

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 15 April 1981

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from 14 April.

THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON (East Metropolitan) [5.03 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion. I have noticed some criticism of the Address-in-Reply debate as a debate this year, and I want to add to the criticisms that have been made some of the things that have perturbed me about the Address-in-Reply since I have been in this House. It seems to me that one of the things that happens is that for several weeks we go into a kind of hiatus where important issues are not necessarily discussed; and sometimes things one wants to talk about happen just after one has spoken on the Address-in-Reply. Sometimes one has to sit and wait, unless one speaks on the adjournment, before one can make any substantive comment on important matters that might be happening. In the meantime one has to sit and listen to some speeches of varying degrees of interest. I suppose hearing the Hon. John Williams play Haman to my honourable friend's Mordechai is of some interest.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Some of your fellow members will not be appreciative of those remarks. They felt they were very important matters.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: Quite right. They tend to forget that.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The Minister will notice I said "some speeches". However, my view is that while the Address-in-Reply is here one should use it and use it, I hope, to say something useful.

I did intend to talk about trade unions and shorter working hours in this speech and to defend both, but for various reasons which might appear later—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members to cease their audible conversations in order that the

member addressing the House might be heard in silence.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Thank you, Sir. For various reasons which might be obvious later, I do not intend to do that. Probably I will speak on those subjects when the Budget debate—

The Hon. Neil Oliver interjected.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: —is before us. Instead I wish to speak about one or two other subjects very briefly and then to speak on something of more substantive interest. However, because of the time factor I do not want to be unduly prolonged, and if I am not tested by members opposite with the kind of inane interjections that the Hon. Neil Oliver is now indulging in, I might get through my speech more quickly, to the joy of the Leader of the House.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You would be very disappointed if we did not interject at all.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I can stand it.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: Even if the speech does not deserve it.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: A matter which has perturbed me and has appeared lately in the newspapers and in various speeches is the notion that seems to be building up that nuclear war is inevitable and that we ought to prepare for it because we are going to survive it. A number of articles have appeared in the Press recently about nuclear fallout shelters—happy little articles about places in which to put one's mother-in-law or to store one's wine. I understand the latter because come the nuclear holocaust one might as well be down there drinking oneself to death as being up on top dying from nuclear fallout.

It seems to me that what we are doing is trivialising the whole matter. That is the attitude that seems to be growing up in our community. I say that because we hear people say they want the American Navy fleet home-ported in Cockburn Sound, which would therefore make us a direct nuclear target from the Russians should a war occur. The attitude seems to be growing up that we need not worry about that because we will have nuclear fallout shelters and all people have to do is pay their \$24 000—or whatever it is—and all will be fine.

I was appalled to read in the *Sunday Independent* a happy little article to the effect, "Who would you take into your nuclear shelter with you in the case of a nuclear war?" The whole business was trivialised and I was particularly saddened because some of the people who played

the game were Peter Cook, Di Warnock, Bishop Vernon Cornish, and others. I mention those three in particular because they are people I know and respect, and I know they have a high social conscience. Of course, it was all very light-hearted, but I find it difficult to be light-hearted about the possibility of nuclear war and radioactive fallout.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Hasn't anyone asked you into his fallout shelter?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Somebody invited Gough Whitlam to his shelter, but that is a lot of nonsense because he is too old.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: That's a bit rough.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: He is too big, but maybe not too old.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: If there is a nuclear war and we have nuclear fallout shelters, the kind of people we will want in them will be young people who are sexually active and capable of reproduction so that we may have some chance of surviving. I am glad to find members find this highly amusing. I hope they are just as amused if the policies of their Government in Canberra put us in the position of facing a nuclear weapon. I hope members opposite have 10 minutes in which to laugh before it hits them, because that is what the policies of their Government are asking to happen to this State.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: Your policy is not to home-base Australian ships at Garden Island. What do you say about that?

The Hon. Tom Knight: At least we are thinking about protection. You would have no defence.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: As a matter of fact, if I were not in Parliament I might repeat the answer given by John K. Watts, which would seem to be one of the most sensible. He said he would like to be by himself so that he could kiss a certain portion of his anatomy goodbye. That is indeed what all of us would be doing if a nuclear holocaust ever developed.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It is very unlikely.

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: You are a prophet of doom.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am glad to hear the Minister say that, because he comes from a party that cries doom and talks about the Russian threat. Certainly nuclear holocaust becomes more likely if we home-port American ships in Cockburn Sound. I hope members realise the kind of things they ignore. The last time I spoke about basing the fleet in Cockburn Sound I

said it would not protect us from a nuclear strike, but in fact would make it more likely to happen.

I think it is most unfortunate to find in the Press this build-up as if nuclear war were not the terrible thing we used to think it was, so that we can go about as if nuclear war might happen and follow the policies of the Reagan Government or the policies of Mr Haig, the bombastic Secretary of State of the United States of America who talks as though we can have a nuclear war and survive it.

We might be lucky, or perhaps we might be unlucky to survive a nuclear holocaust and have to live with radioactive fallout. That is something I do not look forward to at all and it is something that we should take seriously. We should not take it as if we were back in the old gunboat days when we could have a string of American ships across the Indian Ocean, which would save us from the Russians, chaps!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: And the Chinese.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: That is true. The Press has been a little remiss in that respect lately.

As has been pointed out already in this House a State conference of the Western Australian Branch of the ALP was misreported in the Press because it was said the policies of the ALP were changed when in fact the State conference made decisions to put forward certain motions to the Federal conference, which will be debated at that conference. We are a democratic party and as I have pointed out in this House before, all the six constituent bodies will put motions before the Federal conference, decisions will be made, and then we will know whether or not the policy has been changed, or how serious alleged changes in our policies are.

The other day The Hon. Phil Lockyer got terribly excited about this. I was watching him, and he was flushed with joy because apparently according to a Press report and according to something he alleged was said by the Labor Party, the Parliamentary Labor Party had been repudiated by the State executive of the party. Members keep getting up here and talking as if somehow the parliamentary party is separate from the rest of the Labor Party. I was at the State executive meeting the other night as a delegate of a union, just as I regularly am. I am a member of the State Executive and I help to make its decisions. Admittedly a motion was passed which I happened to vote against, as often happens; and it is something I can accept and live with, as are most of the motions which are passed in the collective wisdom of the Labor Party.

Just so there is no doubt in people's minds, I have a copy of the amended motion which was passed the other night, and I will read it for the edification of members so that they might make up their minds whether or not the Press report was correct. The motion which was finally carried and which I accept and defend because it was passed in due democratic form reads as follows—

The State Executive accepts:

- (i) That individuals, including A.L.P. members, and non Party organisations can use a broad range of means to achieve their objectives including some means which are not appropriate to the A.L.P. as a government or alternative government.
- (ii) That actions such as the Jarrah Class Action undoubtedly result from a justifiable sense of frustration within the community at the refusal of the Court Government to give any consideration, other than abuse, to those who present alternative courses of action to those determined by the Government. In particular all concerned citizens must be alarmed at the refusal of the Court Government to properly and openly evaluate or review the impact of large scale bauxite mining of forests and water supplies.
- (iii) That the decision and action of the S.P.L.P. on this issue were within the rules of the Party.

WHILST

The State Executive is of the belief that Australian political issues should be able to be resolved within the Australian constitutional processes:

- * It is recognised that trans-national corporations can be held accountable before the courts and under the laws of their parent nation.
- * The participation of a trans-national corporation in a multi-national venture in another nation does not absolve it of accountability in its parent nation.

* The right of Australia to control its corporations operating in other nations through Australian law is explicitly endorsed in Labor's Platform.

* In this context the A.L.P. recognises the right of Australian citizens to initiate actions or make representations to tribunals of other nations in relation to trans-national corporations operating in Australia.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Would you support the Conservation Council taking similar action in this State, if possible?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I understand it is not possible to take similar class actions in this State. As a member of the Labor Party, I support a change to the law to make it possible to take such class actions. I may or may not support a specific action.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Two bob each way.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would support the right of people to take class actions if they were established under our laws.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You did not say if you would support such action in this State.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would have to wait—

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: To get instructions from Trades Hall.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members to cease their interjections and their audible conversations that begin to give me the impression they are not listening to the speaker.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: As I was saying, I would have to wait and see what kind of class action was involved. I have never yet said I would support a similar kind of class action, because I understand that no similar action could be taken in Western Australia. I cannot say for sure because I do not know enough about the law. But on these matters I take advice from people more learned in the law than I. I have them on my right and my left, as it were. I wanted to read into the record what actually was said so people can see it and read it. I am not at all happy about the attitude of the Court Government in regard to jarrah forests and the extent of the operations in those forests, and I never have been. But I am not going to go into that matter in great detail.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Did you oppose the Wagerup agreement when it was in this House? Mr Dans and Mr Cloughton did.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I do not remember. We can look at *Hansard* to find out.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: If the motion says it is okay for an individual to take action, why is it improper for the party to take similar action?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The policy of the Labor Party is one that believes that as a party or a Government it should not appeal to foreign courts. We do not believe the party itself should indulge in this sort of activity or actively support such class actions.

To advocate the right of a person to do something does not mean it is necessarily something one would do oneself, or what one's party would do. It does not mean it is appropriate for one's party to do. To advocate the right for someone to do something is not necessarily to say that oneself would do it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You want two bob each way.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: The motion does not advocate the right; it simply recognises the right.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I thought that as a number of members were making my speech I should let my honourable friend have a few words.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It would be just as well for you to change the subject.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members on the front benches particularly, who ought to know better, to cease their interjections.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am not embarrassed, although the members who are interjecting might be. I had intended to change the subject some time ago. I promised someone I would not be too long and I have other things of importance to mention. I want to point to one or two things said in this House, because after listening to members in the Address-in-Reply I find some light has been thrown on the attitudes of members opposite. I want to make passing reference to small sections of three speeches—one by the Hon. Philip Lockyer, one by the Hon. Peter Wells, and one by the Hon. Win Piesse—which brought me no joy.

Last night the Hon. Philip Lockyer made some reference to the air hostesses' strike. He condemned the hostesses out of hand and called them irresponsible. Apparently he knew all about the issue.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: He said nothing of the sort. He called the unions irresponsible for calling them out.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Had he not been doing what he accuses me of doing—that is,

playing politics—he could have got in touch with them and pointed out the problem which faced the community and asked if they would man sufficient planes for school children to use. This would have been the sensible thing to do, although I do not know whether they would have said "Yes" or "No".

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The same would have happened to them as happened to the stewards who wanted to go back to work.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: One thing I did notice later on the news was that the dispute had been in train for six months and the employers had chosen that time to refuse their demands. I am not saying this is necessarily the case, but from where I stand it looks as though the employers chose to say "No" just before Easter knowing that the unions would probably go out on strike. The employers probably did this in order to point the finger at the unions and say "Look at what they are doing to the people over Easter."

This kind of provocation is not unknown among employers during industrial problems. If the honourable member wanted to make that sort of statement he should have found out more about the situation. Of course he did not really want the hostesses to man sufficient planes to serve the purpose about which he claimed to be talking; otherwise he may have taken other action.

I notice nearly every time the Hon. Peter Wells speaks about pornography he does not speak for very long or in great detail. I wish he would indicate whether he knows anything about it or what it is that is worrying him. He seems to assume that because pornography is about all sorts of things, something will happen; but he provides no evidence. I am wondering what kind of pornography he is talking about.

I have some concern about pornography. I do not know enough about it yet, and I have not seen a lot, but certainly I have seen what might be called straight heterosexual pornography where we see men and women performing sexual intercourse and performing cunnilingus and fellatio, and even two men entering one woman. It could be argued by the honourable gentleman that this sort of thing sets a bad example for young potential pack rapists. There is some evidence that has come out of Denmark which indicates that since pornography is easier to get hold of, incidents of rape have stayed about the same. There is less reporting and exposure of it.

The Hon. P. G. Pandal: That is only because those things are no longer classed as sexual

crimes. That is the reason the statistics have gone down.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I was about to point out that there was less reporting of indecent exposure, but it is thought this is because women do not bother about it anymore—they think it is trivial. Having seen it in photos they do not worry about seeing it in the flesh.

The report indicated there was little change in sex crimes. This is interesting, but not conclusive. There was some evidence to suggest there was a dramatic drop in child molestation. It was suggested by the people who wrote the article that the kind of people who molest children are those who are lonely and incapable of normal heterosexual relations. Instead of taking their feelings out on children they get away by themselves with their pornography and indulge in a little autoeroticism. I do not know whether the Hon. Peter Wells is worried about pornography with animals—pornography which shows people and animals having sexual relations. I have not seen this sort of thing and I do not particularly want to see it. I do not know whether it is anything we should worry about. I find the thought rather revolting, but that is a matter which depends on the person and the animal.

The Hon. P. H. Wells interjected.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am not suggesting anything, except that we should have a look at some examples. We should know what we are talking about and examine that. I would be interested to hear from the honourable gentleman what it is he is really concerned about, and then perhaps we could consider it. He seems to think naked bodies are pornographic. I do not find them so.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The latest reports from Sweden and Denmark indicate we should not follow their course.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am coming to that. If I were allowed to finish my remarks members might find I am not completely out of step with their thoughts. What is concerning me in this country is the growth of sadomasochistic pornography. I do not know if this inflames people, although it seems it might. I do not have the evidence.

It might provide models and examples for people who intend to commit sexual assaults and so they might do things they might not have thought of by themselves. Some victims may be more humiliated or injured than they would otherwise be, and this is a matter of concern.

I believe, along with others, that adult human beings should be able to read what they like, but problems remain.

I am also concerned with the growth of soft porn—it may even be hard porn, but I have not seen it—through home video cassettes. I notice the Minister for Police and Traffic is looking into this matter. Let me chalk this up: I agree with him once more that the matter should be looked into.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: You do agree with me on some points.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Is "the Mirror" his nickname?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would like to hear something in more detail from the Hon. Peter Wells in this regard, but what did concern me perhaps more were the comments made by the Hon. Win Piesse who has been in the House longer. Perhaps I expected better from her. She was concerned with the paper put forward by the—

The Hon. Neil Oliver: Who is making this speech?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I naturally turn to a lawyer to remember the name.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: Don't take their advice; it will cost you a lot of money.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It was a paper put forward by the Law Reform Commission which suggested there should be rights for children. What worried me was that although the honourable lady admitted there is a basis for concern, she seemed to think that what we should do is make sure parents behave themselves.

The Hon. W. M. Piesse: That is not right.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The reason this commission put forward these papers for discussion—I think they should be discussed—was that an enormous range of violence towards children and other young people is occurring in our society. If some parents were told what their children may or may not have done the parents would beat the children and do other appalling things to them. We must consider seriously at what stage of a child's life parents should not be informed of some of their children's activities. I do not know at what point one would draw the line—whether it should be at 12, 14, or 16 years of age—but I think the concept is something that should be discussed.

I do not think we should dismiss these things as some people dismiss the notion of sex education in schools by saying that we should teach parents to

educate their children. If parents were educating their children properly we would not have the problem before us. Because they are not, it is too late to teach them so we must do something about sex education and other things for children in our schools.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Take them to the farm; that is best.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: We should send you more than any of us to educate the parents!

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: If parents do their job properly they probably would not worry particularly that extra sex education is given at schools. When my children were young I did not worry that they had sex education at their school. They learnt a few things they had not been told, and learnt a bit more about a few things they had been told about in theory. When the Hon. Mick Gayfer—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Speak up, we like to hear you.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: —makes suggestions that it is not proper for people to learn about things from books or to learn from other people's experiences and mistakes, I believe he should try it some time. It is not just the practical men with practical experience who know everything. Sometimes they, too, have been known to make mistakes.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Very few.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I would suggest the same thing to some members opposite.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Sometimes the practical men read, too.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Yes, they do.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I think you really like talking about sex, that is my opinion.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I take exception to that remark, but I will not ask for it to be withdrawn because it is the kind of remark I expect to come from the honourable gentleman. As my friend to my right suggested, it was a puerile remark. It is a pity one cannot speak about quite important matters of decency without others saying one enjoys it. There are many social problems in our society which we must know and read about if we are to do something to solve them.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Some of the people in this House don't care about them.

The Hon. W. R. Withers interjected.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Some of them are interjecting.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I maintain my beliefs regardless of what members on the other side may say by way of interjection. The main burden of my remarks relates to the Bentley Senior High School. I hope the Hon. Phillip Pental does not feel upset by my remarks, because the Bentley Senior High School is in his electorate.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: It is a very fine high school.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It is fed by four primary schools; that is, the Wilson, Millen, Bentley and McKay Street Primary Schools, all of which are in my electorate. In other words, the majority of children attending the Bentley Senior High School live with their parents in my electorate and it is their parents' problems that I am worried about.

I might say in passing—I intended to mention this—that I always believe if a problem surfaces I must find out as much as I can about it.

A problem arose recently in Forrestfield about the detention facility proposed to be constructed there. One of the spinoffs as far as I was concerned was that I visited—no doubt, I enjoyed associating with the people concerned—the Longmoore and Riverbank establishments to determine what is involved in the kind of facility that it was suggested should be established at Forrestfield.

In this House I pay tribute to the work being done in the establishments I visited. Having learnt about them I was very pleased—perhaps, surprised, which possibly I should not have been—to see what was going on. I was quite happy to hear the attitudes expressed and see what was being done by the people running these institutions. I was quite shocked—perhaps I should not have been—by the number of children at Riverbank who could not read, tell the time, or measure, and, therefore, could not cope in our society. I was saddened by some of the remarks coming out of the Forrestfield affair that suggested these children were young criminals who had put themselves outside society and, therefore, should be exiled to Canning Vale and put among other criminals.

I want to repeat a remark made to me by one of the officers employed by the Department for Community Welfare. He said "I look forward to the day, if it ever happens, when a community says 'Put your detention facilities in our community and we will see what we can do to rehabilitate these children'." That is looking

forward a long way, but I hope the day will come. I accept what the Minister for Community Welfare said—that no harm was likely to come to the people of Forrestfield if the facility were put there. However, I also accept for various reasons I have outlined before that it was probably better not to have the facility beside the school. I also accept that when villages of old people already are settled in the area the old people would find it frightening to have such an establishment near them. When all matters are taken into consideration I think the decision by the Minister to have the facility not placed at Forrestfield was wise. I applaud his decision.

I think we should note what the Department for Community Welfare does in its institutions and applaud the efforts there made to help the children who for various reasons have found themselves outside the law. Some were not equipped by their upbringing to cope with society. In anger and violence they reacted against society and, finally, found themselves in strict security detention. It is very sad this should be. It is very sad our society cannot prevent this occurring. We cannot as yet, but I think it is something we should think about to determine how best we can overcome these problems.

I once more pay tribute to what is being done in these facilities. I regard it as a fortunate spinoff of the Forrestfield affair that I was galvanised into certain action, and had the opportunity to inspect what the department is doing. I have since met other people involved with these places and inspected other institutions.

I believe a member of Parliament should be better informed than I am; I have much to learn. It takes a long time to learn everything a member should.

