report on the matter been presented by those consultants to the Government?
- (2) Will he undertake to provide me with a copy of that report?

Mr GRILL replied:

- (1) The report has been submitted to me. However, no formal recommendations have been made to Government.
- (2) When the report and final recommendations are available for submission to Government, the member will receive a copy.

275. *Postponed.*

# WORKS: BUILDING AUTHORITY

## *Ministerial Responsibility*

276. Mr MENSAROS, to the Premier:

Further to his reply to question number 188 of 22 August 1985 this question has been inadvertently mistyped as it should have referred to the Western Australian Building Authority: In view of this would he please say which Minister is responsible for the Western Australian Building Authority and where is such responsibility shown in the *Government Gazette*?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

The Minister for Works is responsible for the Western Australian Building Authority under the Public Works Act which is listed on page 1612 of the *Government Gazette* on 10 May 1985.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### ENERGY: GAS

#### *Sales Agreement: Minister's Paper*

61. Mr TOM JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

Can the Minister advise the House of the truth or otherwise of a statement by the Opposition that his paper on the implications of the North-West Shelf gas sales agreement was—

- (a) written by his adviser, Bill Thomas;
- (b) critical of Alcoa and officers of the State Energy Commission; and,
- (c) timed for political purposes?

Mr PARKER replied:

I thank the member for Collie for some notice of the question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (a) In respect to the claim by some members of the Opposition that the paper was written by my adviser, Bill Thomas, I advise the claim is simply untrue.

Mr MacKinnon: Did he have any part in the paper?

Mr PARKER: I did not say that. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will let me finish, I will tell him about it.

The bulk of the paper included words taken verbatim and graphs from the report of the gas strategy committee—a committee which was set up by the Government and which consisted of Mr Les McCarrey (the former Under Treasurer and now the Director General of Economic Development), Mr Stuart Hohnen (the Coordinator of Resources Development), and Mr Bruce Kirkwood (the Commissioner of the State Energy Commission). Ninety-five per cent of the content of that paper, certainly all the facts about decisions made at various stages, and the advice that was or was not taken, is the result of the work done by the gas strategy committee. In addition, the graphs that were included were entirely the work of the committee and of Credit-Suisse-First Boston, the financial advisers who were appointed to advise the Government on the renegotiation which took

place earlier this year and on subsequent events which have taken place.

Not only Mr Thomas, but also other members of my staff coordinated the work that was necessary because obviously I did not have the time to do it myself. However, the final draft of the paper, and certainly any political comments made in addition to those factual aspects which came from the work of the gas strategy committee, were made by me; and I spent the first two or three days of last week writing the final draft of that paper.

Mr MacKinnon: Mr Thomas had no part in it?

Mr PARKER: I have just told members of the House that, like other members of my staff, Mr Thomas played a part in bringing the report together—it was a fairly substantial exercise. I have told members that 95 per cent of the words were taken verbatim from the gas strategy committee report, which was the work of Mr McCarrey.

- (b) The second part of this question mentioned the Opposition's claim that the report was critical of Alcoa and of SEC officers. That is untrue as a cursory examination, let alone a detailed examination, of the report will show. In fact, it is quite to the contrary. The report is complimentary about Alcoa. Throughout the period of negotiations and especially at the time the Government was renegotiating with the joint venturers, because it did not want to put itself in the same position as the former Government put itself in where it had a contract with the joint venturers and it had to try and negotiate later with Alcoa. It was placed at a substantial disadvantage because this Government insisted that arrangements with Alcoa be in place before the Government's arrangements with the joint venturers were in place.

As I said in the report, Alcoa played a very constructive part indeed in the negotiations and there is not one word of criticism of Alcoa in the report. There are

quite a few words of praise for Alcoa and suggestions on how it helped in the disastrous situation in which the State found itself and, in fact, how it made what could be described as sensible and correct business decisions at various stages of its negotiating procedure, not only with this Government, but also with the former Government. Had similar sensible business practices been followed by the former Government, the State would not be in the position in which in fact it is now.

