

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 26 August 1981

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

HOUSING: KARRATHA

Petition

THE HON. PETER DOWDING (North) [4.33 p.m.]: I wish to present a petition from citizens of Western Australia complaining about the living conditions of many caravan dwellers and the shortage of State Housing Commission assistance in Karratha. I move—

That the petition be received and read.

Question put and passed.

THE HON. PETER DOWDING (North) [4.34 p.m.]: The petition contains 406 signatures and bears the Clerk's certificate that it is in conformity with the Standing Orders of the House. It reads as follows—

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Legislative Council in Parliament assembled.

The Petition of the undersigned respectfully sheweth that the attached statement concerning (a) The living conditions of many caravan dwellers and (b) The shortage of State housing assistance in Karratha is an accurate account of the difficulties being faced by many families in the town of Karratha.

Your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Legislative Council, in Parliament assembled, should arrange for an investigation of the situation in Karratha with a view to alleviating the poor living standards and housing shortage in the town, by whatever means possible.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

I move—

That the petition be ordered to lie upon the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

The petition was tabled (see paper No. 331).

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.18 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable the Workers' Compensation Amendment Bill to be taken on receipt of a Message from the Legislative Assembly and to be passed through all stages at any one sitting.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: To be carried, this motion requires the concurrence of an absolute majority. I have counted the House; and, there being no dissentient voice, I declare the question carried.

Question thus passed.

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT: THE HON. H. W. GAYFER

Litigation: Ministerial Statement

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [5.19 p.m.]: I move—

That I be given leave to make a statement relating to a question without notice asked of me by the Hon. Graham MacKinnon on 13 May last and in which I gave an undertaking to report to the House in due course.

Question put and passed.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: On 13 May, last, the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, asked me a question without notice in relation to a case heard in the State Full Court involving the Hon. H. W. Gayfer, MLC.

The member asked me whether I would examine the transcript of the case to ascertain whether a statement attributed to Mr R. J. Davies, by *The West Australian* of 12 May, was in fact made by him, and requested me to advise further concerning the privilege of the House in relation to the matter.

On 15 May *The West Australian* published a report indicating that its previous report could have been misconstrued and that the statement attributed to Mr Davies was not, in fact, made by him.

The statement referred to, that Mr Gayfer was "a persistent critic of the Road Traffic Authority" must, therefore, be taken to have been made by the reporter of *The West Australian* and published by that newspaper.

The final question, then, on which I am asked to advise the House, is whether the statement as made by the reporter and published in the newspaper constitutes a breach of the privilege of the House.

So far as the law is concerned, the relevant principle is that a member of Parliament cannot be called to account in a court of law for things that have been said by him in Parliament.

This point was demonstrated in a relevant way in the English case of the Church of Scientology v. Johnson-Smith (1971) 1 QB 552. There the Scientologists had brought an action for libel against Johnson-Smith, who was a member of Parliament, and in order to rebut his defence of fair comment, had sought to prove malice by introducing evidence of other statements unfavourable to Scientology which the defendant previously had made in Parliament.

It was held that the giving of such evidence would constitute a breach of the privilege of Parliament and so it was excluded.

By analogy if, in the proceedings concerning Mr Gayfer, it had been sought to establish to his detriment that he had a certain attitude to the Road Traffic Authority by adducing evidence of statements which he had made in the Parliament, it would seem that valid objection could have been taken to that course and the evidence excluded.

If, however, it could be established as a fact that Mr Gayfer had persistently criticised the Road Traffic Authority not only within but also outside the Parliament, there would be no reason that his statements outside the Parliament could not have been referred to.

I have checked the position with Mr Gayfer and he has indicated that there is no doubt that he has been critical of the Road Traffic Authority on a number of occasions outside the Parliament as well as within it.

In the circumstances, therefore, I am advised by the Crown Solicitor that the statement in the newspaper report, either in its original or corrected form, cannot be said to constitute any breach of privilege or contempt of the House.

SPACECRAFT: COSMOS 434

Statement by the Hon. W. R. Withers

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [5.29 p.m.]: I move—

That I be given leave to make a statement concerning Cosmos 434, which I consider may be a nuclear vehicle.

Question put and passed.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: Approximately 1½ hours ago I called the First Secretary of the Ministry of Defence in Canberra concerning Cosmos 434, which some people think landed in the south-western corner of the North Province on Sunday, 23 August. I asked Mr Trevor Rowe, the First Secretary of Defence to the Minister for Defence, if the Minister had received advice from the Soviet Government concerning the satellite. He advised me that the Hon. Tony Street, Minister for Foreign Affairs, had answered a question in Parliament on that subject earlier today.