Last night I went to a meeting of the P & C Association at Bentley Senior High School. This morning I received a telegram from Mr K. Stewart, the president of that P & C, which stated—

420 people—

I can vouch that there were over 350 people there earlier in the night. To continue—

... heard proposal to phase out Bentley High School and introduce senior college at meeting addressed by Doctor Mossenson last night. No speaker in support. Urgent objections raised. Further consideration essential.

I agree with the telegram that further consideration is essential. I was most interested to hear the arguments put by Dr Mossenson. In fairness I will lightly sketch them in because I

want to say why I disagree with them. It is a fact—this is beyond dispute—that the enrolments in schools around the area such as Bentley, Cannington, Como, and Kent Street High Schools, are dropping—and dropping quite rapidly. By 1988 some of them will have student enrolments down to approximately 400, and that situation is perturbing some people. It means some of the schools will have a great capacity in excess of the number of students they have.

One of the things said at the meeting by one officer of the Education Department to a colleague of mine, a member of Parliament in another place, was that Bentley Senior High School had 27 rooms locked. That is not the case; it has no room locked. The principal told me that from a particular point of view one might say they were living in some luxury. They had plenty of rooms and small classes, and as a result the children were benefiting greatly. He said from one point of view the school had a capacity to take in many more students and it would be possible to reduce the occupancy of rooms by the present students so that other rooms could be used for other purposes.

A question does arise out of this situation. It was not answered by the information I received relative to a question in another place about the ideal size of a school. I asked what the optimum size of a school should be. Some people argue the optimum size is between 600 and 700 students; some people put it at 600; some people put it higher; and others put it lower. I wonder what the experts in the Education Department put the figure at, and what sort of criteria they use to decide whether a school is too big or too small.

They agree that a school with more than 1 000 students is too big. Let me make it quite clear that Dr Mossenson, speaking on behalf of the department and, I presume, of the Minister for Education who was not there, made clear the department's position. I had hoped the Minister would attend, and I hope now he will attend the meeting to which he has been invited at the Tuart Hill Senior High School. Last night I happened to be the only politician at the meeting, so I did not think it right for me to make a party-political speech.

Dr Mossenson made it clear that the department had no desire to go back to the huge schools with more than 1 000 students. So, there seems to be some agreement that the optimum size should not be much above 900 students, but there seems to be no agreement on what the minimum size should be.

My own view, for what it is worth—and some members may say it is not worth much, but I have discussed the matter over a long period with a number of people—is that in one sense 900 students is too many. I believe that a school should have fewer than 750 students before it can obtain the relationship between students and staff which turns a school into a good living body where people can know each other and relate to each other usefully.

I am inclined to think that the school of 500 students is not too small, but it raises a problem which has been put by the Education Department. With a school of 500 or fewer students, the range of subjects that can be offered to that school is not as large as with a school of 900 students.

This reminds me of a question which has not been satisfactorily answered. The question was put last night by the Principal of the Bentley Senior High School. When there are schools as close together as the four senior high schools I have mentioned—that is, Como, Kent Street, Bentley, and Cannington—is it not possible to rationalise the process so that if some people want to undertake specific courses, they may travel the extra distance? Instead of going to, say, Kent Street, a student might prefer to travel to Cannington to do a special course.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: In fairness, do you not think that would make irate the parents of the children being forced to go double the distance. You are really only transferring the problem. Is that a valid comment?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I know that there are problems whichever way we try to solve it, but, on balance, I believe my suggestion may be preferable. Careful discussion, and careful public discussion, is required before decisions are made.

The Government and the Minister deserve the strongest criticism for the suddenness of the announcement. The matter may have been discussed in the department, but not anywhere else. I was appalled last night to hear the Director of Education—and I am not blaming him because I believe he had little choice—saying “Of course we believe in consultation; once a decision has been made we will discuss with the parents such things as what will happen with the year nine students.” In other words, consultation comes after Big Brother has made the decision. Consultation then takes place as to the best way to carry out the decision, but there is not too much of that consultation.

For a long time I fought for consultation in regard to the Belmont Senior High School. I am

glad we received some sort of consultation. I report on the Belmont Senior High School periodically when I speak to the Address-in-Reply debate, and I am glad to tell the House that at present everything is proceeding smoothly. Next week I will attend a meeting of the building committee, and I will find out more about what is happening. I am a little dismayed to find that the new building is to have a yellow roof, but that is a matter of taste. I am told that otherwise I will be perfectly satisfied with the building. I suppose some members opposite would be equally disturbed if the building had a red roof, and perhaps some of my colleagues would not like it to have a royal blue roof.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You should see the Manjimup School—it has a blue roof.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I have seen it and it is a fine school but its roof is blue, not royal blue. Consultation and discussion are quite important principles, and we have not seen any consultation and discussion. I wonder at the reason for this. I will say more on this matter later. Numbers are falling in the four schools concerned. Numbers are growing rapidly at the Leederville Technical College and at the Fremantle Technical College. In fact all the technical schools are feeling the pinch. Would it not be better to do something about the small Como School?

The Hon. P. G. Pental: Bentley is the most central. If we put the technical students into Como, people would have to travel from Cannington to get there. That is pretty obvious.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It is not pretty obvious. There are other arguments.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: You are pretty hard to convince.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am developing an argument, and I am not going to be convinced by a petulant interjection from the Hon. P. G. Pental. I intend to spell it out in rather more detail, and I hope the honourable member will bear with me because this is a very serious question, raising quite important education principles.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: I agree.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: On the evidence I have before me at present, the Government has made the wrong decision for the wrong reasons. I will develop that theme a little later. It is now proposed that we have senior colleges. This concept has been considered before at Albany. When there was an obvious need for a second high school, the Education Department put forward a proposal to develop a senior college

or a matriculation college based on a system used in Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory. Many people do not approve of such a system because they feel it is better for students in the whole five years to interrelate. Some educationists are coming round to the belief that we should stop segregating people in little boxes. In another context, a recent newspaper carried an article about apartheid on age—the segregation of old people from the rest of the community. Such a concept is wrong. However, we are tending to move towards compartmentalising people too much. This suits the bureaucrats—the people can be kept in central filing cabinets in separate buildings.

The Hon. P. G. Pendal: That is stupid.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: It is not stupid. It is a very serious problem and one that tends to grow. I would have thought that the honourable member who is interjecting, having been a member of the committee investigating QASOS, would be aware of some of the problems of Government instrumentalities. Quite often people develop a bureaucratic turn of mind to make things easier for themselves. Certainly some of the proposals I intend to put forward in a moment would make things difficult and complex, and some people may shrink away from them for that reason. It could be possible to argue that I am wrong. However, I was interested last night to hear that obviously the Principal of the Bentley Senior High School does not think I am wrong. He seemed to agree with the kind of things I have been saying for a long time, although he expressed them differently and better. So I assume he had thought of the ideas for himself. Whatever it was, I was pleased to hear him agreeing with many of my ideas.

We had had this proposal for senior colleges, and now we have a new proposal for a different kind of senior college, or perhaps it is a temporary step to try to achieve a senior college. Perhaps what we will finish up with, after the transitional period, is a senior transitional college being fed with students from three year-10 high schools. Is this the ultimate to be aimed for. That is not what we are being offered now. We are presented with the concept of a senior college which will admit adults undertaking TAE courses in technical schools as well as various other young people who may choose to return to school. There is the rub, and I will say more about it in a moment.

Not everyone in technical education is happy with the proposal. In this morning's edition of *The West Australian*, in a letter to the editor Mr G. A. Brennan—and the editor points out that he is the Principal of the Balga Technical College and

a member of the Executive of the State School Teachers' Union—refers to the Government's proposal. I would like to point out that Mr Brennan is a Past Principal of the Perth Technical College, and a gentleman I met when a problem arose about an Aboriginal course which was housed at that college. I am glad to say a former Minister for Education solved the problem when I made certain suggestions to him.

I have met Mr Brennan. He is a sensible and sane sort of person, and he impressed me as a decent and respectable principal. In his letter he had this to say—

Beware of Greeks bearing gifts. The State Cabinet would do well to keep this adage in mind in the execution of the Education Department's proposal to establish the so-called senior colleges at Bentley and Tuart Hill.

Certainly it makes good sense to utilise redundant secondary school buildings, but the supposition that this will save \$8 million is palpable nonsense. At best it will release a number of classrooms at Leederville and Fremantle technical colleges.

Additional recurrent cost for administering the two colleges will be at least \$200 000 dollars annually.

There seems little doubt that the colleges will be conducted under the aegis of the secondary division. If so, they will not attract any of the Commonwealth tertiary funding enjoyed by the TAFE (Tertiary And Further Education) colleges.

The main losers will of course be the students—not only the secondary students who will be displaced, but the "second-chance" TAE students, who will no longer benefit by the more mature and practical atmosphere of a TAFE institution.

The entire operation smacks of deviousness and secrecy: Students, parents and teachers were not consulted. The fact that the two high schools to be absorbed are in Labor electorates may be coincidental—

I believe it is not coincidental.

The Hon. P. G. Pendal: You give some evidence of that.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will explain it to the member later.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Mr Pendal thinks it is arrant nonsense.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I will be glad if the Hon. P. G. Pental will allow me to develop my argument.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It is not your argument; it is someone else's argument.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am developing a total argument for myself, and I am using someone's argument to build up my argument.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: You seem to forget that the seat of Clontarf is held by a Government member.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: The letter continues—

—but a deliberate intention to suppress the level of discussion normally expected in a free society appears evident.

The Teachers' Union was first consulted, or rather briefed, on Monday. The Cabinet announcement was published on Tuesday.

Such actions can only strengthen the hand of those teachers who wish to see the union make stronger industrial alliances.

Militarily the tactics may be sound, but educationally, socially and politically they must be seen to lack wisdom.

One matter that troubles me about this proposal is what it will do to technical schools. Technical schools should encompass TAE courses. We should be trying to make it possible for students who primarily undertake vocational courses at technical colleges to take also some TAE subjects if they get a taste to expand their horizons educationally.

We need multipurpose institutions, and if we take the TAE students away from technical colleges, we will turn the technical colleges into vocational colleges, or something very near that. This would be a shame and quite undesirable. I applaud the Government's policy in relation to technical and further education. This sector should be expanded, but it should not be expanded and dismembered at this stage. The opportunity must be there for vocational students at technical colleges to take other units if desired so that they can achieve some kind of mix. We should encourage them to do this. So from the point of view of the technical colleges, the Government's proposal is educationally undesirable.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Before I return to the main burden of my speech, I might say that during the tea suspension the Hon. Philip Lockyer informed me that despite his rather

harsh remarks, he has been negotiating with the airline hostesses, with no success at present. At least he has been trying to do the right thing.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What has he been negotiating about?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: To try to have them take the children home.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: I thank you for that.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Before the tea break, I had reached the stage where I said I believed that to take the adults and the TAE people out of the technical schools would be to the detriment of the technical schools. Another important matter is that we need to use our excess capacities in high schools for the provision of community services. It is most important that we have a sense of community.

Had we won the last election, and had I become the Minister for Education, it was my intention to make the Belmont High School a pilot project for developing a community school. I had looked at the community colleges in the United Kingdom. Instead of following them blindly, we could develop community schools in this State. One of the things that the centralisation of the senior college will do is to cut across the possibility of the women who are homemakers, but who want to continue their education, having available to them a school that they can attend. They should be encouraged to attend a school; and we should make it possible for them to enter that school, not necessarily for scholastic purposes. Perhaps they would then take the next step.

It is important that we make education available to all people. I suggest to the Hon. Phillip Pental, as he is one of the few members on the other side who will read, that he read Robert Nesbitt's book *Quest for Community or Community and Power*.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: "Can read" or "will read"?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: He can read. I do not think he has read the book. If he has not, I recommend it to him as a book worth reading. It stresses the importance of developing a sense of community in our modern world. If we have a sense of community, we have a sense of belonging; and we have a place where people can be educated, can spend their leisure time, and can develop themselves in their own community. In that way, we might be rid of some of the problems of violence that are troubling us. For this reason, the notion of developing a senior college is a bad notion.

The Hon. Phillip Pandal said to me earlier that if we rationalised courses children would have to travel too far. As a boy when I went to school in Victoria, I walked for 10 minutes to a train, rode in the train for 20 minutes, and then walked for 10 minutes at the other end; and it did me no harm. By comparison, the amount of bussing that would be done even to the Cannington High School would be comparatively minor. It would not necessarily cause many problems to the students. However, I agree it is something that should be considered and discussed.

A decision has been made without adequate discussion. I wonder why a senior college, and why at Bentley? One of the things I noticed last night, when I was listening most intently to Dr Mossenson when he was talking at the Bentley P & C meeting to the 400-odd people who were there, was that he kept assuring us that adults had been well received into the high schools. He said that quite often they had made a change in the behaviour and the dedication of the younger students who were there; and that was a good thing. Yet he kept coming back to the fact that in Bentley, for some reason, this would not happen—that the adult students would be a disruptive influence. There seemed to be an hiatus.

It all became clear to me when I was talking to a member of the WACSSO executive who had interviewed the Minister. That man has told me I can say this. He told me that what worried the Minister when they spoke to him was that he had to find somewhere—make sure he had some place—to put the 16 and 17-year-olds when the Fraser Government removed the unemployment relief from them. Suddenly the haste made sense!

It is becoming far too apparent that the word has gone out that in the next Budget there will be no unemployment relief for school leavers up to the age of 18, in an attempt to force them back to school. This will apply from next year; so the Bentley High School and Tuart Hill High School have to be vacated partly in order to make places for those forced students who will be press-ganged into being educated. In my opinion, that is deplorable. It is a terrible thing to do.

I listened to Dr Mossenson, who said "Isn't it wonderful to give people a second chance when they have failed?" I agree with that. There are many people who for all kinds of reasons go out of the school system inadequately educated. There are problems with the home environment, motivation, and a whole range of other reasons; and they need a second chance. I have said this in the House before; and I could not agree more with the concept. However, they will not make the

best of that second chance unless they want to go back to school.

These people should be given the unemployment relief if they cannot obtain jobs, till they find out what the world is like, and they find out what they want to do. If they have to be forced back into school or into the technical colleges, it seems that this much-vaunted senior college will look more like a junior workhouse. The Bentley Senior High School will become the Bentley bastille—

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Very extravagant words!

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: —yes, very extravagant words for an extravagant action—to force young people back into school and to make sure they are disciplined into the three Rs. This is what is happening, and it is wrong. Then the answer to the question "Why Bentley", becomes clear.

The Hon. J. G. Pratt: Why do you think they will be forced back?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Because the people who go to Bentley come from my electorate, which has a high incidence of unemployment. They are the people the Government wants to go back to school. The Government says "Well, either you go back to school, or you stay at home with nothing to do." The pressure will be on those people; and that is deplorable.

It is disgraceful. I disapprove of the Fraser Government's attitude to education, as I have said consistently since I came into this House. In one of the first speeches I made, if not in my maiden speech, I said "Even if you allowed that the Fraser Government's economic policies were correct"—which I do not—"in a time of economic reconstruction and structural change to the economy, we have to spend more money on education to make sure that people are better educated than they used to be because there will be less labour-intensive industries to mop them up." That applies still.

If we want a sense of community, we should not press-gang such people back to school. In that way, they would become totally alienated because of the pressures on them. Such a proposal is deplorable.

It is not surprising that this action has been taken in such a rush, with no discussion. It is not surprising that the 420 people who were at Bentley last night opposed what was going on. I am not surprised that Sir Charles Court, the Premier of this State, would receive a letter from parents representing the Tuart Hill Senior High

School, the Tuart Hill Primary School, the Tuart Hill Junior Primary School, the Yokine Primary School, the Osborne Park Primary School, the Mt. Hawthorn Primary School, the Bentley Senior High School, the Bentley Primary School, the Wilson Primary School, and the McKay Street Primary School. They are unanimous in their opposition to this.

If this concept were such a good one, and if it were to work so well, it should have been discussed openly and persuasively. Dr Mossenson was persuasive last night. I am always impressed by him when he develops his themes. This situation was not his fault. He could not say that the Government was being pushed by Canberra. He could not say that the Government was not prepared to have public scrutiny—that it had to make its decisions now to scramble the egg so it was impossible to unscramble it. In my opinion, this decision is to the detriment of the technical schools and to the detriment of the high schools, to the detriment of the students going to those schools, and to the detriment of the community of Western Australia. Therefore, I deplore this strongly.

If I had time, I would read a letter from one of the students who is most upset by the decision. However, I will not read it because I promised I would not spend too much more time in this debate, in order to allow other people to join in.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: Do you favour an extension of technical training?

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I am sorry that the honourable gentleman was not listening earlier. I said quite specifically and clearly that I approved of the extension of the TAFE sector. Had we been elected as the Government, I had plans to extend the TAFE sector. I had plans to set up a TAFE authority. I had picked out a chairman of that authority, if he had been prepared to accept appointment. Certainly I believe that the technical and further education section should be expanded. There should be far more flexibility in the system.

A Government member interjected.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: If the gentleman on my left wing would keep quiet, I will finish. We need far more flexibility in the system. What is being done by this Government is of dubious morality, and it is dubious educationally. It ossifies the system, and it does not make it more flexible.

A Government member interjected.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Therefore the Government's action is to be deplored strongly. It is a disgraceful action, and I would

regard it as an immoral action. I cannot speak too strongly against it.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: It is about time; but why bring it up now?

THE HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [7.45 p.m.]: I used to think of boats parked on the front lawns of many homes—boats with the lawn growing up over their axles and wheels—as status symbols not only in cities, but also in country towns. I am sure most of the boats one sees parked on lawns are seldom used; in fact, I doubt whether they would function without a great deal of trouble and effort. It is clear they are only status symbols.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: My boat is on the front lawn, but it goes.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Perhaps people bought these boats to keep up with the people next door—the Dans' and others. However, I should like to talk about another status symbol which has appeared recently and it is not necessarily cheaper to own, but it is certainly cheaper to buy than a boat.

This status symbol can be a little more expensive than a boat if it takes to the road. It is equally as dangerous when out of control and, above all, it is a symbol of strength. To the average Australian it represents the attitude "I'm all right Jack and to hell with everyone else".

The status symbol of which I am speaking is even better than the power boat, because it can be shared equally by country or city people and it can be turned away at will and replaced at no cost whatsoever. Of course, I am referring to the Alsatian dog.

I must apologise to my electorate for supporting the removal of laws which has made the Alsatian dog the frightening force it is in our community, especially in country towns and on adjoining farming land.

I am not being facetious when I say that, wherever one travels now, this symbol of authority suddenly appears. It runs down the main street and it can be seen cavorting and frolicking with other Alsatis behind four-foot house fences. Alsatian dogs were a rarity only 12 to 18 months ago. However, we in our wisdom or otherwise, succumbed to the pressures of people within our own ranks and finally voted to turn the tables, as it were, and allow the Alsatian dog to remain fertile and to continue his breeding habits in traditional style, thus producing young with the free abandon he certainly has at the present moment.