As far as the officers of the SEC are concerned—of course the member for Narrogin constantly talks about and tries to hide behind officers of the SEC—one of the things that was clearly revealed in all the documents and correspondence was that many of the detailed matters of negotiation of the gas sales agreements between the SEC and the joint venturers were handled by officers and advice was proffered. On the three critical decisions made by the Government—the decision to increase the take in the south-west from 250 million cubic feet of gas a day to 300 million; the decision to take on the marketing of 70 million cubic feet of the Pilbara gas per day in 1979; and the decision to proceed with the construction, letting of contracts, purchasing of pipe, and all the other work associated with the commencement of the pipeline—in the first two cases the decision was not taken on the basis of SEC advice or advice from other departments. The third decision about continuing the contracts was taken against—

#### *Point of Order*

Mr HASSELL: The Minister is making a political speech which is unrelated to the question, and quite deliberately in circumstances where the people he is accusing have no opportunity to reply. This properly belongs in a debating situation and not in question time.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: On the same point of order, it is quite tiresome because the only person to whom the Leader of the Opposition can be referring when he says that people do not have the opportunity of answering for themselves is the member for Narrogin. It is not the Government's fault that the member for Narrogin is not present. As far as the Minister is concerned and as far as the point of order is concerned, it is once again a demonstration of the inability of the Opposition to realise that it is in opposition and that it does not have the right to order Ministers to answer questions to suit it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! In respect of the point of order, it must be obvious to most members who have spent some time in this House that there are occasions when statements are made to answer the question asked; and that is unpalatable to them. That is a fact of life. What also is a fact of life is that no member in this House can direct Ministers to answer or not to answer, or what to say in their answers. The only course open to me is to indicate that answers should be reasonably concise. However, I point out to members that it is rather difficult for me to say that so far, of the Minister for Minerals and Energy. There have been many occasions when answers have been considerably longer than this one and those answers have not been similarly treated.

I take this opportunity to indicate to the Minister that answers should be relatively concise.

Mr PARKER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As members would have observed, this answer is relatively concise.

#### *Questions Without Notice Resumed.*

I would like to make two brief additional points about the SEC. The member for Narrogin has consistently tried to hide behind officers of the SEC and at times has called for the resignation of various officers. The report conclusively demonstrates that the responsibility for these decisions rests not with officers from the SEC but with him and his predecessor, the member for Floreat.

- (c) The third question raised by the member for Collie referred to the timing of the release of the report. As I have indicated, the report could not have been released earlier than the date on which the final arrangements were made for the go-ahead of the North-West Shelf project and the final signing of the agreements which followed the renegotiation in March and the proclamation of the Bill, the green light for the project. The proclamation was made on, I think, 29 July. I am very proud of my role and this Government's role in ensuring the go ahead of this project.

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: I am trying to be brief, but it is very hard. It is universally acknowledged, and certainly any one of the joint venture partners will tell this House quite openly and honestly without any prompting from the Government—they have said it publicly on many occasions—that the second stage of the North-West Shelf project would not have gone ahead without the involvement of this Government and me in particular.

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: I am very proud of that.

The Opposition has talked for years about the second stage of the North-West Shelf project. In the 1977 election they talked about it; in the 1980 election they talked about it; and in the 1983 election they talked about it; but it never came.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PARKER: I am happy to go on for a long time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Perhaps the Minister for Minerals and Energy should resume his seat so that I can lend some guidance to the Opposition. It seems to me that members of the Opposition want the Minister to conclude the answer to this question and sit down. Might I suggest the quickest way for that to happen is for interjections to cease, or at least to slow down.

Mr PARKER: It was only when this Government came to power that the second stage of the North-West Shelf gas project was able to proceed.

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: It would have been easier to do it at that stage. We would have preferred to do it that way, but I will not go into that now because I have been asked by the Deputy Speaker to be quick. We would have preferred to have released all that information much earlier than we were able to. It was very difficult for us to endure some of the criticism which was being made without being able to release that information. We decided that the responsible decision was to ensure that we went ahead with the North-West Shelf project. As soon as we had done that, we released all the information, and that was our response as Ministers of the Crown and as representatives of the people of Western Australia.

PRISONER: RONALD JOSEPH DODD

*Parole*

62. Mr HASSELL, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that the convicted killer, Ronald Joseph Dodd, is to be released on parole with the approval of the Attorney General on 6 September after serving only eight years of a life sentence for wilful murder?
- (2) Is he further aware that after his conviction Dodd was reported in the newspaper on 5 February 1977 to have been on parole from prison at the time of the murder? There was a description of the way in which the murder was carried out.
- (3) Is the Premier concerned about this position and will he be reviewing it with the Attorney General?