I understand the *Daily News* tonight gives a fair representation of that answer. I understand further that the Minister is of the opinion that Cosmos 434 did not contain radioactive material and that it may have come to earth on 23 August, but not in Western Australia.

I have done some basic research of information that I have obtained from the State Library, and I find that Cosmos 434 may have been powered by nuclear means during its time in space. For this reason, I believe this Parliament should be advised of the situation and should support our State Government's demands for more accurate information.

The evidence which leads me to believe that Cosmos 434 may have landed in the North Province and also may contain nuclear material is as follows: Between November 1970 and August 1971 four Cosmos space vehicles were launched. Cosmos 434 was launched in early August 1971 and compared with the other Cosmos vehicles it had the lightest initial weight with the highest initial orbit. All these vehicles were said to be highly manoeuvrable; however, Cosmos 379 and Cosmos 434—that is the one to which this statement refers—were not fitted with solar panels. As a layman, this indicates to me that Cosmos 379 and Cosmos 434 may have been nuclear powered.

The information I have quoted to date is contained on pages 383 to 385 of *Space Flight*, volume 19, of 19 November 1977. The information has been collated by D. R. Woods who is a staff systems engineer with IBM, USA.

For further information to support my contention, I refer to the publication *Astronautics and Aeronautics* dated 5 September 1971. On page 249 it says—

U.S. and British space experts believed purpose of four Cosmos launches in past 10 months was to test components for manned lunar landing, *New York Times* reported.

Cosmos 434, launched August 12 was said to have been test of variable-thrust, restartable rocket engine similar to onboard propulsion system in Apollo CSMs.

It goes on to say—

... Cosmos 434, had demonstrated greater ability to manoeuvre in space than any previous Soviet manned flight.

Members will have already observed that evidence suggests that the Cosmos 434 had no solar panels but it carried a variable-thrust restartable rocket engine.

Because of these factors one now looks at the possibility of a nuclear power source. There is a possibility that the restartable rocket motors may have had a battery power source for use in a short-lived experiment on space manoeuvrability.

[Resolved: That motions be continued.]

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: However, if one looks at the re-entry flight path of Cosmos 954 which was a nuclear carrying space vehicle in 1978, we find that it too would have passed over the North Province.

That highly radio-active space vehicle came to earth in a remote area in Canada. Immediately the landing was confirmed, the United States despatched a high flying U2 and a larger KC135 both carrying radiation sensors to check for high altitude radiation over the Canadian wilderness. A 22-man Canadian nuclear accident support team equipped with radiation proof suits went into operation with a 44-man team of US military technicians. After two days of searching, a low flying joint US-Canadian "sniffer plane" detected an extremely dangerous level of radiation. However, officials seemed to differ on the radiation source.

Further to this it is interesting to note that in the documented highlights of international legal materials there is a claim made by the Canadian Government against the USSR for compensation of over \$6 million for liability in respect of Cosmos 954. It is interesting to note also that *Time* magazine dated 6 February 1978 refers to, and I quote—

No cause for panic, said the U.S. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski. It had merely been "a space age difficulty ... There is no danger."

The little difficulty that Brzezinski so soothingly soft-pedalled was the fiery return to earth of Cosmos 954: ...

It goes on to say—

... The craft crashed into the atmosphere over a remote Canadian wilderness area last

week, apparently emitting strong radiation.

...

It then goes on to say—

Both Washington and Moscow seemed to feel that the danger of widespread contamination in a densely populated area was minimal and wanted to cooperate in calming any public concern. Yet intelligence officials in both nations knew that Cosmos 954 was a rare and sophisticated Soviet bird designed to track deep-running American nuclear submarines.

It had 110 pounds of enriched uranium on board. *Time* magazine goes on to say—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has leave of the House to make a statement. I am hoping that the conclusion of his statement is fast approaching. It seems to me that it is starting to become more than a statement.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: It's a Press release.

An Opposition member: Space invaders!

The Hon. W. R. WITHERS: I appreciate that. I am approaching the end of the statement, but it was very necessary to mention this evidence, which is at this stage circumstantial evidence.