I am particularly concerned about this measure. If people kept Alsations on a chain or inside their own yards, the situation would not be so bad. If people kept Alsations under control inside their vehicles, rather than sitting on the backs of utilities or thrusting their heads out of windows barking ferociously, the situation would be better. However, when Alsations are allowed to roam, particularly in country towns and adjoining fields which are grazed by sheep, it is a different matter. I am not saying other dogs do not do this also, but other dogs are a great deal easier to catch and control than are hungry Alsations.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: They did a lot of damage down at the university recently.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I have just received a skit from one of the Clerks which, if I read it, would indicate how much trouble these dogs can be.

In all seriousness, we must have another look at this matter. We gave way under the principle that Alsations were needed and were a great help as watch dogs. These dogs it was claimed have everything going for them and we listened to the arguments. However, Alsations and other large dogs are becoming an embarrassment to society.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: Particularly when they bite people.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: All dogs bite, but these large dogs on the loose are of no use whatsoever. They can eat a sheep a week whether it is given to them out of the refrigerator or whether they catch it themselves. I do not see how society or the owners of these dogs have been improved as a result of their prolific breeding.

I do not mind members of the German Shepherd Dog Association owning Alsations and I do not mind people who are familiar with dogs having one as a pet, but the situation has gone beyond that and the ordinary person wants a dog as a status symbol. That is all it is and these dogs terrify older people who are not quick enough to jump over a fence or cross to the other side of the road. I am frightened of these dogs myself.

The Hon. Tom Knight: Try going to the beach and finding a place to put down your rug.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not go to a beach and put down a rug.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He takes his caravan.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Perhaps we should license the dog owner instead of the dog.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The member who has just interjected could be right. It was suggested and, of course, it was said in the Assembly that when the operation was performed

on the Alsatian dog, it was performed on the wrong end of the dog. I think that could be right, because the other end is the dangerous end as far as I am concerned. I shall explain that to Miss Elliott later.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: I did not hear it all, but I think that was a chauvinistic comment.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It was definitely a masculine comment.

On 28 January 1928 the following comment was made—

We have six States, poor and needy and a rich, bloated Commonwealth ending each year with fat surpluses that are the sign manual of bad government . . . Bit by bit the Federal authority is growing, at the expense of the States. We are drifting as sure as fate towards unification. That means ruin. This enormous country cannot be governed from a political centre by men almost entirely ignorant of conditions in the far corners of the land.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Said by a Country Party man no doubt.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Of course, a number of members here will recall that was said by a Labor statesman (Mr Collier) and not by a National Country Party statesman.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I mentioned him inadvertently last night.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not believe truer words than those have been said. Indeed, they are true to this day and yet they were uttered in 1928; that is, 27 years after federation. Today, 80 years after federation, they are as true as when they were said by Phil Collier. He was supported by Sir James Mitchell, Sir Charles Latham, and quite a number of other members from all sides of the House. In fact, it was proved that his words were supported by the majority of Western Australians.

It does one good to look back in history and to see that the original plebiscite for federation was carried by about only 500 votes and the 1933 plebiscite for secession was carried overwhelmingly.

The same problems have existed over the years and despite the many constitutional conventions which have been held from the 1920s to the 1960s—our Attorneys General have attended many—there has been no real change that can undo the great wrongs—I do not believe one could describe the situation differently—which are at present being imposed by the Commonwealth Government on the States.

I believe section 87 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia was one of the many framed at the convention in South Australia in 1897 and it reads as follows—

During a period of ten years after the establishment of the Commonwealth and thereafter until the Parliament otherwise provides, of the net revenue of the Commonwealth from duties of customs and of excise not more than one-fourth shall be applied annually by the Commonwealth towards its expenditure. The balance shall, in accordance with this Constitution, be paid to the several States, or applied towards the payment of interest on debts of the several States taken over by the Commonwealth.

What is happening is legend. There is no need for me to reiterate to the House the current position. As has been mentioned frequently in this Chamber by some great authorities on the subject, in 1942 we lost our taxing powers as a result of a war-time measure.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We are going to get some taxing powers back shortly.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: Mr Dans has a crystal ball.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you like a little wager on that?

The Hon. P. G. Pental: You will have to ask Mr Wran.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: As a result of a war-time measure in 1942, the States lost their taxing powers and the delegates at constitutional conventions since then have been endeavouring, amongst other things, to have these powers returned to the States.

Not only does the Constitution contain regulations governing taxing powers, but also High Court rulings which have been made over the years have made it more difficult for the States to introduce any of the taxing measures which, before the war, were the rights and prerogatives of the States.

As we know, most legislative powers and responsibilities have remained with the States, but many of the financial resources available are now under Commonwealth control. I understand the task of all constitutional conventions has been to break this control. Out of every dollar paid in taxation, 70c goes to the Commonwealth Government, but the States are expected to finance the Police Force, hospitals, roads, housing, sewerage, rail services, and provide stable law courts. The States are responsible for the provision of all facilities which make life

worth living. However, all the States have been involved in a long procession to the Commonwealth in an endeavour to regain at least some of the taxes which have been paid.

Of recent times I have been amazed to realise exactly how much power is wielded by Canberra not only on the Commonwealth side, but also on the States as a whole. We see the annual pilgrimage of Premiers and Ministers crawling to Canberra as if to some mecca of another world, there to receive some small reward for their endeavours or perhaps an absolution of any sin they may have committed. This is what is going on today.

The Premier of Western Australia (Sir Charles Court), astute businessman that he is, should start to wave the big stick of secession.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You have to be joking!

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: At least he should talk of Western Australia as a State on its own and we, as Western Australians, should be looking at the situation. That applies not only in the Commonwealth governing sphere but also in business and industrial relationships. It applies in the law courts as well and in fact, it applies in every walk of life where federalism or centralism is supposed to be the ideal of living in Australia.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That is romantic piffle.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: There is a lot of support for it.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: There is more and more support for it.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is an attractive idea which I do not wish to experience.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is perhaps not as practical as Mr Dowding and Mr Olney and others would wish it to be.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: I suppose we could make it a republic and Sir Charles Court could be president.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not care whether it is Sir Charles Court or who it is.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You could genuflect to him.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: I will treat that remark with the insignificance it deserves; as my colleague would say.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: If we look at the trade of Western Australia in 1978, 1979, and 1980 and take into consideration the imports and exports from other States, we will note that \$2.5 billion-worth of goods were actually exported to

other States and \$636 million-worth were imported to this State. Those amounts represent the total imports and exports for 1978 and 1980.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Where will we obtain fuel to run our cars? Overseas?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: If it is necessary we will trade overseas, but at the present time it is quite likely that our fuel will come from within Western Australia.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You want to be careful, you might have to join with us all.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I shudder to think what may happen if we had to live in a Labor Party secessionist State; we would all be broke. We have a lot of fuel in our own country and in our own State.

We need the Commonwealth Government to recognise how big this State is and what it requires to make it go. However, that recognition is not forthcoming from the Federal Government at the present time and was not forthcoming under a Labor Government.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (the Hon. V. J. Ferry): Order!

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Western Australia imported from New South Wales \$911 958 000-worth of goods in 1979-80 and exported to that State \$282 108 000-worth of goods. We imported from Victoria \$1 038 427 000-worth of goods and exported \$168 million-worth of goods to Victoria. Western Australia imported double the amount it exported to Queensland and imported from South Australia $2\frac{1}{2}$ times that which we exported to that State. We imported almost five times as much as we exported to Tasmania and we imported one-quarter of what we exported to the Northern Territory.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That proves that we have nothing to export to them.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is correct. However, Mr Dans, overseas—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is a different story.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: —is another story. In 1976-77 we imported \$29 million-worth of goods from Canada and exported to that country \$34 million-worth of goods. We imported \$8 million-worth of goods from France and exported to that country \$51 million-worth of goods.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I will not dispute that.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: We imported \$31 918 000-worth of goods from the Republic of Germany and we exported to that country \$110 853 000-worth of goods. With trade with

Greece, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, Sweden, USSR, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom, the balance was working in Western Australia's favour, yet when we consider our sister States it is a different story; and, it is not funny.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It is a different picture.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: As a businessman, I know where I would want to go if I wished to sell the goods from my shop.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We do not have a manufacturing base in this State.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: One of the reasons that we do not have a manufacturing base in this State is because the power to invoke customs and excise has been taken away from us by the Commonwealth. Now, everything, under section 96 can come across the border quite freely and that fact alone proves my point.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Do you believe in tariffs?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not believe in tariffs except where they protect this State. I do not believe tariffs are protecting this State at the present time. As a matter of fact, I can give a discourse on tariffs in this State which could make the member blush.

It is quite amusing when we consider the first argument Western Australia had with the Commonwealth Government on tariffs was about railway engines. The Commonwealth Government wanted them to be imported from England because they could not be supplied here. The Commonwealth Government imposed an import tax of £32 000 on it—if my memory serves me correctly. We were to be charged interest on that, as a national debt. That is how crazy it can be. Somehow or somewhere along the line we must think more seriously about going it alone. We must try to get back to a more favourable position and I am not speaking only about being governed by the Commonwealth; I am speaking about our own members of Parliament.

Members of Parliament who must travel to Canberra are often tired from travel when they arrive and are hurt by the rebuffs when they are trying to establish the importance of what they represent. Often, they finally succumb and stop trying to swim against the stream, and join in as one in the functions of the Canberra club. They lose all interest in this State; that is nothing new, but it is a sad fact of life that our representatives, after travelling many, many miles, often forget we exist.

Often, we are so insignificant that the appointments we make in Canberra are not always kept. I have been known to fly to Canberra, leaving at midnight and having a two-hour wait in Melbourne. I have then sat around at Parliament House with other members from other States, only to be told eventually that the person we wished to see was unable to see us, but of course we would understand. So, there is that magnificent expensive flight home, the same evening, in the knowledge that nothing has been achieved and that the effort will have to be made again.

The pilgrimage to Canberra is something which has to be experienced to be realised and only Western Australians could understand how it feels. Very often, when the appointment is honoured, time is such that it is too precious to waste talking to a prodigal son from the west. All these people wish to do is finish the interview and the same platitudes and promises are made, but rarely kept. Often they bear no consequence to the particular scene of activity and, after all, they do not know where Western Australia is or if it really exists.

It is a sorry state and it is growing. If we do not watch it we will be in the situation as stated by Mr Collier 50 years ago. Even the captains of industry and others controlling industrial matters are removed from the active scene; they are languishing in the atmosphere of Canberra.

We all know that that is a fact because it is a case of bringing those wise men from the east to obtain their views because they are the captains of industry. The huge cost of bringing over such people to Western Australia is enormous. Mr Dans knows this fact. It could cost \$2 000 a day just to get certain "silk" to represent one in one's particular case, when we have the "silk" to do the job here for \$1 250 a day, as Mr Olney charges.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You are putting Mr Olney on the spot with the barristers' board because his charge is below the real charge.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: That is about three times the charge.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Certain sets of rules are applicable in the Eastern States perhaps, but they are not applicable to the conditions in Western Australia. However, because of the rubber stamps which are used in the main by bureaucrats who have no interest in the back paddocks of Australia, that is what happens to us here in Western Australia. They could not care less about us.

All they are happy about is living in the magnificent citadel of Canberra; that citadel

which is supposed to look after Western Australia and the other States is not even built where it should be. Mr Berinson knows that it should be in Alice Springs.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: God forbid. That is going too far.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is exactly where it should have been. It was built where it is only to satisfy the jealousies of two warring States—New South Wales and Victoria—and Mr Berinson will not argue about that. Ever since it was built, those two States have been warring about who should be in control of Canberra.

Mr Berinson is aware of the problems which occurred in those States when Mr Holt died. Mr McEwen filled the position for a while, then Mr Gorton became another Melbournian to be elected as the Prime Minister. The story came out of Sydney immediately that it was time that State had a Prime Minister. We can all remember the ruckus over Mr McMahon's appointment. His life was hell until the job was taken over by Gough Whitlam, with his force behind him. There may have been others in between, but I cannot remember them at the moment.

It is this alternating jealousy which has caused members of Parliament to become Prime Minister only if they come from one or other of the two States.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: We had to rely on the Labor Party to produce a Prime Minister from Western Australia.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, the Labor Party did a good job. The Western Australians of that day were statesmen and the Labor Party was a middle-of-the-road party. We enjoyed hearing a little bit of philosophy from Labor members at that time. But those days have gone and we cannot expect ever to have the same sort of statesmanlike attitude from the Labor Party in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You are not suggesting you are getting it from anywhere else at present?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: We are not getting it elsewhere, because I have not seen anybody representing the Labor Party exhibit such an attitude.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Our leaders always became good posthumously. That is the problem.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are not wrong.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What is the present Prime Minister's name—Mac the Knife?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The whole matter is a joke; I realise that. Possibly that is the way most people look at it. However, whilst I am an

Australian—and very much an Australian—I am fast coming to the belief that something must be done. Mr Pendal said a while ago that this sort of atmosphere is building up and I agree with him. We have had Canberra; we have had the dictates of that place. The people I have mentioned are sick of paying huge prices for products that come from the east.

Western Australia is close to markets it wants to establish in Indonesia and other parts of the South-East Asian continent in respect of which we have to take our turn with the other States, and usually at the back of the queue. These are markets we should be satisfying and encouraging; in general we should be trying to ensure they are permanent markets for Western Australia.

Even in the matter of defence I read some of the comments made by Mr Hayden when he visited Western Australia recently. In my opinion he was a very lucky man to have been shown around the defence installations. I do not know of many countries in the world where the Leader of the Opposition would be shown through such installations and allowed to criticise them freely in the Press; that is, to criticise the nation's top secrets, as it were. I thought it was a magnificent gesture on the part of the Prime Minister to allow that to happen.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Would you expect a Labor Prime Minister to do the same?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I would, but I do not think he would.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Of course he did. Don't be ridiculous.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Does Mr Berinson believe that?

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: It is a fact.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Is it?

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: It certainly is. As a matter of fact the widest access was given to members of the Opposition during the last Labor Government. It set the pattern which has been followed, and there is nothing wrong with that.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, like Chifley calling in the troops to smash strikes.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: What on earth has that to do with giving the Opposition access to information? I thought that is what you were talking about.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Getting back to you, Sir—

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: By all means change the subject.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER:—I must admit I thought it was pretty big of the Prime Minister to allow that to happen. However, I do not think as much of Mr Hayden in respect of some of his comments following his visit. As a matter of fact, he gave me the awful impression that he did not particularly want any bases whatsoever to be in Australia, and in Western Australia in particular.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: The people at Exmouth didn't like it either.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am most content to have these bases here. Mr Hetherington expressed fear about nuclear war. Today I listened to the Press Club discussion with the admiral in charge of the British fleet, and I noticed the people concerned were quite content to believe the wisdom of a man senior in defence when he spoke of the importance of Cockburn Sound and Exmouth to the Indian Ocean as a peace-keeping zone. There is no way it will ever be made a peace-keeping zone by pulling our ships out of the arena.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You do not believe in peace, Mr Gayfer?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do believe in peace, very much so—

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You do not believe in doing something strongly to promote it?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER:—however, if the people staring at me from the other side of the fence are armed to the teeth and determined to take what I have, I will not lie down and be walked upon.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Do you believe we should have a nuclear base in Cockburn Sound?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not know that I am so worried about it. I think a little hysteria is attached to this matter. If the bomb bursts, it could be there or anywhere. I am not one of those who is going into a pit; Mr Hetherington has told me I am too old.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Do you have any grandchildren?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am luckier than Miss Elliott; I have eight grandchildren.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You should worry about them.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do greatly; it is the other people who do not worry about them who concern me. My God, if they are going to kick my kids in the teeth I am going to belt them up good and proper. That is where I stand on the issue.

We have really got something going for us in Western Australia. We started off here with a boatload of people, and it is not so long ago we celebrated our 150th anniversary. Mr MacKinnon should know about that, because he organised it. What a start we would have! We could make this place a colony and start off with 1.25 million people all putting their shoulders to the wheel and really working like Western Australians with the idea of making this State greater. It is my believe we can do that and should do it.

When the Premier goes to the Premiers' Conference on 4 May he should not pussyfoot around with the Commonwealth Government. He should tell the Commonwealth straight away that if there is any way that Western Australia could break its ties with the Commonwealth he will see it is done. It is no good complaining, because the Commonwealth Government does not understand that sort of thing. It is simply a matter of showing the Commonwealth that we mean business. I am sure the Premier would have the support of the people if he did just that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What would happen if the Prime Minister said "Here is the key to the State. You are on your own"?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Good! We would be so far in front we would be lonely.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: You could not hit us with a .303.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Does Mr Dans know that Western Australia produces 28 per cent of the grain crop of Australia? Just imagine what we could do with that as a starting point, without taking into account the iron ore, gold, and other untapped resources of the State. Mr Dowding is worrying about oil and wondering what we will run our cars on. I am not a bit worried about that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I cannot see it as a practical proposition.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: If ethanol cannot be produced in the north of this State, I am not here. One of the best things to help people get by is to be hard up for a while, then they will find out how to do it. This State would go; and it certainly will not go while it is under the thumb of people in Canberra who do not understand us and who could not care less about us. The part that irritates me most is the fact that they could not care less about us. I flew to Melbourne and back last Monday to attend a completely abortive meeting.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is not unusual.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: No it is not, but it is not good enough. It is happening all the time. One takes a 727 across to the east and it is filled with people making a pilgrimage. They go to the east to bend their knees and implore somebody to do something for Western Australia. We should be jacking up about that and not standing here and saying "It is just too bad. We have to do something. The Government has to spend more money." Mr Hetherington said the Government should spend more money to provide a school; we have to go to Canberra and ask for money to provide that school, and also to provide the water pipeline for Mr Knight in Kendenup, or wherever it was.

Instead of asking the Commonwealth for money we should be getting back from the Commonwealth three-quarters of the taxation it receives from Western Australia. The State should be able to split up that money itself and to allocate it in the way it wants to. What is this Commonwealth Government which suddenly wants to take control from the States? The States appointed the Commonwealth! What right on earth has it to come in, take over, and tell the States what do do?

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not arguing with you.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr Dans is, because he is happy to be subservient to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I am not arguing with you, but let us get it right. The States exist as a result of the Commonwealth. You have the Constitution in front of you.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I have read the Constitution.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr Medcalf might be able to help you.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Funnily enough, if I recall correctly my notes from the various constitutional conventions I have attended, Mr Medcalf has argued along lines similar to mine. If he was not, then he was arguing against the States.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: The States created the Commonwealth.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Yes, that is what I am trying to tell Mr Dans.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is true, but the States exist as a result of the federation.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: He just said the opposite thing.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is the basis of my whole argument. If the States created the

Commonwealth the States can tear down the Commonwealth or pull it into gear. It is not for the Prime Minister and other Federal Ministers to be telling us what to do; we should have the power to tell them what to do and how to do it. We are the ones who set the Federal Government up in Canberra—in that citadel, that mecca. Who are we to go on annual pilgrimages? We are the ones who have given them their swollen heads.