Mr BRIAN BURKE replied:

- (1) to (3) To the best of my knowledge I have not been acquainted with this matter and I am not aware of it. In those circumstances it is very difficult for me to pass judgment without the details being conveyed to me. I shall be happy to ask the Attorney General whether the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition is factual,

and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to raise the matter with the Attorney General I am sure he will be pleased to talk to him also.

## HOUSING: NEGATIVE GEARING

### *Premier's Attitude*

63. Mr BURKETT, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is he aware of a statement issued by the Leader of the Opposition claiming that the Premier supported Federal Government taxation provisions which would mean that people such as school teachers, policemen, welfare officers, bank managers, railway workers, and others, when moving to work in the country, will no longer be able to deduct the loss they suffer when they rent out their homes in the city?
- (2) What resemblance does this claim bear to the true position taken by the State Government on this issue?

Mr WILSON replied:

- (1) Yes, I noted the uninformed comment of the present Leader of the Opposition.
- (2) The Leader of the Opposition's statement is pure fiction.

I have pursued this problem of unintended landlords with the Federal Minister for Housing and Western Australian members of the Federal Cabinet subcommittee on taxation reform. The Premier is aware of this approach and fully supports it.

In addition to lobbying the Federal Government, I shall be meeting with the Real Estate Institute of Western Australia this week with a view to coordinating our approach to the problems faced by transferred workers.

In order to quantify the effect of the negative gearing quarantine, I shall be proposing a survey of landlords. Again we will be making every effort to fully research this problem.

I have also written to the President of the Real Estate Institute of Australia informing him of this State's intention to support workers who may face financial loss due to being transferred as a result of their employment.

As I stated in my media statement of 2 August, Western Australia is represented on the national working party on private and community rental housing. This working party is addressing a range of issues confronting the private rental market. It is particularly concerned about the supply of rental housing and is investigating ways to stimulate this supply.

Currently the working party is putting together a taxation proposal for the Federal Minister for Housing to take to his Cabinet. Such a taxation proposal will include recommendations on an accelerated depreciation allowance, tax deductibility of unintended negative gearing, extending the depreciation allowance to established dwellings, and targeting of incentives.

This House should rest assured that the Burke Government regards the well-being of the private rental market as a high priority.

## HEALTH: AIDS

### *Education Programme*

64. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he read the statement made by Dr David Plummer to the ANZAAS Congress in which he—
  - (a) predicted Australia would have several thousand cases of AIDS in the next few years;
  - (b) called for a comprehensive education programme on AIDS?
- (2) What initiatives has he taken in the field of AIDS education?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) A number of very informative pamphlets and publications have been produced by my department, and these have achieved very wide circulation. They have been particularly successful in pharmacies, where we have had a good response from pharmacists. We have also mailed them to doctors and had a good response there as well.

A number of important seminars and conferences have been organised by the Health Department. Some months ago we sponsored a leading American expert to address Health Department officials and other interested people in Western Australia on the subject of AIDS. More recently we hosted an international conference in Perth, again sponsored by the Health Department. That conference was on sexually transmitted diseases, and a good portion of it was devoted to AIDS. I had the pleasure of opening that conference.

The Commonwealth has made funds available to all States for health education on the question of AIDS. So far we have spent about \$10 000 out of our own State funds on a telephone information line. We have placed advertisements in newspapers giving information on the risks and advice to people who may be worried about AIDS. The Education Department has been involved and also material has been sent for teachers to study so that they can include information on AIDS and health education in their lessons.

An audiovisual presentation has been prepared by the Health Department for health professionals. We have also produced an audiovisual presentation for community groups. That is being tested and will be available shortly.

We have had special training courses available for health education officers so that they in turn can go out and speak to the community, address other health professionals and help alert them to the risk of AIDS.

All in all so far we have a fairly good record of activity, but it is only beginning. It is an important health matter, and we will be stepping up our efforts in this area. I expect to put a submission to State Cabinet in the near future setting out in some detail the steps which I think should be taken in this important area.