I have pointed out what has happened, and it must be undone. Even trade unions are run from the east, and Mr Dans knows that.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Very few are run from the west at present, and they are becoming fewer.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is right; some have a little autonomy, so they say, but they are still governed from over there. I was amused last night when Mr MacKinnon gave me a Press release of the Minister for Transport (Mr Cyril Rushton) which said Mr Rushton announced that Cabinet had agreed that Western Australia would reluctantly accept a new national policy on emission control. Reluctantly! Who the devil are we that we have to reluctantly accept anything? In the Press release the Minister said also that evidence showed the new policy would be more expensive than the continuation of the present policy, and because of that he would have preferred the States to delay the decision. Why do not we delay the decision? Are we frightened of the Eastern States because they might stop some of their motor vehicles coming over here? Why are we not in a position to institute a tax at the border to keep out motor vehicles from the east?

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Don't do that.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Why not? Even the Minister for Lands came from Tasmania to make a living over here, and he has succeeded.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He is an import.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is right. We got him from Tasmania and he is happier here than he was in Tassie. He is a debit, but after he has been here 20 years he might be a credit!

It is so irritating to read things such as that Press release, and it is of no use pulling more of them out of the files. They are present every day in every paper. A person can pull out reams and reams of them.

We should be very sorry to have a system whereby we are voluntarily succumbing to this sort of subservience to the Federal Government. I repeat: Our Federal politicians are absolutely no help to us. They try when they first enter the Federal Parliament; they are full of high hopes. But come another six months and they are just

sitting back licking their wounds like everyone who has ever gone there before them.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: It is called "Canberraitis".

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not know what it is, but Mr Pike and I would suffer in the same way. It gives me the horrors every time I go there. They are always too busy to talk to us. They are flat out. God knows what they are doing for Western Australia; but they are too busy to talk to anyone. I had better get on to another subject!

I think everyone in this Chamber would be very disappointed if I sat down without giving my current views of the RTA.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You had better get back to Canberra.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Is this *sub judice*?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is quite a serious matter. I shall read the document I have here and I will ask the President whether or not I can continue on this subject. I would like him to deliberate on this matter. I do not want particularly to carry on because it might be better for me if certain things were not said. However, the document I have here is something that, frankly, as a citizen I do not know what the next step is arising from it. I will read it out because, for a man who had a taillight out just before Christmas, I find it rather interesting. It reads—

FOR SERVICE

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Appeal No. 40 of 1981
IN THE MATTER of the Justices
Act, 1902-1980

and
IN THE MATTER of Complaint
No. 647 of 1980 heard and
determined on the 9th day of
January, 1981 by D. W. S. Brown,
Esquire, Stipendiary Magistrate

BETWEEN:

RIGO ALBERT GIMM
Appellant
(Complainant)
and
HARRY WALTER GAYFER
Respondent
(Defendant)

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE
MR JUSTICE WICKHAM IN
CHAMBERS THE 6TH DAY OF
MARCH, 1981

UPON the application of the Appellant (Complainant) by Motion dated the 4th day of March, 1980 AND UPON HEARING Counsel for him IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The abovenamed Respondent (Defendant) do show cause before the Full Court of the Supreme Court at Perth why the decision on the abovementioned

complaint should not be reviewed on the grounds:

- (1) That the Magistrate misdirected himself as to the criteria appropriate to the use of Section 669(1)(a) of the Criminal Code in that he (a) took account of matters not relevant to the exercise of his discretion namely

- (i) the result of the analysis of a blood sample taken subsequent to the offence and which had no bearing on the offence, and
- (ii) the effect of the provisions of Section 106 of the Road Traffic Act, 1974 if he had proceeded to conviction

and (b) took no or no sufficient account of matters relevant to the exercise of his discretion under Section 669(1)(a) of the Criminal Code, namely:

- (i) the youth of the Defendant;
- (ii) the character of the Defendant;
- (iii) the antecedents of the Defendant; and
- (iv) the nature of the offence itself.

- (2) that the Magistrate misdirected himself as to the criteria appropriate to a decision pursuant to Section 6 of the Official Prosecutions (Defendant's Costs) Act 1973 ordering that a successful Defendant is not entitled to his costs in that he:

- (a) took account of matters not relevant to the exercise of his discretion, namely:

- (i) the fact that the Magistrate felt that the charge should not have been brought at all and

- (b) took no or no sufficient account of matters relevant to the exercise of his discretion namely: (1) the fact that he had found the charge proved, and

- (2) the fact that he had dismissed the charge under Section 669(1)(a) of the Criminal Code

copy of the original. I know what it means. As a humble person I realise I have to go to the Supreme Court. There the Full Bench of three judges will line up and no doubt I will have to appear before them. I do not think the matter is *sub judice* because I do not know even the date this is to be heard. These papers were not served on me personally so I am a little loath to decide whether I should speak about them. I am sure members will understand the dilemma facing me. I do not think it is presently *sub judice*, although I have a horrible feeling it is going to be!

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I will give you some good advice; you should engage Mr Olney right now.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: He is the best of a bad bunch.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I had thought of engaging a QC. My last representative was engaged as a result of advice from a very close friend sitting in the Chamber at the moment. His advice was that I engage a local lawyer. He was pretty good with his advice. I remind members that this all happened because I had a taillight out of order. It did not seem to matter that I had plenty of other lights burning.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: The car had a taillight out.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: That is true if the member wishes to be precise. I engaged a local lawyer—and we licked them! The local lawyer turned out to be a real nice chap. Through his brilliance I intend to carry on in spite of the fact I have been told that when a person goes to the Supreme Court he needs to employ a QC. One gauges a lawyer by how much he charges. If a lawyer charges \$2 000 a day one knows he is good.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: The same as with the quality of a bottle of wine.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: On the top of this document are the words "For Service". I do not know what that means! But this is a very serious matter. It is a strange thing to happen in this day and age in Western Australia. It is strange that one should be a victim of this sort of thing. It is a very difficult thing to understand when one has never been arrested before. Having been arrested on the occasion to which I am referring I was taken to the lockup and divested of the ring on my finger, the watch on my wrist, and then physically searched in areas of the body I did not think I would ever let any man touch! This is an indication of the sort of thing the average citizen can be subjected to—almost indecencies. Yet a criminal would have to accept this sort of thing.

I received that as an ordinary man. It came from my lawyer and he indicated it was a photostat

But I am not a criminal! After all, all I had was a taillight out of order. I was arrested on the side of the road. I have read the relevant Act and I cannot see how these people can arrest a person on the side of the road. Perhaps they can. I noticed the QCs in the Chamber are not being of any great help at the moment! I am certainly looking for free advice.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: It is in the small print.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: But it is all rather horrific. However, it is said to be designed to prevent deaths on the road. This all happened just before Christmas and we did read in the paper that the death toll had fallen. I am sure it was not just because I was locked up for the night and put off the road. It was a strange thing to walk around at Christmas time during that period of jollity in the bush, when people always stop their harvesting and gather in the town and joke with one another, to find that this was not the case this year. That is why there were no accidents—everyone was forced off the roads! They were absolutely frightened to move. It is as simple as that.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: They were having their taillights fixed.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I have been told that in my case I should get rid of my number plate and my car, or perhaps have it repainted and then go into exile. Surely this should not be the situation in Western Australia. Surely there is no vindictiveness here, so it cannot be that. It is truly a law that we in this place wrote into the Statute book and how it is upheld which are at fault.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Cut your telephone too.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is not the fault of the police. I said in court that I was not crooked on their demeanour. They were very courteous—extremely cold and courteous! One could not complain. But we did pass that legislation. I am sure that at any time anyone can be apprehended and told to put his head over the bag and to blow into it whilst he is stopped on the side of the road. If we created that law we did wrong because the right of the individual surely is something that still remains in the world.

Another question asked is "Have you been drinking?" Surely there is a thing called the fifth amendment which indicates that no man can be compelled to incriminate himself.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is in America.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It should be here also because no way should that happen. I know that not one iota of alcohol was in my body, yet I

was compelled to answer leading questions, compelled to say "No; I am not taking that breathalyser test because I do not believe in it". I said I would go back to the station and take a blood test. That was not refused. But I would not blow into the breathalyser because I had not been drinking alcohol. Of course, this is what I was thinking to myself—I was not saying too much to my friends who had stopped me, because they were not particularly interested anyway. Their one idea was to get me out of my car and back to a certain place. This happened and I spent a few hours there.

My wife is a teetotaler; she has never drunk alcohol in her life. Those here who know her know that to be the truth. She is a public-spirited lass who goes into the Corrigin Golf Club and serves behind the bar when she is rostered to do so, just as she does in the bowls club. We country people know that we cannot afford barmen in our sporting clubs. She could be driving home in her car and be pulled up and asked whether she had been drinking. If she said "No" the officers could say they could smell beer on her, so she must have been drinking!

That is the attitude they have: there is this licence to stop a person and make all sorts of accusations in an endeavour to prove something. But to prove what? To prove that the taillight was out of order? Is that what they are trying to prove? After all, no-one went across a double line or through a "Stop" sign. No-one drove erratically. There was nothing wrong except a taillight was out of order, but a court case has come about as a result of that. It cost a month of bail on a surety of \$100 and I was not allowed to leave the country until the court case was held. It has caused a worried family to wonder what the outcome of a Supreme Court case will be against a husband and father who never has been in strife with the law before. All this has occurred because a taillight burnt out.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: Was it the inside or the outside light?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It does not matter what it was. It could have happened to anybody anywhere at any time. I could tell members a lot more about how the defective taillight was discovered, but I will not go into the details of the situation.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: It was the excuse to pick you up.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I walked around to the back of the car and found that the taillight was off. I drive a cheap Mercedes motorcar which I have serviced every month. For the first time in

25 years the car I was driving had a defective taillight. It was just one of those coincidences. I will not deny it was out, but, surely, to continue the matter on and on is just ridiculous. Next I will have to employ a QC in the High Court. I do not know whether this matter is *sub judice*—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: If it is, you have had a fair go.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: If you had an American car you could have a class action over there.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Members will realise the mental anguish hanging over one honourable member. As a matter of fact, the situation is reaching the stage—I must be honest—of my having to cease my electorate duties. I represent 26 shires and two towns which are Narrogin and Northam. I will have to write to the shire councils and inform them that because I am nervous on the road and I am an embarrassment to the RTA I can no longer visit the shires and carry on with my job as a member of Parliament. It is getting to the stage where I can no longer go through every little town while waiting to see what is over the next hill and what will happen to me.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: How many local authorities?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Did you ask “How many points did you lose?”

The Hon. Neil Oliver: How many local authorities?

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I told the honourable member that there are 26.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: That is a bit more than the number the Hon. H. W. Olney represents.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I do not intend to enter into an argument about that. The point is ridiculous.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: There are 70 000 people in it.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Each area I represent is 20 miles from another.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: It is a long way to walk.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I could not do that.

I apologise for boring the House with this matter, but I believe we in this House should consider closely any legislation which comes before us for review, and should make sure nothing in any legislation can be read in a way which we do not intend it to be read. I do not believe we in this House ever discussed random

breath testing. Certainly I have never been in favour of it and I never will be. However, somewhere along the line last Christmas the police in this State carried out random breath testing. I do not know whether I am right or wrong on that point.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You are right.

The Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I have a horrible suspicion I am right. In the Act which covers these matters and which I have made time to study almost every night, I cannot see any reference to random testing. When the Minister introduced the legislation last year the matter of random testing was not raised. In fact, my learned friend, the Hon. N. E. Baxter, introduced some amendments to that Bill on which much of the random testing was based. Some months ago he discussed that legislation at great length and said how he had believed it would operate when he introduced the amendments. He has said also how it is used at present by the RTA.

I could refer to what the judge thought of the Act and what he thinks should happen to it. I can only say that his words were kind compared with what I would like to do with the Act right now.

Be that as it may, I wish to refer to other subjects but the Hon. Lyla Elliott wants a little free time before 9.30, when she has another engagement, to speak on this motion. So, I will leave those matters and, in doing so, support the motion before the House.

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [8.51 p.m.]: The Hon. Mick Gayfer is always a hard act to follow. I am sorry I cannot follow in the same light-hearted vein and amuse the House. However, it is rather interesting to note that through his humour this evening he put his finger on a very important matter when raising the last issue with which he dealt.

By his statement of the events he built a picture of the atmosphere of the beginning of a police State. It was rather frightening to hear the first-hand experience of a member of this Chamber. I sympathise with him. I thought it was interesting because it is allied to the first matter which I wish to raise tonight, and that is exactly where we are heading and what is happening to the rights of individuals in this State. It is an issue of freedom of speech.

In recent time I have become alarmed increasingly at the present Government's tactics which I believe are designed to stifle freedom of expression of opinion unless that opinion is in line with its own. We have seen many examples of this. First of all I refer to the brow beating of any

person who speaks out publicly against the Government. I am not referring to members of Parliament, although they are browbeaten. I refer to ordinary members of the community who come out in the Press in opposition to Government policies. These people are browbeaten by Ministers, and it does not matter whether the matters concern conservation, industrial relations, schools, or what-have-you. That is the first indication that people will not be allowed to express a free opinion without having their integrity questioned.

The second point to which I wish to refer relates to some recent statements in the Press of how there has been suppression of information by this Government. I am sure most members read Tony Noakes' article in *The Sunday Times* in which he pointed to a few areas where there has been suppression of information. He referred to the Government's refusal to release the Stanford report on conflicting land use in the Darling Range; its refusal to release the EPA report on the Worsley project; its refusal to release a list of buildings for use as nuclear fallout shelters; and its refusal to release the feasibility study on which the Government based its decision to abandon the West Trade Centre.

I have cut out other Press releases as I have come to them which refer to other matters. One appeared in *The West Australian* of 7 March and relates to the pollution of the Harvey estuary in the Peel Inlet. It states—

One of the scientists in the study, Dr Ross Field . . . has been gagged by his department and told not to talk to the Press.

Obviously that was on instructions by the Minister. I cannot think of what would be subversive about giving information to the public about the pollution of an estuary, but that is an instance of someone being told to be quiet.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: The report was not completed.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Another article refers to Government experts working on the problem being ordered by the Minister (the Hon. Gordon Masters), not to talk to the Press. In *The West Australian* of 7 March we read that administrators and officers of hospitals and health officials were told not to talk to the Press on hospital funding cuts and that all statements must come from the Minister for Health.

There was the refusal of the Government to release the findings into last month's peak-hour rail smash. Before Parliament sat I challenged the Government to release details of the financial assistance given to Agnew Clough Ltd. by the

Government since the sale of the Wundowie charcoal company in 1974. The Government refused to answer my challenge. I think even more telling is a directive issued by the Director of Agriculture on 18 March to employees of the Department of Agriculture. It dealt with technical advice on the impact of an aluminium smelter. This was an example of the selective, discriminatory, and secretive policies of the Court Government.

The director had this to say to his department—

The Hon. Minister has requested that should an approach be made to you for information on the possible impact of aluminium smelters on the environment by a Labour Member of Parliament, the Member should be advised to make the approach through the Minister or the Premier's Department.

Should an approach come from a body which might be expected to use the information broadly in opposition to Government policy, such as the Union movement or private conservation organisations, the enquirer should similarly be referred to the Minister's office.

That is absolutely outrageous in a so-called democratic free society.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I think it would be polite for a member of Parliament to request information through a Minister.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The directive does not say that Liberal members of Parliament should seek information through a Minister.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Any member of Parliament.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It refers to Labor members of Parliament. The directive referred to an approach on the impact of aluminium smelters on the environment by a Labor member of Parliament or a person involved with the union movement or matters relating to conservation. Why does it specifically refer to those people? It does not refer to other organisations or members of other political parties. I would like to know whether we are reaching the stage in this State where Labor members of Parliament, members of trade unions, and people concerned about the environment are treated like second-class citizens and are not entitled to be treated equally. That is what this sort of thing is pointing to. It is designed to suppress any information that may be detrimental to the Government.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: We were told two nights ago they were to help formulate Government policy.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: You must be stupid to say something like that. It wasn't two nights ago; it was last night.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: In any case, the comment is quite irrelevant. No member from the other side or Minister can say anything to detract from what I have said about this directive.

My thinking is that this is another indication of the way the Government is trying to suppress information, trying to stop the public from obtaining information to which it is entitled. It will release only information in line with its own policies through its propaganda machine. It is not interested in the freedom of expression of anyone else.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You have not said anyone refused information.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I became aware also, from other inquiries, that a direction had been issued in the Public Works Department that questions on water salinity should be directed to the Minister in charge of that department. I wonder just how many other similar instructions have been issued by other Ministers. As members are aware, on 1 April I placed a question on the notice paper to the Minister representing the Premier. I asked him whether instructions had been issued to employees of Government departments along these lines, and if so, would he table the instructions. I do not know whether the Minister representing the Premier thought it was an April Fool's Day question, but that is the way he treated it. He gave me a rather evasive reply.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: No he did not.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Yes he did. He replied that the Premier had not issued instructions.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Then he went on and spoke about the Ministers.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The question asked whether any Ministers had issued these instructions, and the reply was evasive. I thought the only way to obtain a reply was to ask the question of each individual Minister and members saw the result of that course. The reply was an insult to our intelligence. I must say I was rather staggered. It was the first time in my 10 years in this Chamber that I have seen Ministers either afraid to answer a question or instructed not to.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Ridiculous!

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I would like to know what the Ministers have to hide. If they

have nothing to hide they should answer the question. A few days ago we saw disgraceful conduct on the part of the Minister for Police and Traffic in another place. He sat in his seat and refused to answer a very serious question.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: There are ways to answer proper questions.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This was a serious question on phone tapping.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It was asked in a most offensive way.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Government members are sensitive to this issue; they must have guilty consciences. In another place the member for Balcatta actually presented evidence of phone tapping to the Minister for Police and Traffic.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: What was on the paper?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: He refused to answer or to try to conduct any investigation into the complaint.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It was the biggest hoax of all time. You know it. He was made to look a great fool.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You know that is not right.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: An absolute fool and you know it.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Has the Government decided that its Ministers are not to answer questions that are in any way embarrassing, or questions that the Ministers do not like? That is the way we are heading when a Minister can sit in his seat and not even stand to answer a question. When the Premier answers on behalf of the Ministers, it means that the reply must be embarrassing.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Not embarrassing at all. The director and Minister responsible for the department should answer such questions.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Under the Westminster system, Ministers are answerable to the Parliament, and the truth is of paramount importance. It is time members opposite stopped mouthing platitudes about the Westminster system and started acting as though they believed in it.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Tell the member sitting next to you the same thing.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I asked another question about land that was taken over by Agnew Clough Ltd at the time of the sale of the Wundowie charcoal iron industry. Following a

Press article containing my comments about the closure of the factory, I was approached by a number of farmers who owned properties in Wooroloo. These people had always believed that the land adjoining their properties was Crown land. They were surprised to find that it had been handed over to Agnew Clough Ltd as part of the package deal.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It was not handed over; it was part of the agreement.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The farmers became aware that the land was up for sale. This disturbed them because technical evidence on the vegetation, the rainfall, and the soil points to the fact that the land has a high salt content. If clearing takes place, the local farmers' livelihood could be affected seriously because of what could happen to a creek from which they water their stock. If this creek were to become too saline for stock use, they would face the considerable expense of having to install and use scheme water.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: It is pretty saline at the moment though, isn't it?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It is saline, but not too saline for stock.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: I know the area well. It is pretty saline now, isn't it?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It is being used by a number of the farmers, and it will mean a considerable loss to them if it becomes more saline. They are using it for sheep and cattle.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Tell me, do you think their clearing of their farms affected any of the farmers below?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: We are not talking about the past, we are talking about the future.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Oh well!

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Don't confuse her with facts.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: This Government is spending money holding seminars, bringing people in from all over the world to discuss salt problems, and imposing clearing bans on catchment areas in order to combat salinity. It realises that mistakes were made in the past.

The Government is aware of the problems associated with the removal of native vegetation. We have a dreadful salt problem throughout the State. Now if the practically virgin bush is removed in this particular area in Wooroloo, the adjoining farms will suffer.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: That matter is being examined.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Irrespective of what happened before, this is a current problem the Government can do something about. I do not intend to go into the matter in great detail because the Acting Minister for Water Resources has received a deputation about it from the farmers, and he is giving the matter consideration. However, I have raised it tonight because I am most concerned that I cannot obtain an answer to a question I asked three weeks ago. I cannot believe it would take three weeks to obtain the information I requested concerning the land.

The question I asked on 25 March inquired as to the amount of land involved in the first and second schedules of the agreement; where it was located; its value at the time of sale; whether the company had been given permission to subdivide, and so on. Surely most of this information would have been available through the Town Planning Department which would have to have considered the subdivision. Surely it would not take three weeks to obtain the information.

The Hon. I. G. Medcalf: What was the number of the question?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: It was question 14 of that day. Subsequently I asked another question without notice, although I do not have that question with me at the moment. I am becoming rather concerned that the reason I have not received an answer is that the Government does not want this matter to receive publicity at the moment because it may cause the Government or Agnew Clough Ltd some embarrassment.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: The inability may have been in your asking the question rather than in the Government's not answering it.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have heard some pretty weak interjections, but that takes the cake.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: It is not weak at all. If you asked town planning about something that had nothing to do with town planning, you would not receive an answer.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I asked a question to obtain information. It was accepted by the Leader of the House on behalf of the Minister for Resources Development. I was told that the information was being collated and that a reply would be provided as soon as possible. Really that interjection was quite unnecessary and silly.

Surely the information should be available three weeks later. If there is no ulterior motive involved, why have I not received the information?

I will move on to the next matter I want to deal with tonight. For some time I have been concerned about nursing homes and whether elderly people in these places are receiving the best possible care, or whether they are being exploited. I would like to refer to a question I asked on 13 August last year. I will not read the whole question, but amongst other questions I asked was the following—

What steps are taken by the—

- (a) State; and
- (b) Commonwealth;

to monitor these homes to ensure the patients receive the best nursing and other care, such as diet, comfortable and aesthetically pleasing physical surroundings, occupational therapy, etc.?

To that portion of the question the Minister replied—

- (a) Officers of the Department of Health and Medical Services carry out regular inspections.
- (b) Officers of Commonwealth Department of Health also carry out regular inspections.

I wanted some further information on this matter, so I asked another question on 19 August last year. It was as follows—

In respect of the reply to part 4(a)—

- (a) how often are inspections carried out by the Department;

The reply to that was as follows—

- (a) At least once a year, but may be more often if the circumstance warrants;

I then asked—

- (b) by whom; and
- (c) is advance notice given to the home concerned?

The reply to which was as follows—

- (b) by the nursing officer of the department. Advice may be sought by this person from other departmental officers where specialist knowledge is required relating to matters of concern or interest;
- (c) No.

All I can say is either the standards of the Department of Health and Medical Services are not high enough, or the inspections are quite inadequate.

I do not know how many members read the excellent article by Catherine Martin which appeared in last Saturday's edition of *The West Australian*. It was entitled "Verdict is guilty on the score of age".

The Hon. P. H. Wells: A lot of lonely people.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: That is right—it was very depressing to read it.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: A challenge to our society to find some other way to accommodate them.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Despite my concern, last year I was not able to get any hard evidence.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Do you think inspectors would be the answer to that?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I had hoped that the department would be keeping an eye on the problem, and I thought the best way to find out was to ask questions, and that was the answer I received. It indicated that there was surveillance by the department.

I would like to quote from the article written by Catherine Martin. It is absolutely scandalous that this situation should exist in Western Australia in 1981. Mrs Martin obtained the information from people who had worked in private nursing homes. Her article states as follows—

They tell of how such patients, without any kind of stimulation, retreat from society, lie listless in bed all day, talk to no one.

One woman, regarded as a "vegetable," surprised everyone one day when she raised her hand slowly to stroke a kitten placed on her bed.

Senile

They talk of "the babies" (the senile or disabled aged) being put to bed for the "night" at two or three o'clock in the afternoon, the evening meal served at 7 p.m.—

I believe that is a typographical error; probably, it is 5.00 p.m. Mrs Martin's article continues—

—and orders forbidding an evening drink of milk and no more than two biscuits.

"Then they wonder why the patients are up at 5 a.m. starving" a nurse said.

There was talk of insufficient staff, some untrained in how to lift patients, of saving on food and on laundry.

One nursing home instructs the staff not to change the wet draw-sheet of incontinent patients, but to move it along so that the damp area is to the side of the bed.

They speak of elderly people sitting around the walls of a day room staring into space, with nothing to divert them, nothing to look forward to.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: That would not be true of every institution; it would be an exception.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Of course it is not true of every institution. As Catherine Martin points out, some nursing homes are very adequate, and provide a good range of services for their patients. However, that is not the point; the point is that if one aged person in these homes is being exploited or starved or is suffering discomfort, we should be concerned.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: Don't you think it is the children who neglect them?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Some do not have children. That is not the point. The Government has a department which is supposed to provide surveillance for these homes and it is an absolute disgrace in this day and age that such a thing could exist. I do not doubt for a moment that what Catherine Martin has been told is true. It is the sort of thing which has been concerning me for some time. However, I was unable to get hard evidence on the matter. People generally are afraid of losing their jobs and do not want to speak out. Relatives do not want to speak out of turn because the result could mean that their mother or father might end up with them.

I believe it is a good thing this information has come out through Mrs Martin's article. I ask the Government to take this matter seriously and to establish what the department is doing, and why it is allowing these things to happen.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You asked about inspectors. I do not believe the problems of loneliness, etc., will be solved by the appointment of additional inspectors.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: A lot can be done. Community involvement in these homes can be organised. We need a full range of programmes, including occupational therapy. However, most importantly, these people need the basic requirements of life such as enough food and decent bed clothes—never mind the trimmings—which apparently are not being provided in some of these homes.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: Would you say that is happening in any of the homes in your electorate?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: As I said, I have not been able to obtain any hard evidence, but obviously Mrs Martin has.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: Surely you would have visited these homes in your electorate.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I have visited some.

The Hon. P. H. Wells: There are some very good ones in your electorate.

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: I do not know how many nursing homes there are in the metropolitan area and I do not know whether this is happening in homes in my electorate or in the electorates of other members. However, that is irrelevant; apparently it is happening in some homes, and the department must investigate the matter.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: Which department?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: The Department of Health and Medical Services.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The State department?

The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT: Both State and Commonwealth departments have responsibilities in this area. However, I am addressing a House of the State Parliament and I am asking the Minister concerned why these things are happening.

Not only patients in nursing homes have given me cause for concern; I have also been concerned about the attitude expressed to aged people generally. I do not believe they should be treated like second-class citizens or children as soon as they become pensioners or residents in aged persons' homes or villages.

These people are entitled to respect as mature citizens who have contributed much to their country. I have heard a number of complaints from elderly people about the patronising and sometimes insulting way they are treated by employees of aged persons' homes; apparently, these people think it is unnecessary to listen courteously to matters raised by elderly residents of these homes concerning maintenance and other matters which require some co-operation. It appears that if the elderly residents resent this sort of attitude and treatment, and are not prepared to be put down and treated rudely, but stand up for themselves, they are liable to be victimised in mean little ways; I have been given a few examples of this.

This problem is unlike that of the problem experienced in nursing homes in that this is more a question of human relationships and attitudes between groups in a community. I am very impressed by what the Wran Government has done in New South Wales. Each year it runs what is called a Senior Citizens' Week. This week has a great deal to do with the question of human relationships. This year the Wran Government allocated \$100 000 to Senior Citizens' Week activities.

In 1978, the Wran Government decided to sponsor the Senior Citizens' Week to emphasise the valuable and contributing role of the aged to the State of New South Wales and to Australia

generally, to highlight the needs of the aged both present and future and to enable the community to share the expertise of its aged and senior citizens. Every year since then, New South Wales has held a very successful Senior Citizens' Week. Government departments, local authorities, the media, and voluntary sporting, and business organisations all contribute and participate in the week and organise activities for aged people. Numerous social, cultural, and educational activities are held. There are visits from schools to senior citizens' centres, open days at retirement villages and nursing homes, and media articles written by senior citizens.

Probably the most important and valuable programme is one called "Now and Then" which is described as an "age to youth teaching programme". It has been written by an officer of the New South Wales Council on the Ageing.

I might digress for a minute to draw a contrast between the State Governments of NSW and Western Australia. In NSW, there is a Government which very strongly supports the Council on the Ageing, which is able to make available officers to provide excellent programmes like the one to which I have referred, whereas in Western Australia, the Council on the Ageing is just about broke through lack of Government support. Because it could not obtain additional assistance from the Government, the council recently had to dispense with the services of its executive director who, for the past eight years, has done a wonderful job in devising programmes for aged people in this State. However, because the Commonwealth Government reduced its contribution and because this State Government was not prepared to make up the leeway, the council is now in a very weak financial situation.

The "Now and Then" programme is very interesting and valuable because it brings children into contact with elderly people. It is a two-way process in that it is educational for the children and enjoyable for the senior citizens. The aims of the "Now and Then" programme are as follows—

1. To bring children and the elderly together to communicate.
2. To draw on memories of older people as rich resources of living social history.
3. To give children understanding of their heritage, past and present history of migration.
4. To develop attitudes of human understanding of the elderly.
5. To give children opportunities for developing initiatives.
6. To give children experience in oral communication.

7. To deepen children's understanding of how the media and advertising shape their attitudes to old age.

I have received a great deal of information on Senior Citizens' Week; this is only one of a number of documents I have received. The "Now and Then" programme was described to me in a letter from the Co-ordinator of the NSW Community Programmes unit of the Premier's Department as "our most significant contribution to date which we trust will bring young people and old people together whilst at the same time identifying needs of the aged now and in the future".

This gets back to the question of human relationships, and that is why this week is so important. Although there are lots of very enjoyable social and cultural activities in which the senior citizens are involved, the most important aspect of the week is finding and identifying the needs of elderly people, and educating the community to understand those needs and to become involved with elderly people. This is particularly important for children, because it provides them with a better understanding and encourages them to be more respectful of the aged.

For anybody who is interested, I have a great deal of information on the NSW Senior Citizens' Week. I would like to see our State Government give serious consideration to holding a similar week in Western Australia. I would be prepared to pass these documents to the Minister concerned.

Another initiative taken by the NSW Government is the establishment of a 12-member task force to study and make recommendations on such things as laws relating to domestic violence, and the need for improvements in health, welfare, legal, and police services and of ways of preventing domestic violence. I was pleased to learn in reply to a question I asked on 25 March this year that the Department for Community Welfare in Western Australia, in conjunction with the Police Force, is examining ways in which a service dealing primarily with domestic violence can be established. I hope it does not take as long for the recommendations arising from that study to be implemented by the Government as did the recommendations of the committee established following my private member's Bill in 1976, which dealt with family planning nurses.

It is all very well to set up these investigations, inquiries, and committees. It is another thing to take them seriously, and then implement the recommendations when they are presented to the

Cabinet. I hope also that the terms of reference will be as wide as the New South Wales study, and that detailed attention will be given to important legislation, perhaps along the lines of the British Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act of 1976.

Among other things, that Act allows a judge to attach a power of arrest to an injunction, if he is satisfied that the other party has caused actual bodily harm to the applicant or the child, and the judge considers that the man is likely to do so again. The problem here is that if a wife needs legal protection from a violent husband, she can do it in one of two ways. One way is to report the incident to the police after it has happened; and the second is to seek an injunction. However, the police are reluctant to become involved in matrimonial brawls, unless the violence is particularly brutal. Then, of course, the woman must take the husband to court. There is a long delay, and all sorts of complications can arise.

Another Press item to which I would like to refer appeared in the *Sunday Independent* on 4 January this year. It was headed "Inadequate laws make wife-bashing a growing sport in Perth". It dealt with a woman called Michelle, who had been badly injured by her husband. In an interview with the journalist from the *Sunday Independent* she spoke of the problems of women who are involved with violent husbands, and the problems they have in obtaining action to protect themselves. In that interview she said—

"If you lay charges against him under civil law it takes up to three months before it comes to court," explained Michelle. "In that time he is free to come around and beat you into dropping the charges.

"When I laid the first assault charge, I was beaten up by the man five times before the first charge was heard in court."

Michelle wants a Royal Commission into legal areas covering domestic violence.

"Restraining orders from the Family Law Court aren't worth the paper they're printed on.

"Once you get one it then has to be served on the man before it is valid.

"There is no power of arrest attached to them so that if he breaks the order you can only try and have him charged with contempt of court. Meanwhile he's still on the loose and able to belt you up."

In many cases the only chance of a brief respite from the bloody violence is for the women to escape to one of the dozen or so

women's refuges in Perth. But unfortunately even they can't offer absolute protection.

.....

But the refuges do give victims medical treatment, counselling, legal advice and the chance to find a new home.

That brings me to my last point relating to the women's refuge centres in this State. The Government has been very mean to these refuges. Western Australia and Queensland are the only two States in Australia which refuse to provide their full share of the funding for these refuges—that is, 25 per cent of their running costs. The Commonwealth picks up the tab for 75 per cent.

In Western Australia the Government will meet only half that amount—that is, 12½ per cent. This means that the women who run the refuges are, in some cases, working for as little as \$1 an hour, or else they are providing their services free of charge. In addition to that, they are having to use their valuable time in trying to raise money by running cake stalls and the other things that people do to raise money for charities.

The refuges are in a constant state of financial crisis. They cannot offer all the necessary services to women who have enormous social, financial, and legal problems. The incidence of wife battering is recognised now; and the need for the refuges or shelters has been well established. Last year, for example, the eight refuges in Western Australia accommodated something like 1 500 women and over 2 000 children; and still families have had to be turned away.

This financial year the State Government is providing \$57 000, which represents its half of the 25 per cent. If the refuges cater for 1 500 women and 2 000 children in a financial year, that represents an outlay of about \$16 for each woman or child assisted. I would like members to compare that with the cost involved if the women and children had to be hospitalised, or if the children had to be cared for by the State in some institution like Bridgewater. The State is getting out of it very cheaply, I would say—too cheaply.

In New South Wales, by comparison, not only does the Government contribute its 25 per cent, which amounts to \$382 000, but it is actually spending in excess of \$1 million on women's refuges in this financial year. If this State can find \$4 million for WAY '79, \$2 million for greyhounds, \$1 million for the West Trade Centre, and \$6 000 for an ex-Governor's gutters, I do not know why we cannot find the extra funds for such an essential service as the women's

refuges. I ask the Government to review its funding for these shelters.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [9.37 p.m.]: I will speak briefly in support of the motion. Firstly, I would like to join other members in stating my welcome to our new Governor and his lady. I wish them well in their stay with us in Western Australia.

Secondly, I would like to offer my congratulations to my colleague in the Lower West Province, the Hon. Neil McNeill. As we know, he has had a long and distinguished career in Parliament, both Federal and State; but it is only this year that he has had the opportunity to move the Address-in-Reply. He made an excellent job of the task on the evening of the opening of the Parliament. I take this opportunity to congratulate him and to tell him that I enjoyed his speech; and I am sure that every one of us here on that night enjoyed it. It was an excellent speech, and one worthy of a person as experienced and capable as Neil McNeill.

It had been my intention to speak about the jarrah class action, because it is the biggest issue concerning the people in my electorate. However, during the debate on a motion earlier in the sitting, we had a chance to discuss it fairly fully, so I will not take the time of the House further on that.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: It concerns the Caucas, too.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I gather it does; but that is their problem, and they will have to live with it.

I now wish to deal with something that happened to me the other day. It is not very significant, perhaps. I was driving through Perth last Wednesday, on my way to a meeting. It was one of those things that happens sometimes to motorists, but it was not a tail-light and it did not affect the RTA. I had a breakdown in my car.

I managed to pull into a parking lot, and I discovered that a piece of electrical wiring had burnt out. I went into a hardware shop and obtained a new piece of wire. If members have ever dealt with a piece of wire that has burnt out, they will know that by the time I had finished I had black, gooey, burnt plastic and rubber all over my hands.

So off I went to a supermarket which thankfully was close by, so I did not have to walk very far. I am not making a plug for any special brand of soap, but in that particular situation there is one old, well-known brand which is Solvol. I do not use Solvol in my own home. I

happen to use a cream-based product made by another company.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Palmolive cream.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: No, this was for my hands, not for my face!

This particular soap gets rid of grease and I had no need for it at any other time, but only wanted it as a result of the predicament in which I found myself; that is, on my way to a meeting with my hands covered in dirt and grease from repairing my car.

I went into the supermarket and tried to buy a cake of Solvol soap. I found there were two cakes to a packet and, because I needed only one cake of soap—one was going to be used and the other was entirely superfluous—I asked the lass who was stacking shelves if it was possible to buy only one cake. She said "No, you have to buy two cakes, but ask the girl at the check out." I took my packet of Solvol soap and went to the check out where I asked the attendant if there was any way in which I could buy one cake of soap. She said "No, you have to buy two, but I will just check." She asked another young lady who said "No, you have to buy two."

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That was not because she did not like the look of you, was it?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: No, I was on my own. Had I been with Mr Dowding, perhaps that might have been the case, but I was on my own.

I thought I would ensure my facts were completely right, so I paid at the check out and took my two cakes of Solvol and the ticket to the store manager.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: It intrigues me to see members opposite are not interested in this matter and I will refer to that in a moment.

I took up the matter with the manager of the store and he said "I am sorry, this is the way we merchandise that soap. We sell it only in packs of two."