## MINERAL: COAL

### *Collie: Implications*

65. Mr TOM JONES, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) What are the implications for coal in Collie, or what position did the Government find when it reviewed the North-West Shelf gas agreement?
- (2) What are the implications following the Government's successful renegotiation of the agreement?
- (3) What has the Government done to ensure the continued strength and growth of the Collie coalmining industry?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) The first thing that was apparent was that there was a substantial reduction in demand for coal from Collie as a result of the plan that was set in place by the previous Government. For example, from Western Collieries alone there was a reduction in demand for coal from the Collie coalfields from 1.5 million tonnes per annum to about 850 000 tonnes per annum. In the case of the Griffin coal agreement there was a take-or-pay arrangement for 2.1 million tonnes, but that matter was in dispute with Griffin at the time. There was no commitment from the former Government to take coal from Western Collieries, no commitment to maintain employment level at that colliery, or even to maintain the skills and the employment levels that were appropriate for underground mining. Members might be aware that Western Collieries is the only concern which operates underground.

In order to use the gas, as the member for Floreat observed when speaking to the Bill in this place in July, we would of course have needed to eliminate a lot more coal from our power generation. In fact, to use all the gas, or even most of it, we would have needed to have eliminated virtually all of the coal from power generation. There was considerable advocacy of that course of action during the course of the negotiations by some of the joint venturers, and, as I say, there were suggestions by the member for Floreat that he or his colleagues would have



been prepared to contemplate something along those lines had the Liberal Party been in Government.

- (2) In relation to the implications of the renegotiation of the agreements, the position now is that we can look forward to maintaining at least the current level of coal usage in our power generating systems. We can in fact look forward to a gradual increase both in the usage of coal over fairly short periods of time and certainly, in the long-term future, to a substantial increase in the utilisation of coal. The Government has been able to commit, legally, contractually, and in every other way, to the coal producers in Collie to ensure not only that the people are employed but that they can also make plans and investments to ensure that both skills and efficient operations are maintained on the Collie coalfields.

- (3) To ensure the continued strength and growth of the project, a whole range of discussions were held at my instigation in respect to the long-standing contractual and other disputes between the SEC and Griffin coal. These discussions resulted in the settlement of the dispute between the SEC and Griffin coal on a basis which was satisfactory to both sides and, importantly, a new contract has been drawn up which is much more satisfactory for the consumers of this State and, at the same time, provides the security and the same volume of coal—2.1 million tonnes per year—as was previously the case.

In respect to Western Collieries, the Government has signed a heads of agreement with that company and is in the process of translating that heads of agreement into contract form. Western Collieries and CRA, the owners, have accepted that the heads of agreement is sufficient for them to go on with mining development activities. Indeed, they have spent considerable amounts of money on their new Western Seven operation.

The Government has committed itself to advance stripping of overburden to ensure the maintenance of employment levels on the coalfields during the early years of the operation when

the Government will not be able to increase the demand for coal very substantially.

The Government has cooperated with both Western Collieries and with Griffin coal in coal exploration and evaluation work to look to the long-term future and to ensure the viability of the leases. I believe that had the Labor Party not been in Government during this time, the future of the Collie coal industry, and in particular of Western Collieries and underground mining, would have been very bleak indeed.

However, one result of what the Government has been able to achieve, although of course there is still the problem of the gas surplus—and as a result there will not be a growth in the demand for coal as there otherwise would have been—is that the situation is now better than it would have been before the Government renegotiated the gas sales agreements.

## HEALTH: AIDS

### *Prisoners*

66. Mr THOMPSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What steps are being taken to establish if there are any inmates of Western Australian prisons who have AIDS?
- (2) If steps are being taken, with what results?
- (3) If no screening is being done in Western Australian prisons, does he intend that such should be done?

Mr HODGE replied:

- (1) to (3) Work is being done at the present time between the Health Department, the Prisons Department, and the relevant union towards developing a policy on assessing prisoners for AIDS. At the moment, it is done on an *ad hoc* basis; that is, the prison doctors assess prisoners that they consider may be in high risk groups, taking into account their physical condition and their past history and circumstances. If the prison doctors, after assessing the prisoners whom they consider may be at risk, decide that the matter needs to be

taken further, they then consult with the doctors in our special clinic in the Health Department.