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That is free enterprise. What are you worried about?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The lack of interest of members opposite is becoming more evident each time one of them opens his mouth.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Perhaps it has something to do with the quality of the speech being made.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The fact that I had to buy two cakes of soap did not matter very much to me. Mr Dowding can laugh, probably because he did not hear what it was all about.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: No, he did not. He is ignorant.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I can afford to buy two cakes of soap whether or not I intend to use them. However, I am concerned that people who obviously shop in supermarkets because they want to buy their products at the cheapest prices — these include people on low incomes — are forced to buy more than they require because of store policy. This is an entirely unsatisfactory situation for people on low incomes and particularly those who receive pensions or unemployment benefits.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Isn't it free enterprise?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: While it is no great loss to me to pay twice what I need to pay for something, for a person on a very low income, it is a serious matter.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Surely you don't want to interfere in market forces.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Even if Mr Dowding does not agree with me, this matter should be examined. If a person needs to purchase one item only, there is no way he should be forced to purchase more. Had the supermarket sold packets containing two soaps as well as single cakes of soap, even if the price was higher for the single cake — one may expect that to be the case — it would have been all right because one could choose whether one would buy one or two cakes. It is entirely wrong if one does not have a choice to buy either one or two cakes of soap and in spite of Mr Dowding's comments, I think it is morally wrong as well as

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Would you like to legislate for it?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: ... actually wrong. People who are aware of the difficulties experienced by those who do not have as much money to spend as members of Parliament, should be interested in this matter instead of making snide remarks to prove how smart they happen to be or perhaps to prove they are not smart at all.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Would you legislate for it?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The member knows this is the occasion on which we bring matters to the attention of Ministers if there are situations we want examined and that is exactly what I am doing now.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You would like to see legislation, would you?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I would like to see something done about it and I do not believe it needs legislation.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I would like to see something done about Mr Dowding.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I should like to see Mr Dowding follow up this same topic and show he cares about the difficulties experienced by people on low incomes.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I just wanted to know what you want to do about it.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: That was the small --

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I have seen single cakes of soap in supermarkets.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: —matter I wished to bring to the attention of Parliament.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You can't tell us what you would like done about it.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: He has told you already, but you were too busy interjecting.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I do not intend to give Mr Dowding a lecture on what I would and would not do about it. My intention is to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister. I shall decide what I shall do in this House and I shall not be guided by what Mr Dowding wants me to do. He can bleat for as long as he likes and if he wishes to keep bleating I will stay here and keep talking.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You don't know what you would like done about it, is that right?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: This gentleman

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: He is not a gentleman.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: — is finding it difficult to understand that what I want done about it is for people to be able to go to shops and buy one item rather than a package containing two.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: How would you achieve that?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Hon. Peter Dowding will never have the opportunity to be a Minister, because I am putting this to the Minister and I expect him to look into it and do something about it.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What is he going to do about it?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the member on his feet to ignore the interjections and I point out that if members continue to interject, they will be doing so from outside the Chamber.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I thought if the interjectors wished to keep themselves here for a certain period of time, I would help them in their endeavours. As far as I am concerned, if Mr Dowding wishes to keep going he can do so, but I do not intend to be brow beaten by him.

The other matter I wish to comment on—

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Could I ask you why people can't go to the corner store? If they go to supermarkets they expect certain discount practices.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I have no obligation to answer Mr Dowding.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the member to ignore the interjections.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Did you try the corner shop for your soap?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Peter Dowding is defying the Chair. I draw his attention to Standing Order No. 106 which suggests that, if he persists in wilfully disrupting the proceedings of the House, he will be dealt with. If the member wishes to see me put that into effect in the hope he will gain some notoriety for himself, he is going the right way about it. I ask the member to act like an intelligent member of this House and to cease this perpetual harassment of the member who is on his feet.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The other matter I wish to mention briefly is that of salinity. It has been referred to by many other members in the Address-in-Reply and I do not intend to spend a great deal of time on it.

The clearing taking place is something which we all know has caused difficulties in farming areas. I want to express my concern about something which has occurred. When driving through farming areas and, particularly, the wheatbelt area where I was born and raised, I become concerned by the practice of some local authorities, particularly those in areas where there is a salt problem, of clearing the road verges completely. I know this was something done when rabbits were a problem because everybody said rabbits bred in the scrub near the road verges. Today rabbits are fairly well under control.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Not here.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: That is a very bad interjection.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: It is a practice of shire councils when they work on roads to have the grader or dozer go down each side of the road to clear the bush aside. I believe that is a contributing factor to the salt problem and destroys much flora and fauna.

When we consider problems associated with clearing and salinity we should think of what is being done by local authorities and suggest to them that certain courses are not appropriate. They should stop and think a little more. Clearing of verges probably makes it easier for farmers whose properties adjoin these roads to provide for adequate fire protection, but I do not believe the verges should be cleared as they have been in the last few years.

I support the motion.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [9.52 p.m.]: I do not propose to comment on all the speeches made during the Address-in-Reply debate. Of course, I support the Address-in-Reply.

It would be improper for me to comment on the many statements made and the many questions asked which will be directed or already have been directed to the appropriate Ministers. As I indicated the last time I spoke on the Address-in-Reply, all the comments made and questions raised by members will be directed to the appropriate Minister and answers will be provided or some statement made to assist the members, and I hope the statements will assist members in relation to the matters they raised. As I have invited members on other occasions, if they do not receive an answer they should communicate with me because I assure them I will endeavour in all cases—I have not yet had any complaints—to ensure questions raised in this House are treated in the proper way and given the attention they deserve.

However, there are a few matters on which I believe I should speak, and they are matters which in most cases relate to my portfolio. The Hon. Howard Olney referred to the matter of defamation, amongst a number of other subjects he raised. On the subject of defamation I think he rather implied that a reference of power might sort out this question of jurisdiction between the States and the Commonwealth. It seems unlikely that a reference of power would be given. Indeed, a reference of power is not a very likely event.

Some three or four years ago when there was discussion at an Attorneys General conference on the subject of the Family Law Act, the Commonwealth Attorney General, then Mr Ellicott, suggested the States should adopt the same practice as adopted by Western Australia—the same principle. He suggested other States should have a State Family Court. This was not found acceptable by some of the other States and they discussed the question of a reference of power. It was considered that a

reference of power could be made in favour of the Commonwealth by the States interested. This discussion went about and about.

I wanted to see Mr Ellicott about one or two other matters, so I walked with him to his chambers. He said "They really don't know what they have done in rejecting the opportunity to have State Family Courts which would have resolved immediately all their jurisdictional problems. Instead of that they are talking about a reference of power. It will take two years to obtain a reference of power that is satisfactory". That discussion took place about three and a half years ago and the States are still just as far from a reference of power as they were then. The States of New South Wales and Victoria cannot agree on the terms and I do not know whether they will ever agree. There are ways of resolving these Federal problems through co-operative measures which can work and which we have seen work in a number of cases. We should be sensible about this to try to find a way to obtain a liaison between State and Commonwealth Governments.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Considering the advantages of the State court in Western Australia why are the other States so reluctant to move to a similar system?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I believe it was largely political; it came about because of the Whitlam Government's insistence on going it alone which brought about the antipathy of the then Governments of New South Wales and Victoria. They were not prepared to co-operate in any way.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Why don't they do it now? Mr Whitlam's shadow surely does not fall over this six years later.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I do not know about that. I am not so sure; I still see it about on occasions. I would like to say there is just no way anyone could persuade the Government of New South Wales to have a State family court, and I doubt whether anyone could persuade the Government of Victoria to have one either because I have endeavoured to do just that.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: I thought the Government of Queensland was amenable to the idea.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Queensland was ready to have it, but to do so now is difficult. Having set up the Family Court of Australia on a certain basis the judges themselves have become, one might say, unionised, and are not prepared to change from the status they have achieved. That is the situation we have, and what I have outlined are the factors involved.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Wouldn't ours have been better as a division of the Supreme Court or the District Court and we would not have had problems with the property law legislation and the jurisdiction swappings which go on?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: All sorts of different ways exist in which problems of this kind can be tackled, but one finds one can achieve only certain practical results in a particular climate of a time and, in particular, in the climate of the time the Family Court of Australia was set up. Due to amendments which originated in the Senate and were accepted by the House of Representatives it was made possible for a State family court to be set up within the scope of the Commonwealth Family Law Act.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You mean not as a division of the existing structure?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: No, I mean as a separate entity. Nevertheless, it should be in co-operation. At that stage it would not have been possible to bring in at that stage the proposition the honourable member suggests. I think we have reached the stage in history where we will not see State family courts. In any case, that subject is a diversion. I did not want to talk about family courts except in relation to the reference of power solution to the jurisdictional problems in Australia. Members may feel that a reference of power is a way out of the situation, but that is so only in theory and not in practice. I know that because I have been through the situation.

Much was said about the substance of Address-in-Reply speeches, or the lack of it—chiefly the lack of it. I can well understand the frustration of some members in having to listen to speeches in which they are not interested, but that is all part of Parliament. Parliament consists of a diverse group of people who happen to be the representatives of the public. Members of Parliament are really no different from members of the public and that is the reason they are in Parliament.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: I was not objecting to their making a speech.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The members of Parliament have the confidence of the members of the public and, naturally, the members in Parliament wish to talk about matters which are relevant to them and to their electors. Some members talk about electoral matters and talk about them very well because their constituents wish them to air their views. Members of this House who believe that it is wrong for members of country or city electorates to air the problems of their electors, are suffering from a form of

elitism and it ill-becomes anyone in this place to criticise people who speak about matters which are relevant to the constituents in their electorates.

It may be difficult for some members to listen to such speeches because naturally we are interested, in the main, in the things we say ourselves. Nevertheless, it is an important exercise and one we should allow to continue and one which I believe will continue.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: There is no doubt about that.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I suggest to members who believe that we should not spend our time airing problems which are relevant to our electorates, but should have a debate about particular subjects such as shopping centres, education, and the rights of teachers who are taking time off, or preference to unionists or such problems—

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: That sounds very familiar.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I have taken it straight out of Mr Berinson's speech so that explains the reason it sounds so familiar. Mr Berinson mentioned another matter which I think referred to turning off lights in Government buildings. He did not say that exactly; he said "Energy conservation in Government departments".

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: You do not think it is important?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I think it is very important, but I do not think it is important enough to have preference over electoral matters. Members can move a motion, at any time they wish, to discuss a particular subject. Often, when I am driving down Mounts Bay Road and I look in this direction I wonder who is paying the Government bills for the lights which are left on in the buildings. There is nothing to stop any honourable member from supporting a debate on any such topic if he wishes to and there is nothing to stop any honourable member from discussing such topics in the Address-in-Reply debate.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Any time on the adjournment debate?

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: My suggestions were not directed at debating those subjects. My suggestion was that this House spent a good amount of time talking about nothing.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: There is nothing to stop a member from debating any such subject he wishes.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: I was suggesting that it be done by a committee system.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I took it to believe that Mr Berinson was referring to the fact that the debate should be on the subjects he mentioned. If the member were to speak on any such subjects during the Address-in-Reply debate I would not object because I think it would be a very good idea if we could hear his views on Public Service superannuation. The member obviously has many ideas. It would be a good idea if the honourable member did speak on such subjects, but unfortunately we are to be deprived of that opportunity because the honourable member has said that never again will he speak in the Address-in-Reply debate.

The Hon. P. G. Pandal: Can you persuade him otherwise?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Mr Berinson has spoken in the Address-in-Reply debate for the last time and we will not have the opportunity to hear his views again. We will not know whether or not anyone else should turn out the lights in Government departments.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: The way in which you are trivialising is a very good example of what is wrong with the debates we do have here.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I believe Mr Berinson has not only deprived himself of an opportunity to put forward his views, but he has also deprived us of hearing his views. He has disbarred himself from speaking and I am sure he cannot eat his words because they are recorded in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: What time do you anticipate the adjournment debate should commence?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Mr Berinson has also said that he believes 10 minutes is quite adequate time for the adjournment debate.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: And I stay with that, too.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I agree with Mr Berinson, 10 minutes is not only good, it is more than adequate.

The Hon. J. M. Berinson: Do you think 1½ hours is adequate for the Address-in-Reply debate?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I am not trivialising what Mr Berinson has said because he did make an important contribution, even though it is the last time he will ever speak to us in the Address-in-Reply debate. There is no reason in the world, apart from the fact that he will have to eat his words, that he may not, at some future

date, take the opportunity to speak during the Address-in-Reply debate. There is no reason that Mr Berinson cannot speak on a particular subject during that debate and indeed, I would look forward to hearing his comments.

Quite a number of members have used the Address-in-Reply debate to discourse on a particular subject. Some members have spoken on one subject only and it is usually a subject about which they have much interest. When they do so, they make a valuable contribution because no matter how little speeches are reported in the Press or media, that member is rendering a service to this House by putting forward his views. Likewise, I believe members are rendering a service to their constituents because other people will become aware of the views of people in other parts of the State.

Mr Brown mentioned several matters yesterday when he spoke to the Address-in-Reply debate and one was courts in the country. Mr Brown said that some people must stand outside the courts and of course some are forced to do so because there is not enough room inside them. However, some people elect to stand outside the courtroom. Indeed, on the many occasions I have been to country courts I have found that people have been standing outside the court even though there has been plenty of room inside. Very often this is because they prefer to be outside and I can understand that, especially if it is a sunny day.

There are occasions in some places where there is not enough accommodation, but we are endeavouring, wherever possible, to attend to this matter. It is a costly business, but we are trying to improve the court facilities wherever possible.

I was not aware of the particular situation at Merredin which the honourable member mentioned. I will look into it. The honourable member referred also to the variations in penalties which different courts levy. He referred to a \$5 fine at Fremantle and a \$15 fine at Merredin for drunkenness charges. He indicated that it might have been a case of one defendant having a previous record, although I am not sure about that.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: In both cases.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: That could be the difference. I am not trying to conceal the fact that there are differences because the Executive is not responsible for the penalties handed down by the judiciary. I never attempt to justify the decisions of courts, although I am reminded of the variations constantly by people who are dissatisfied about them in one way or another. Some people feel that certain penalties are too

heavy, while others think certain penalties are too light. We must preserve in all respects the separation between the Executive and the judicial arms of government. All the Executive can do is to ensure that justice is not delayed and that proper, fair-minded people are appointed to preside over the courts. The Executive must ensure that there are proper and adequate facilities, not only in the sense of buildings, but also facilities for people to conduct their trials.

The honourable member referred to the particular situation of people charged with the offence of drunkenness. The same problem is apparent in many areas and it is almost impossible to ever attain consistency. I discover often that there are imperceptible differences between cases. If one reads about a case in the Press, one reads perhaps a few lines that cover a few days' evidence. It needs someone who is present in the court throughout to judge whether or not cases are similar.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: What about the graduated fines in drink-related driving offences?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The Hon. H. W. Gayfer touched on Parliament's responsibility in regard to minimum penalties. These penalties are laid down by Parliament.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: I realise that. In Fremantle it is \$100 for the first offence, and elsewhere the penalty is determined according to the level of alcohol in the blood.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I appreciate what the honourable member is saying. In spite of the comment I have just made, I have endeavoured to work towards a better rate of consistency. It is very difficult for the Minister to intervene in this area. Variation in penalties is of constant concern to people, and naturally, if one is interested in the administration of justice, one is concerned about the situation.

I am not attempting to say that the honourable member is wrong. I know that inconsistencies occur from time to time, and this is of great concern to many judges and to some of the magistrates.

We have heard some very good speeches during this debate. In the time available I have not been able to refer to every member's comments. If members feel I should have referred to some matters personally, I would like them to let me know about them and I will attend to their queries.

I have listened with great attention to all members. I was extremely interested in all the contributions made; it is very gratifying that so many members have contributed to the debate. I

thank members for their contribution, and I support the motion.

Question put and passed: the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

Presentation to Governor

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the Address-in-Reply be presented to His Excellency the Governor by the President and such members as may desire to accompany him.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.04 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 28 April.

Question put and passed.

**ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE:
ORDINARY**

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [10.05 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Bentley High School: Closure

THE HON. P. G. PENDAL (South-East Metropolitan) [10.06 p.m.]: I would just like to burden the House for two or three minutes on the adjournment debate, on the subject that the Hon. Bob Hetherington dealt with at length during the Address-in-Reply debate. I am referring to the decision announced recently by the State Government to convert the Bentley Senior High School into a senior college.

I join with the Hon. Bob Hetherington in expressing regret that the decision ever had to be made. I also express disappointment about it. However, there are a few aspects of the situation that previous speakers have not yet canvassed, and the public at large should be made aware of them.

The decision to convert the school to a senior college was an inevitable one. The evidence for that is no better an authority than the Principal of the Bentley Senior High School himself (Mr Eborall). It is possibly not very well known, but it ought to be borne in mind by members and by the people of the area, that the principal of the high school was in no way surprised at the Government's decision to close the school as a senior high school.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: But he did not support it.

The Hon. P. G. PENDAL: In fairness to Mr Eborall, I indicate he made the comment that the timing was a surprise. He was reported at some length in yesterday's edition of the "South Suburban" supplement in *The West Australian* and he made the point that in his professional judgment the decision was inevitable. He said this because enrolments had dropped dramatically over the last 12 years, and no other sensible course was open to the Education Department.

I will quote the figures that Mr Eborall used publicly. The school was opened in 1960 and the enrolment has dropped from 1 400 in 1969—I assume that was the peak—to the present level of 629. Mr Eborall is on public record as saying that the indication is the number could drop to the 500s if the present situation continues. He made the further observation that when he arrived at the school in 1977, the enrolment was in the order of 900. So even under his principalship the number of students has dropped from 900 to 629. He felt that it was unlikely anything would stimulate an increase in the number of school-aged children in the district. This man is a professional in the field, and surely in the face of such views, the Government could have reached no other decision. I am one of the members who represent the area, and I would have preferred that the Government had made some other decision.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Do you support the Government's decision?

The Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Yes, I do support it, and I might add that when I have spoken or written to constituents who have lodged a protest with me, I have been honest enough to say that I do not like the decision very much, but that I support it for the reasons put forward by the Government and backed up by Mr Eborall. During his speech the Hon. Bob Hetherington quoted at length from a letter which appeared in today's edition of *The West Australian*. The letter was from a Mr Brennan who is the Principal of the Balga Technical College. This was a fairly scurrilous letter since Mr Brennan said that one is entitled to speculate about whether the decision had anything to do with the fact that the school is in a Labor electorate.

That is utter rubbish. Had he cared to spend a few minutes to check, he would have found that the school is represented in this Parliament by, and is situated geographically in the electorates of, three Liberal members. Surely there can be no suggestion on the part of anyone that the school is

being closed because it happens to be in a Labor electorate or that it does not matter if the Government gets a Labor electorate offside. That is nonsense, and Mr Brennan as a paid servant of the State should be brought to book for saying that.

Another thing that seems to be interesting in this matter—and I say it with as much charity as I can muster on an occasion like this—is that the Labor Party prides itself on being a party of change, a party of reform, and even being known in our society as a radical party. Therefore, it is ironical that when anything is put forward by way of change which might advance the situation for certain people, as is the case with the present decision, the Labor Party turns from that radical stance and becomes a fairly reactionary sort of body.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Rubbish!

The Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The decision to create two senior colleges is an innovation from the point of view of educationists, an innovation which will give plenty of young people and not-so-young people an opportunity to do what Mr Hetherington seems to think is a dastardly thing; that is, it will enable people who may have been high school drop-outs to go back to school. Those people will now have that opportunity because the Government is prepared, firstly, to take a courageous decision by converting both the schools and, secondly, because it is prepared to give people an opportunity of education they missed out on previously.

I say here and now, in common with other Liberal members in whose electorate the school is situated, that I will do all I can—and I have already begun—to ensure that the dislocation of students and staff is kept to an absolute minimum. I will do what I can to ensure that the undertakings the Minister has given are discharged fully and correctly by the Minister and the Government. Notwithstanding that, I support the decision of the Government.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Criticism of Public Servants

THE HON. PETER DOWDING (North) [10.23 p.m.]: I rise on the adjournment to deal with some matters which are, in my submission, of some immediate importance because of the circumstances under which they were raised. The use of parliamentary privilege has been commented upon, more often by the braying of members opposite who wish to support some particularly conservative view about the use of privilege.

I must say it was with some surprise, therefore, that I found the Hon. Phil Lockyer misusing parliamentary privilege in such a dramatic way as he did during his speech on the Address-in-Reply.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: It appears that the interjections are out of order as to their quantity rather than as to their quality.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members to cease interjecting. I am not quite sure of the inference of the member who is addressing the Chair. If it is what I think it is I would ask him to be terribly careful about drawing that sort of inference again. I ask him to proceed.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: The reality—despite the interruptions from some of the less intelligent sections of the Government parties, which one might expect—is that this was an improper use of parliamentary privilege. The Hon. Phil Lockyer, without any substance, attacked people who have no right, of any sort of reply. I refer specifically to people who are civil servants.

The person who stood in my shoes prior to the last election was a man who misused parliamentary privilege on many occasions in relation to attacking public servants. It is a matter of some concern to me that people who ought to be immune from that sort of political attack have in fact been attacked in this House. It is quite improper in my view that the private lives of public servants should be aired in the vitriolic and political way that the Hon. Phil Lockyer did. It is quite improper in my submission for members of this House to inquire as to the political beliefs of public servants.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: You have been doing that yourself in respect of Dr Reid.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: All I can say is that if people wish to engage in public life the way Dr Reid has and to utilise, for party-political purposes, services provided by the public then I disagree with that.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Would you say it outside the House?

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: When people utilise public property during the public's time, that is a different matter. What the other member for North Province ignores is the fact that the member for Lower North Province got up and attacked two public servants for having done something in their private time. Whether his allegations be true or false, I object to that strenuously, and I rather suspect Mr Withers

would, too. I believe public servants are entitled to do what they will in their private time and to hold whatever political beliefs they wish to hold. It would be silly—although the Hon. Phil Lockyer frequently is—to suggest all public servants have particular political beliefs. It is pathetic to suggest the bulk of public servants vote for one or other of the major political parties. Some public servants may even vote for the minority, fringe parties which represent the extreme lunatic fringe and which emerge at each election. Nevertheless, that is their public and private right.

When the Hon. Phil Lockyer gets up to attack two members of the Commonwealth Public Service for an alleged act they are supposed to have committed in their private time, I regard that as indefensible. It is indefensible for him to be a bleating representative of those political extremists in my electorate who cannot bear to see anyone disagree with them. We have seen some classic examples of that. Even Mr Oliver, who is trying to interject, were he able to discriminate, would be able to see how appalling those political attitudes are.

It is disgraceful and absolutely without any sort of merit that the Hon. Phil Lockyer would seek to represent those extremist political views that exist in odd places throughout my electorate. In fact, I challenge the honourable member to produce evidence of the allegations he made, because I put it to him that the allegations are totally false.

Mr Lockyer referred to a particular senior public servant and alleged that he helped during an election campaign. I have been given courtesy by most public servants. I have been impeded in my efforts to represent the area by the Honorary Minister for Housing and by a number of other Ministers.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Rubbish!

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: The Minister does not know what he is talking about, and that is not a new experience. The fact is that I regard the right of the civil servants to give courtesy and assistance to members of Parliament as sacrosanct no matter who the members of Parliament are. I do not even mind civil servants talking to Mr Sodeman or being nice to him, although I cannot for a moment imagine why anyone would wish to do that. That is their right, and they are entitled to do that. To single out two civil servants and accuse them of some partisan activity, as the Hon. Phil Lockyer did in this House without any evidence at all, in my submission is intolerable.

It also is contrary to the views of his own party. Obviously, he has not researched the dreadful

campaign of terrorism and intimidation of public servants conducted by his own Government Ministers against civil servants in the Kimberley prior to the last State election. If he had, he would understand they were intimidated from expressing any sort of political belief, let alone using Government cars in support of any political activity. For the Hon. Phil Lockyer to pretend that is all right, and that anyone could do it is so contrary to the facts and to the vitriolic campaign carried out by Mr Hassell and Mr Ridge prior to the last State election that no doubt the Hon. Phil Lockyer would prefer to forget it ever occurred.

There is a further matter to which I refer. Politicians are fair game with other politicians and it is no doubt quite proper for me to endure some criticism at the hands of even the most ignorant member opposite. However, it is intolerable when members opposite—however ignorant or intelligent they may be—make up fanciful allegations of which they have not the slightest proof. I challenge the Hon. Phil Lockyer to accompany me to the senior management of MMA and discuss the spurious allegation he made yesterday in this Chamber and to prove that one single incident or allegation occurred. If he does not wish to take that opportunity, it simply proves to everyone that his allegation was false.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: He did not make any allegations; this is fantasy.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: The Hon. Bill Withers, who interjects, casting an arrow into my heart, obviously—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr President, if interjections are disorderly, I would ask the iron wall protection from them.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will receive the protection of the Chair when he is entitled to it. All interjections are out of order and I ask members to cease interjecting. If the honourable member continues his speech in a less provocative manner, perhaps there will not be so many interjections.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: With all due respect to you, Mr President, I will continue my speech as I had intended. It does not matter to me what the honourable member says; the reality is there in *Hansard*. The fact is that the Hon. Phil Lockyer suggested by innuendo—an innuendo I would be quite happy to test before one of Her Majesty's juries, properly constituted in a civil action in which I would like to have a bit of the honourable member's money—that I behaved improperly. I invite the Hon. Phil Lockyer to step

outside the House, not to engage in some athletic pursuit, but to repeat his allegation. I would be quite happy to take issue with him on the matter. I would be quite happy to place his nasty little innuendo before a court of law. It may have been only an innuendo but his intention was clear.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: This is fantasy. There is no such thing in *Hansard*.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Of course it is fantasy.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: On your part.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr Lockyer raised the matter. He now has his options: he can either admit his allegation was totally untrue and without any substance, good or bad, fair or foul, and that it was pure innuendo which he made upon the spur of the moment because he was under some sort of pressure; or, he can step outside the House and repeat his allegation and go with me to see the general manager of that enterprise and we will have a discussion and establish who is telling the truth. It is a matter of truth or falsity, not simply of political licence.

THE HON. P. H. LOCKYER (Lower North) [10.35 p.m.]: It does not surprise me that air hostesses make comments on the behaviour of members of Parliament, if this is any example from the Hon. Peter Dowding. Had the honourable member been in the Chamber last night when I referred to the matter of the two public servants in Port Hedland, he would have understood I was not making a personal attack on them.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Not much!

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: You were not here; how do you know?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Because I read it in *Hansard*, you clot!

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Mr President, I am sure you realise I sat through a personal attack by the honourable member, and did not interject once because I thought he should be paid the courtesy of being given a fair hearing.

I return to the point: If the honourable member had graced us with his presence in the Chamber last night which he so rarely does these days

Point of Order

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr President, I object to that. I ask the honourable member to withdraw the allegation because it is false.

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is not an objectionable point.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Because it is true.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: I ask for it to be withdrawn because it is false.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I make the decisions as to what will or will not be withdrawn.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: I seek a withdrawal. I ask you to order the Hon. Phil Lockyer to withdraw that statement, because it is false.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Under what right do you ask me to do that?

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Because, in my submission, the statement was quite unparliamentary.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is completely out of order. Any decision as to whether or not a comment is unparliamentary is for me to make.

I am certainly not a President who believes in personal attacks on members of either House. However, people in the political arena must be prepared to accept certain comments that perhaps in other circumstances they would not be expected to accept. I do not believe that particular comment was one which could be considered unparliamentary.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: As I was saying, if the honourable member had graced us with his presence in the Chamber at the time I was speaking of those two gentlemen in Port Hedland, he would have realised I was not making a personal attack on them. In fact, I said that if they used their vehicles and I am led to believe they did - during the last State election

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Led to believe? By whom?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I did not believe that was a bad thing. The honourable member has tried to convince members that personal attacks on members of the public should not be allowed. I put it to him that people in glass houses should not throw stones. If Mr Dowding reads *Hansard* obviously he has not read the copy I have in front of me

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He has the uncorrected copy.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I also have the uncorrected copy; Mr Dans is quite wrong in what he suggests, and I am surprised he should make such a comment. For the benefit of members, I have not touched or altered in any way the part of my speech containing the interjection relating to MMA. I am sure Mr Oliver and Mr Withers would both remember that when Mr Dowding

interjected on me I said, "I have heard about your behaviour from the hostesses." I did not say whether it was good, bad, or indifferent behaviour. In fact, my comment was made in a lighthearted manner and has been taken far too seriously and too quickly by Mr Dowding.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Was it true or false?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I do not have to answer questions like that.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: No, you just peddle lies.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: If the honourable member has a guilty conscience, that is his problem; if he does not have a guilty conscience, he has no need to worry.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: I have no guilty conscience.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: It is very good that the member has not a guilty conscience.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Direct your comments to the Chair.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I shall. I put to you, Mr President, that the member's personal attacks on Dr Peter Reid in Broome over a series of months, in a series of questions, are far worse than anything I said last night.

Government members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: There has been a sustained attack over a long period of time. This member has to realise that if he is going to hand out this type of thing—and he hands out plenty in this Chamber—he must be prepared to take it back.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Even if it is false?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: We saw a scurrilous attack on the Hon. Neil McNeill, when the Hon. Peter Dowding made completely unfounded allegations about some obscure newspaper down at Rockingham one night when the Hon. Neil McNeill was not even in the Chamber; so the Hon. Peter Dowding's personal behaviour here is absolutely dreadful.

Tonight the Hon. Peter Dowding used the adjournment debate to "slip into" the Minister for Lands, the Minister for Housing, and the Minister for Community Welfare because he has a phobia about this thing. I am suggesting that perhaps the member should take the recommendation of a very good psychiatrist, and visit him quickly. Honestly, I feel for him. Six years in this Chamber will make him a gibbering wreck.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will certainly not tolerate the approach that the honourable

member is taking. If members cannot address themselves without attacking the reputation of other members, I would prefer them not to address themselves to the Chair at all.

If members, in their comments, make references which some other member believes are not factual, the other member has the opportunity to refute them.

I ask the honourable member to continue his comments and reach the conclusion of his remarks as soon as he possibly can.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Thank you, Mr President. I do agree.

As far as the member's invitation for me to step outside the Chamber and make the comment I made in my speech—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You said it.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: There is no question of that, because we saw what he did to the Hon. John Tozer.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: The jury did.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: I am not talking about the election. Mr Dowding knows.

There is no question of my going outside the Chamber. Should the member and I ever step outside this Chamber, I promise that no words will pass.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What does that mean?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: Should the member like to take it up, he will be welcome.

I hope I have refuted what he said tonight. It was quite unfair. I did not make a personal attack on Mr Hayward or Mr Muddie, because they are the two people about whom he is talking. In fact, if they gave him a hand in the election—

The Hon. Peter Dowding: They did not.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: —it is immaterial. I do not care whether they did or they did not. If they did, what is the problem?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Well, why name them?

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: All I am trying to do is to draw the attention of members to this personal attack on Dr Peter Reid in Broome. Dr Peter Reid cannot come into this place to defend himself, which is exactly what the Hon. Peter Dowding is accusing me of trying to do. Dr Peter Reid cannot come in and defend himself, as Mr Hayward and Mr Muddie cannot.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You do not defend by attacking somebody else.

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: The Hon. Des Dans does not understand because, apart from a

few visits to different places in the north, he does not know the problem. In fact, it has nothing to do with him anyway.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: You are getting more scatty than I thought you were.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER: What the Hon. Peter Dowding said tonight is wrong, and I refute it totally.

Traffic: Canning Highway

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [10.44 p.m.]: What I am going to say will take a few minutes only, and it will come as somewhat of an anticlimax after that rather spirited defence by the Hon. Phil Lockyer.

I want to speak about the Road Traffic Authority, but in a different sense from that mentioned earlier. I will direct my remarks to the Leader of the House; and I hope he will speak to someone about the problem.

For some time I have been disturbed about the speed at which heavy vehicles travel down the Canning Highway. An incident today prompted me to raise the matter in the House. I am fully aware that trucks have to meet schedules; and I am aware that our road system was never meant to carry heavy road transport traffic as well as ordinary motorcars. We are all aware of that.

The Hon. Neil Oliver: Was it an owner-driver?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I did not stop the truck to find out. This is a serious matter.

The drivers of heavily-loaded vehicles, particularly those coming from the wharf, do not like to stop; and they try to jump the lights. On the highway today, this particular vehicle went through two sets of red lights at a very fast rate. As I approached the Canning Bridge, the truck was parked on the highway with its lights flashing on and off.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Was the tail light on?

The Hon. D. K. DANS: I think it was dragging on the ground! I thought that the driver had been apprehended by the RTA; but as I looked into the rear vision mirror of my car, lo and behold the driver came out of the TAB. As members know, there is no parking on the highway.

I am not here to criticise the RTA; but I think attention should be given to the speed of these vehicles. I know there are owner-drivers who need every load they can obtain; but one day there will be a king-size accident involving one of these trucks. The reason there are not many accidents now is that most drivers on the road know what the trucks do, and they take evasive action. Of course, I am not very familiar with what happens on the Stirling Highway.

At the time of the incident today, school children were leaving the schools; so the situation was worse. Some people seem to think that some firms have an open go; but I do not believe that.

In all fairness I accept that the RTA is probably understaffed. I recognise the deficiencies of our road system. At the same time, in addition to the RTA's doing the things about which Mr Gayfer complains, it would be a very good plan for the officers to give attention to these large vehicles. I am not thinking of apprehending them and fining the drivers heavily; but there should be some sort of directive or caution for the drivers of those heavy vehicles to be a little more aware that other people use the roads also. If something tragic happens, it will be far too late.

Members of Parliament: Parliamentary Privilege

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [10.48 p.m.]: I feel the need to rise and speak quite briefly. In my period of seven years in this House I have not used parliamentary privilege to say anything concerning anybody that I would not be prepared to say outside the House. I do not intend to use it in that way. Anyone who knows me well would accept that, because that is the way I operate.

However, I am becoming sick of the situation in this House when repeated threats are being made for people to step outside and say something about someone which they have already said in the House.

The Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Always by the same person.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: This is a habit that has become prevalent, unfortunately, since the election to this House of the Hon. Peter Dowding.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: It reflects on the speaker, not the challenger.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I wish to remind the House that on a previous occasion the Hon. Peter Dowding had some comments to make about a certain Mr Leggoe. I have not met Mr Leggoe, and I do not hold any brief for him. However, at the time I thought that the Hon. Peter Dowding should have gone outside the House and repeated the things he had been saying about the appointment of Mr Leggoe. It is most inappropriate for the Hon. Peter Dowding continually to make these sorts of comments in

the House. He either plays the game by the rules, or he does not play it.

The honourable member was challenged at the time. In fact, I rose and spoke during the adjournment debate and raised the matter, so there is no point in the member saying he was not challenged. He should be prepared to take the medicine which he believes other members should take.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

RAILWAYS: FREMANTLE-PERTH

R. Travers Morgan Pty. Ltd.

184. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Who recommended the firm of Travers Morgan to carry out a review on the Fremantle line?
- (2) On what basis was it selected?
- (3) Is it American based?
- (4) Has it been, or is it now associated with the American Westinghouse Skybus proposals?
- (5) What substantial work have they done for other Australian States?
- (6) What will the total cost of the report be?
- (7) What are the terms of reference?
- (8) Will its report be made public before any decision is taken on it?
- (9) Why was not a local firm such as Maunsell and Partners engaged to do the work?
- (10) Can the engagement of Travers Morgan be construed as an admission by the Government that it at no time had sufficient information on which to base a decision on the Fremantle line or that it still feels ill-equipped to make such a decision?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The consultants, R. Travers Morgan Pty. Ltd., were recommended by the Director General of Transport.
- (2) On an assessment of the expertise and experience of the consultants and on a desire to engage consultants with complete independence from events which have occurred to date in relation to the Perth-Fremantle corridor or which might occur after the Government reaches its decision next year.
- (3) No.
- (4) The consultants advise that the answer is "No."
- (5) Without listing all of the consultants' work, major studies in other States include—

- (i) New South Wales: assessment of public transport alternatives between Sydney CBD and Sydney Airport; and advice on costing of buses and taxis in Wollongong.
- (ii) New South Wales and Victoria: Sydney-Melbourne railway electrification study.
- (iii) Victoria: evaluation of alternative forms of public transport.
- (iv) South Australia: Adelaide rail costing study; and economic assessment for the north-east area public transport review study—NEAPTR.
- (v) Tasmania: Derwent region transportation study.
- (vi) Australia-wide: Australian Railways pricing study.
- (6) Approximately \$100 000. The final cost will depend largely on the quantity of public submissions which the consultants will be required to assess.
- (7) The full terms of reference are as follows—

Preamble

The Western Australian Government is committed to review the provision of passenger services between Perth and Fremantle and to announce future plans by September 1982. This study, by independent consultants, is to ensure that all relevant facts receive proper consideration.

Irrespective of the recommendations, the Government is committed to reserve a segregated right-of-way adequate for any conventional form of transit.

Terms of Reference

The consultants will—

1. Examine all feasible mass public transport options for the Perth-Fremantle corridor.
2. Consider both probable and possible levels of future patronage.
3. Evaluate all evidence submitted by the Government and its Departments and any submissions by interested bodies or individuals.

4. Assess passenger convenience, cost limits, energy sources, environmental pollution, ability to cope with demand, compatibility with other transport systems, adaptability to future developments, and any other matters which will impinge significantly on the selection of a recommended form of transport.

5. Recommend the most appropriate form, or succession of forms, of transport for the provision of passenger services between Perth and Fremantle, including a suggested timetable for its introduction and for future developments.

- (8) The Government has already announced its intention to make the report public.
- (9) R. Travers Morgan Pty. Ltd. is qualified in the assessment of planning, economic, social, and environmental issues and were considered to fulfil the requirements of this particular study best.
- (10) The member seems to want it both ways. While his parliamentary leader and the Opposition spokesman on transport have apparently welcomed the appointment of independent consultants, the member himself seems to have doubts. The Government has full confidence in its advisers and the information on which it based its decision to withdraw rail passenger services in the Fremantle corridor. It is most happy to submit this information to the assessment of independent experts. It is hoped that the Opposition will be putting forward the factually supported details of its own scheme for independent evaluation.