An education programme has been held for prison officers in order to allow them to be alert to what must be looked for in at risk prisoners. Steps have been taken and laid down to ensure that a person who is suspected of having AIDS is put into isolation in the prison system. That work has been done and, as I say, work is now progressing between the relevant department and the union to try to develop a more formal policy on how to assess prisoners.

## TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIES

### *Youth Involvement*

67. Mrs HENDERSON, to the Minister for Technology:

Would he explain what the Government has done to involve young people in the new high technology industries, given their obvious and growing importance to the State's future.

Mr BRYCE replied:

To promote and encourage the innovative spirit on which the future of the State depends, the Western Australian Government has introduced the Neville Stanley Studentships.

The studentships will be administered by the Technology Development Authority and they will give young Western Australian students the opportunity to apply their own ideas to business and industry. Students with a particular project in mind will be expected to liaise with organisations which have the potential to facilitate and assist in the completion of their project.

Recipients of a Neville Stanley Studentship will work within an organisation for the duration of the studentship. Successful proposals will show innovation and creativity in addressing an issue affecting the long-term development and modernisation of West Australian industry.

Studentships will be available within Western Australia, with a limited number to be offered in Singapore. Studentships will be available for a 10-week period, ideally to coincide with the summer vacation from December to February. An allowance of \$300 per week will be made for the period of the studentship.

Neville Fenton Stanley was foundation Professor of Microbiology at the University of Western Australia, a biologist of international renown, and a founding member of the Science, Industry and Technology Council (SITCO). For many years he was Director of Microbiology Services at Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, and consultant in immunology and virology to the World Health Organisation. He was also consultant to the medical faculties of universities in Singapore and Malaysia. He is an outstanding Western Australian; and I am very proud that the Government has decided to name the studentships after him.

## HORTICULTURE: GRAPES

### *Wanneroo: Export*

68. Mr SPRIGGS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are there any table grapes produced for export in Wanneroo?
- (2) If so, could the Minister advise the number of producers and their names?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) and (2) The available records indicate that table grapes are not produced in Wanneroo for export purposes.

## EDUCATION

### *Privatisation*

69. Mr TROY, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Government support privatisation of the State school system?
- (2) Is there any evidence that the Opposition's sudden urge to privatise everything in sight is based on attempts at privatisation by past Liberal Governments in this State's education system?

Mr PEARCE replied:

- (1) and (2) It certainly is the case that in the education field generally people are concerned about the failure of the Opposition to spell out its privatisation plans and the extent to which they and some of the Opposition's other policies relating to the financing of the State will impact on education. There is of course some evidence of the Opposition's move to privatisation in these areas, because it has already opposed the Government's efforts to put a limit on the fees and charges which parents will have to pay in order to send their children to school.

As members will be aware, the maximum charge that could be levied on any child in a Government school in years 8, 9, and 10 next year will be \$110. The Opposition is opposed to that. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has publicly opposed that proposition and has taken the view that schools should be able to charge what they like, thereby transferring the cost of education from the Government to the parents. I am not surprised that he should adopt this stance, because the Opposition has already announced policies for the scrapping of FID and the fuel levy, which would reduce the State's Budget by \$60 million. The situation is that with \$60 million-odd to be taken off the State Budget, with the education budget being at least 25 per cent of the State Budget—at least under a Labor Government it is, but probably less under a Liberal Government—one would expect to see at least \$15 million taken off the education budget. A cutback of that magnitude would be approximately twice the amount of the cutback which the previous Government attempted to implement in 1982—something which members will recall very vividly, I am sure.

It seems clear to me that the Opposition, with its privatisation policy, is looking to see two things occur: The first is a greater participation level by our students in non-Government schools rather than Government schools, with a consequent saving to

the State; the second is the greater transfer of the cost of education to parents with children in Government schools, and the Opposition is looking at a figure in the order of \$15 million. This is of very considerable concern to people in the education community.

The only way this concern can be dispelled is for the new shadow Minister for Education to have his leader make a clear statement about precisely what he is intending to privatise. He needs to issue a clear statement that the education sector is to be exempted from the privatisation policies the Opposition is seeking to pursue. Does the member interjecting want to give that clear guarantee now that it will not affect the education sector? Of course not. People in the education community continue to worry.