EDUCATION

Mt. Lawley High School and Kyilla and Mt. Lawley Primary Schools

185. The Hon. J. M. BERINSON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In each of the last five years, what was the enrolment at the following schools—

- (a) Kyilla Primary School;
- (b) Mt. Lawley Primary School; and
- (c) Mt. Lawley High School?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

I am advised as follows:

(a) Kyilla Primary School		
1976	August	169
1977	August	158
1978	August	162
1979	August	148
1980	July	150
1981	March	151
(b) Mt. Lawley Primary School		
1976	August	441
1977	August	400
1978	August	424
1979	August	394
1980	July	376
1981	March	380
(c) Mt. Lawley Senior High School		
1976	August	1 292
1977	August	1 242
1978	August	1 170
1979	August	1 187
1980	July	1 143
1981	March	1 225

186. *This question was postponed.*

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS

Bentley and Tuart Hill

187. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will the closure of the Bentley and Tuart Hill Senior High Schools involve an overall loss in the number of teaching positions in the State?
- (2) If so, how many?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

BOATS

Certificates of Registration

188. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

Will the Minister advise—

- (a) the total number of power boats registered in this State;
- (b) the cost of a licence fee for a power boat;

- (c) the total returns to the State Government annually from such fees; and
- (d) the total departmental cost of administration and policing of power boats?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) Approximately 40 000
- (b) vessels up to five metres \$10.00
vessels five metres and over \$20.00
- (c) revenue 1979-80 \$434 884
estimated revenue 1980-81 \$508 000
- (d) expenditure 1979-80 \$516 583
estimated expenditure 1980-81 \$540 000

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS

Optimum Number of Students

189. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

What does the Minister for Education regard as an optimum number of students for a senior high school?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The answer to this question was provided in another place on 14 April 1981 and for the member's consideration the question involved was as follows—

- (1) Is it fact that the parents and citizens' association of Tuart Hill Senior High School have contributed equipment and facilities for that school, the estimated value of which exceeds \$100 000?
- (2) Why has he apparently not answered all of the questions contained in my question without notice to him of 8 April 1981 touching on Tuart Hill Senior High School?
- (3) What is the ideal school population for each of the senior high schools in the metropolitan area?
- (4) Will he list all of the senior high schools in the metropolitan area stating in each case school populations for each of the last five years and the anticipated population for the next five years?

- (5) Noting that he says that he has written to every parent concerning the closure of Tuart Hill Senior High School, on what date or dates does he say that every parent received his letter?

- (6) Having said that the closure of Tuart Hill Senior High School will produce tremendous educational advantages for all concerned, will he state each of those advantages so far as the present students of Tuart Hill Senior High School are concerned?

The answer was—

- (1) The Parents & Citizens' Association of the Tuart Hill Senior High School has been active in supporting the school. Figures relating to the value of equipment and facilities provided are not maintained in the Education Department.

A significant part of the equipment, which is not consumable and has not worn out, is at present in the school. It is anticipated that much of this will transfer with the students to their neighbouring schools.

- (2) Detailed responses were made to the 12 questions provided. If the member would like to specify the questions he considers "apparently not answered" I will be pleased to furnish further information.
- (3) There is no "ideal size" for a high school. The general consensus is that schools need to be large enough to maintain a full range of subject choice for students. Most metropolitan senior high schools have been built to accommodate between 1 000 and 1 200 students.
- (4) This information is being compiled and a copy will be forwarded to the member when available.
- (5) Letters to parents were delivered to the school on Wednesday, 8 April, and distributed to students to take home that afternoon.

- (6) The populations of Tuart Hill High School and Mirrabooka Senior High School are projected to fall below 600 students each. Both schools will experience severe limitations in the range of subject choice in upper school and of options in lower school unless a move is made to rationalise the situation. In the future some of the students who are at present attending Tuart Hill Senior High School will have the opportunity of attending the new senior college. This additional educational facility will be of great benefit to all students in the locality. It would not have been available to them if the school were not to be redeveloped.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOLS

Cannington, Como, and Kent Street

190. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What provisions for physically handicapped children are to be found at the following high schools—
 (a) Como Senior High School;
 (b) Kent Street Senior High School; and
 (c) Cannington Senior High School?

- (2) What arrangements are at present planned for physically handicapped children who are at present attending Bentley High School, or the primary schools from which Bentley High School students normally come?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) and (2) No special provisions exist at these three schools. The one girl in question here will require special arrangements which will be made well before they are needed next year.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

191. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the Education Department compiled a priority list for the closure of schools in the area around Bentley Senior High School?

- (2) If so, what was the position of the Bentley Senior High School on that list?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) No. After consideration of all schools in the district Bentley was selected as the most appropriate.
 (2) Not applicable.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

192. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Are resources adequate in nearby schools to cope with the dramatic increase in student numbers which will follow the closure of Bentley Senior High School?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

Current predictions indicate that this is the case. However, minor adjustments or extensions to accommodation will be made if necessary.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

193. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In the event of the closure of Bentley Senior High School, what will happen to the students using Bentley who are at the Clontarf Special School?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

There is no unique provision for Clontarf students at Bentley Senior High School. Students who live at Clontarf and who wish to enrol at a Government secondary school in the future will be able to do so at the most appropriate school, probably Como Senior High School.

AGRICULTURE PROTECTION BOARD

Armadale Town Council

194. The Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the Agriculture Protection Board's decision—conveyed to the Armadale Town Council on 25 February 1981—to require the town to make its own arrangements in future regarding the control of declared plants and animals?
- (2) If so, is the Minister aware of the council's 8 April response that vast areas of the municipality comprise water catchment and forest areas?
- (3) Will the Minister seek a reversal of the board's decision in so far as non-municipal land such as water catchment and forest areas are concerned?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) to (3) The advice to the Armadale Town Council related only to council property and does not apply to the remainder of the municipality.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

195. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) In the event of Bentley Senior High School closing, what will happen to the low ability special class?
- (2) Will the class be kept together?
- (3) If so, where is it intended to locate the class?
- (4) Will the present teacher remain with the class?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) It will be retained as a class, but relocated.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) At the most convenient location in the region.
- (4) Yes, unless otherwise entitled to a transfer.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

196. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Should Bentley Senior High School be converted to a Senior College—

- (1) Will the present cleaning staff be retained, or is it intended to put cleaning out to contracts?
- (2) In the event of retention of cleaning staff, will hours be maintained which are convenient for the staff?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The nature of the institution is unlikely to affect the form of cleaning.
- (2) The hours are not expected to cause problems for cleaning staff.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

197. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Should Bentley Senior High School be closed—

- (1) What provisions will be made for the current year eights?
- (2) What provisions will be made for the socialisation in 1982 for years nine, 10 and 12, in the way of interschool sporting contacts and other contacts?
- (3) Will classes remain for the current year 11s when they have TAEs in 1982, even if they are an uneconomic size?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) This decision will be made after discussions with the school staff and with parents.
- (2) It is anticipated that arrangements will be made where desirable through neighbouring high schools.
- (3) Yes, but this contingency is unlikely to occur.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

198. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Should Bentley Senior High School close, will parents be compensated for school uniforms, sports uniforms, different text book and/or different book hire schemes?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The plans for phasing out the school will mean that students transfer only at the end of year 10 and possibly at the end of year eight. They should face no problems with regard to textbooks and/or different book hire schemes. School uniforms are not compulsory and receiving schools will be expected to deal sympathetically with students affected by a change of school.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

199. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In proposing to close Bentley Senior High School is it the intention of the Government that the PWD will continue to maintain the school?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

Bentley is not closing, but it is being transformed into a different but still most important Education Department institution. The normal arrangements for school maintenance will apply.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

200. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Should Bentley Senior High School be closed, is it proposed to establish another school as Special for the hearing impaired?
- (2) If so, which school is proposed?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The school will be chosen after consultation with appropriate staff and announced well in advance of the date of its establishment.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

201. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In the event of Bentley Senior High School closing, will the present senior staff of the school be given preference in transferring to other schools in the metropolitan area over other applicants for transfer?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

Subject to departmental regulations, the preferences of senior staff will be given a high priority in transfer.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

202. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has the option of Bentley Senior High School remaining as a multi-purpose school been considered?
- (2) If so, can the Minister outline the reasons for rejecting such an option?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The senior college concept possesses real advantages. In particular, experience in technical colleges over many years has demonstrated that there is a significant group of older students who can be catered for far more effectively in the more mature, practical adult ethos of a technical college. These students will not return to a school-type environment. The shared use of the same facility by school children in the age group 12-15 and young adults in the age group 16-20 is a less desirable alternative than the senior college proposal.

Further, the increased number of students in neighbouring high schools as a result of the decision will enhance the programme of those schools.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

203. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In the event of the closure of Bentley Senior High School, where is it intended that Aboriginal students from the McKay Street Hostel will go?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

A decision will be made as to the most appropriate high school after consultation with hostel authorities.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

204. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

Why has Bentley Senior High School been selected for closure instead of one of the other high schools in the area?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The redistribution of students would present less difficulties and the facilities lend themselves admirably to the requirements of a senior college.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

205. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has it been suggested that all members of the staff of Bentley High School apply for transfers?
- (2) If so, will this involve such members holding substantive positions in other schools while other staff have to be seconded or appointed to acting positions?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes, as it is only by asking all members of staff to apply for transfers that it is possible to gain the necessary information about their location preferences and thereby ensure that the teachers concerned have opportunity to relocate in congenial areas. To ensure that students are not disadvantaged during the transition period, key personnel who receive transfers will be seconded back to Bentley to give continuity to the current educational programme.
- (2) No. See (1) above.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

206. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Should Bentley High School be closed, will strict zoning apply for the other high schools in the area?
- (2) If this is not the case, will arrangements be made for multiple busing?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) It is anticipated that current zoning rules will apply.
- (2) Arrangements to meet the new situation will be negotiated with the metropolitan transport authorities.

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Bentley

207. The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

In the event of Bentley Senior High School closing, what will happen to the resources at the school provided by the parents?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

Discussions with parents will identify those resources which will be reallocated among schools receiving the students from Bentley.

RAILWAYS

"Australind" Service

208. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it true that the Government intends to ensure rail passenger services on the Perth-Bunbury line cease to operate by continuing to patch up the *Australind* coaching stock until it is no longer economically possible to do so?
- (2) If it is not true, will the Minister advise what plans the Government has for a modern replacement train?
- (3) If plans do exist, will the Minister give a categorical assurance that the new train will be air-conditioned?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) A study is currently being undertaken by Westrail to determine the options for replacing the existing *Australind* passenger train at the end of its economic life.

This examination is in its initial stages and it is not possible at this time to state what replacement equipment will be provided.

RAILWAYS

Bunbury-Fremantle

209. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will the route of the electrification of the Fremantle-Bunbury railway line be via Perth and Armadale?
- (2) If not, will the Minister advise the proposed route?
- (3) What type of electrification system—voltage—will be used?
- (4) When will construction be—

- (a) commenced; and
- (b) completed?

- (5) Will the railway track be converted to—
- (a) standard gauge; or
- (b) dual gauge?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) and (2) The preliminary feasibility examination which has been made of this proposal was evaluated on the route from Kwinana via Mundijong to Bunbury.

As indicated in answer to a previous question, this was a preliminary study only and it indicated that a detailed economic and engineering study should be undertaken. Such a study may or may not suggest an alternative route.

- (3) The preliminary study envisages a 25(kv)50HZ alternating current overhead equipment system.
- (4) and (5) This has yet to be determined.

RAILWAYS

Freight: Tonnes Hauled

210. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Would the Minister advise the total tonnage hauled on the Bunbury line for the year ended 30 June 1980?
- (2) As total tonnage hauled on Westrail's main freight lines, e.g. Bunbury, Kalgoorlie, Geraldton, Albany, etc., is frequently referred to by the Minister for Transport, would the Minister ensure this information is included in future annual reports of Westrail?
- (3) If the Minister will not, could he please supply his reason?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) It is not possible to provide a single figure for the Bunbury line. As seen in the data provided below the tonnes varies within the line depending on the influence of major traffic tasks such as alumina from Calcine and bauxite from Jarrahdale. For your assistance details on both net tonnes and net tonne kilometres are shown as the latter is a more meaningful statistic when examining a section of lines' performance.

	Net Tonne Km Millions	Net Tonnes Km Millions
Armadale-Mundijong Junction	2.09	0.65
Mundijong Junction-Mundijong	17.78	9.31
Mundijong-Pinjarra	7.99	3.67
Pinjarra-Brunswick	6.50	2.95
Brunswick-Picton	5.20	2.31
Picton-Bunbury	3.94	1.23

- (2) and (3) Since 1973 Westrail's annual report has been prepared in two parts. The main report is essentially published for public consumption and it highlights the main elements of the years' performance. The second part contains selected financial and operating statistics and it is restricted primarily to departmental use.

The reason for separating the statistics from the annual report proper is that many of the details are confidential in as much as it could place Westrail in a disadvantageous position if such data were available to their competitors.

While the question of confidentiality does not apply to all statistics another important factor is that the data may be used inappropriately by persons not familiar with the methodology used in compiling the figures. There are also special conditions which need to be recognised when comparing annual statistics about which an uninformed user may not be aware.

For these reasons Westrail policy has been and will continue to be to exclude detailed statistics from the published annual report. However, where available, data as requested will continue to be provided.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Roadworthiness

211. The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

Does a new vehicle straight off the showroom floor have to be taken to a testing station for a certificate of roadworthiness before it can be licensed?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

If the vehicle is being licensed under the bulk licensing scheme, "No".
In all other cases, "Yes."

ROAD

Glen Road

212. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the desire of the Shire of Mundaring to extend Glen Road across the railway reserve?

- (2) Has any request been made to have a section of the railway reserve gazetted for road purposes?
- (3) Has part of the railway reserve been bulldozed by the Shire of Kalamunda without authority?
- (4) Is it the intention of the Government to change the purpose of the railway reserve to permit the extension of Glen Road?
- (5) If so, when is it likely that the necessary action will be taken?
- (6) Is the Minister aware of the opposition of local residents to the proposed extension, and if so, will he take this opposition into account before any decision is made to allow the extension of the road?
- (7) What action has been taken against the shire for having bulldozed the railway reserve?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes, although the land concerned is not a railway reserve, but a former discontinued railway now set apart as Reserve No. 31196 for the purpose of parklands and vested in the Shire of Mundaring.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) To my knowledge, the Shire of Kalamunda is not involved.
- (4) There is no intention to change the purpose of Reserve No. 31196. What was requested by the Shire of Mundaring was the resumption or excision of the area of land continued within the proposed new Glen Road alignment from the reserve to allow its dedication as a public street. The Glen Road extension across the reserve comprises an area of 879 square metres. The current area of Reserve No. 31196 is 73.264 6 hectares.
- (5) The Shire of Mundaring's request was approved by the Governor-in-Executive-Council this morning.

- (6) I am aware of both support and opposition by local residents to the extension and both views were taken into account. The arguments put forward by both sides show that the matter is essentially a local planning issue and as such it should be resolved by the duly elected local authority. It was principally for this reason that the Shire of Mundaring's request has been agreed to.
- (7) When the shire's actions were brought to the attention of the department, instructions were issued for it to cease further work until the matter had been determined by the Governor.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

HEALTH: ALCOHOL

Alcohol and Drug Authority

72. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Is it a fact—

- (a) that the Alcohol and Drug Authority placed an advertisement for a social worker in last Saturday's *The West Australian*;
- (b) that before the ADA could interview applicants it was informed that there would be no funds available for such an appointment;
- (c) that the filling of this position would have provided a service considered essential by the ADA;
- (d) if the answer to (1) to (3) is "yes", how can the Government justify withholding the funds necessary for such an important appointment?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) No, but the authority itself deferred consideration of this appointment pending a review of the funds available to meet the cost in this financial year.
- (c) The appointment is obviously an important one, but the authority will endeavour to continue to provide the same level of service.
- (d) Not applicable.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Roadworthiness

73. The Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

I apologise to the Minister for asking this question without notice, but his answer to question 211 stated "I am advised by the Minister for Police and Traffic that if the vehicle is being licensed under the bulk licensing scheme, 'No'." As the Minister has been advised, could he inform the House what the bulk licensing scheme is?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

If the member can recall, I read as follows—

If the vehicle is being licensed under the bulk licensing scheme.

I did not say I had been advised because I did not believe that I had been fully advised on the background of this matter. If the member wishes a further answer I would only be too happy to provide it.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: My paper reads a little differently from yours.

HOUSING

Applicants: North-west

74. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

I refer to the Minister's answer to question 178 in which I asked for further information. I ask the Minister: Has he referred the matter to the Minister for Housing and has he an answer for me?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

The member's question 178 asks—

- (1) Is it necessary for a State Housing Commission applicant in the North West, in order to be eligible for housing, need to have dependent children?

The answer given to part (1) of the question is "No".

With regard to part (3) of the question—

In what towns are people without dependent children granted housing?

the answer, without taking this part in isolation, is quite obviously "any town" subject to the availability of accommodation in that particular locality.

In relation to part (4), the answer is simply "Yes" and the latter part of the question is not applicable as to circumstances. By that, I would imagine it would be "any circumstances". However, if the member wishes to be more specific, further information could be provided.

ROAD

Glen Road

75. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Minister for Lands:

I refer the Minister to the answer he gave to question 212 and I draw his attention to the fact that in part (3) I asked whether part of the reserve had been fully bulldozed by the shire without authority to do so. His answer was that to his knowledge the Shire of Kalamunda was not involved. I refer the Minister to part (7) of my question in which I asked what action had been taken against the shire for having bulldozed the reserve. The Minister said the direction was for it to cease.

I ask him: What was it the shire was asked to cease doing if in fact it was not involved in doing what I suggest it had been doing?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

I was asked what was the involvement of the Shire of Kalamunda, and that shire does not happen to be concerned. Therefore I am not sure why the member asked that.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: Yes, it is a different shire.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is right.

As regards the Shire of Mundaring, Reserve No. 31196 is vested in it for the purpose of parklands. It contains about 73 hectares, and the shire carries out various works in that area including the planting of trees, etc. I was phoned by the Speaker early one morning and told the shire was indeed working on that reserve; it was working on the trees with a bulldozer. The shire said it was to replace and plant new trees, but I instructed that it did not carry out road construction as I was aware it had requested permission to put a road through there. I asked the shire not to carry out construction until such time as the Government approved of it.

POLICE

Telephone Tapping

76. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Attorney General concerned about recent allegations which have been given prominence in the Press that State police may have been involved in illegal telephone tapping?
- (2) In view of the refusal of the Minister for Police to investigate whether the allegations have any substance, will the Attorney General take steps to inquire whether the allegations have substance and report to this House about whether the police are in fact accountable to Parliament?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) and (2) I have already answered a question in substantially the same form on a previous occasion, but I am not sure whether the member was present. I indicated then it is not my practice to interfere in the portfolio of another Minister.