#### LAND: PURCHASES

##### *Kemerton*

70. Mr MacKINNON, to the Minister for Minerals and Energy:

- (1) Is it correct that the Government, through its agencies or agent, has re-entered the marketplace to purchase properties in the Kemerton area in addition to those formerly acquired for the Government's ill-fated smelter proposals?
- (2) Is it also correct that the agent or agents of the Government, if any, are dealing on a secret basis with individual property owners?
- (3) Is it also correct that the agent or agents, if any, are responsible for telling people in the area that the acquisitions are being made for the creation of a national park?
- (4) Is that proposition true; is there to be a national park created?
- (5) When is the Government proposing to announce its endeavours to resurrect the smelter project?

Mr PARKER replied:

- (1) to (5) Firstly, I have made it quite public in the past, and stated it again in answer to a question last week from the member for Murray-Wellington, that we are purchasing properties from willing landowners in the Kemerton area. We are continuing to do so; it is not a question of resuming

such purchases, because there has been no cessation of that activity. No secrecy has been involved whatever. We are not leaning on people. We have had people coming to us asking us to purchase their properties. We are dealing with these people. No secrecy has been involved at all. I have made our activities public previously as I did last week in answer to that question.

Obviously the details of the negotiations between the landowners and the people who are purchasing the land are on a normal commercial basis; they are not held in a public meeting hall with 20 people present. There has been no secrecy about it. I am not aware of any at all.

I find it hard to believe that agents might be commenting that the land is being purchased for a national park to be created. Certainly there is no truth in that. The Government has never made any suggestion that it was intending to create a national park in the Kemerton area. Such a national park is not in our contemplation, not in any shape or form at all. I find the suggestion astounding.

Further, I have also said publicly on many occasions that the Government remains convinced that with suitable circumstances, with the right partners, at the right time from an economic point of view, and with a viable aluminium market, a smelter will be a viable proposition. There is a lot of logic to that. In the right circumstances we could still have a smelter in this State. We have a power contract in place; we have a coal contract in place.

We have all the necessary planning work done. We are about to consider the report of the Environmental Protection Authority. We believe that with all the proper circumstances there is all the logic in the world to say that a smelter will be developed. We have cleared away most of the obstacles. We have certainly gone a long way further to achieving our aim than any Government of members opposite did in 20 years. We still have people committed to proceeding at the appropriate time.

The problem is with the aluminium market, something over which, with the best will in the world, the Government has no influence. That is the only obstacle remaining in the way of an aluminium smelter going ahead in WA. We will continue on in this way. The Opposition need not worry about that but can leave it to us. I am sure that at the appropriate time we will ensure that an aluminium smelter is built in this State.

## AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

### *Newspaper Article*

71. Mr D. L. SMITH, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of an article in the *National Farmer* of 13 June 1985 entitled "Farmpoll: Agriculture Departments, More Bouquets than Brickbats"?
- (2) Can he advise what action he has taken on this article?

Mr EVANS replied:

- (1) The answer to the member for Mitchell is "Yes", and I am very pleased, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you allowed this question.
- (2) I would be delighted to answer the question because that farm poll rated Western Australia's as the top Department of Agriculture in Australia for the third year in a row. This rating was for the best overall performance and stemmed from a survey of the magazine's readers—and a very prestigious magazine it is, too. So I can inform the member that our farmers themselves rate Western Australia's Department of Agriculture as the best.

Our department also topped the list for its research effort, its publications, its market information, in pest control, and in soil and water conservation.

Generally, the department increased its approval rate between 4 and 5 per cent over the 1984 Farmpoll.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must draw to a conclusion.

Mr EVANS: I am drawing to a conclusion, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Nearly half the Western Australian farmers polled indicated that the attitude of the department's staff was good to very good, and a further 38 per cent said it was better than average. I also point out that in terms of offering economic advice the Western Australian Department of Agriculture was rated only second behind Victoria.

This Parliament can be proud of the role the Department of Agriculture is playing and the effectiveness of its officers in extension work and also in research. It certainly has the full backing of this Government.

I have written to the Director of Agriculture, as you would wish me to do, Mr Deputy Speaker, requesting that he convey my congratulations to all the officers in the department.