We then look at the statement of claim which the Canadian Government issued against the USSR. There is a lot of interesting reading in it. I intended to read two paragraphs, but in view of your comments, Sir, I will read only one. Part 7 of that claim says—

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics failed to provide timely and complete replies to the questions posed by Canada on January 24, 1978 despite the reiteration of the request for information on several occasions, in particular in the Department of External Affairs' Aide-Memoire of February 8, 1978, in its Note of February 28, 1978 to the Embassy and in its Note of April 13, 1978 to the Embassy. The Government of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ultimately provided some information in the Notes of the Embassy dated March 21, 1978 and May 31, 1978. This information, particularly that in the latter Note, contributed to the Canadian evaluation of the required course of action.

If we are dealing with such radioactive material, that period of time is far too long. I am afraid the circumstantial evidence which I have just presented to this House indicates that the vehicle that has possibly landed in my province in the north is Cosmos 434 which, also from circumstantial evidence, could be nuclear

powered. Because of this evidence, plus the attitude of the USSR in respect of the Cosmos vehicle which landed in Canada, I ask that the members of this House give support to the State Government to seek urgent and specific information from the Soviet Embassy.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: Why don't they do something about it in the meantime?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

BILLS (10): ASSENT

Messages from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills—

1. Dried Fruits Amendment Bill.
2. Seeds Bill.
3. Wheat Bags Repeal Bill.
4. Western Australian Institute of Technology Amendment Bill.
5. Rural Housing (Assistance) Amendment Bill.
6. Road Traffic Amendment Bill.
7. Art Gallery Amendment Bill.
8. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Amendment Bill.
9. Wheat Marketing (Delivery Quotas) Amendment and Repeal Bill.
10. Hospitals Amendment Bill.

HOUSING AGREEMENT (COMMONWEALTH AND STATE) BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) [5.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Housing Agreement (Commonwealth and State) Act Amendment Act, No. 20 of 1978, ceased to apply as from 30 June 1981, and legislation has been enacted by the Commonwealth to facilitate an ongoing Commonwealth-State housing arrangement for a five-year period commencing 1 July, 1981.

It is a requirement that the authority of this Parliament be obtained to enable the State to be a party to the new agreement.

The new agreement is modelled largely on the previous one which operated for a three-year

period, but now makes provision for the inclusion of the Northern Territory as a participating party. Hitherto, separate arrangements have existed between the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory.

However, there are some other significant features in the new agreement which require some comment.

Under repeated pressure from the States, the Commonwealth agreed to write a base minimum level of funding into the agreement with a view to enabling States to make forward planning. However, in consenting to the States, the Commonwealth has set the base figure at \$200 million for each of the five years of the agreement as a forward commitment on the part of the Commonwealth, with additional or top-up funding to be determined within the context of the annual Budget.

The amount prescribed is unrealistic and totally inadequate, particularly in view of the facts that—

the base amount includes \$54 million by way of tied grants for pensioner and Aboriginal housing; and

no provision is made to vary this amount in the wake of inflation and any other changing circumstances.

All States have vigorously opposed the unrealistic and totally inadequate base minimum level, but the Commonwealth is adamant that it is not negotiable. Notwithstanding this, members are assured that continuing representation will be made at every opportunity by the Western Australian Government for the lifting of the base amount and overall funding to more realistic and adequate levels.

From the 1956 agreement, and up to and including the 1978 agreement, the States have been required to set aside a stated percentage of advances for allocation to the home purchase assistance scheme, previously known as the home builders' account.

This condition will no longer apply and States will now enjoy the responsibility of allocating advances as between the purchase and rental assistance schemes as the State itself sees fit to meet the evidenced needs at the time.

It is mentioned that whereas that portion of advances employed on rental activities under the previous agreement was repayable with interest at 5 per cent, under the new arrangements the interest rate applicable on all advances will be 4.5 per cent over a repayment term of 53 years.

The new arrangement incorporates two significant aspects which had not been included previously in agreements between the Commonwealth and States.

The first relates to matching arrangements. This is nothing new as all States were required to provide matching funds over the last three years.

The incorporation of this requirement into the agreement has been done with a view to the arrangement being regularised. Whilst arguments can be advanced to object to such a requirement, it does at least ensure that States will provide sufficient funds from their own resources as a matching contribution, which is to the benefit of housing overall.

Additionally, whereas in the past three years States have been required to apply their matching funds towards the purposes of the agreement, provision is made now enabling these funds to be applied also for other purposes outside the agreement, provided the assistance is directed to the same category of persons that would normally be assisted under the agreement.

Secondly, during the period 1 July 1978 to 30 June 1981, the Commonwealth made grants available to States for the housing of pensioners, Aborigines and other disadvantaged groups, under the umbrella of the Housing Assistance Act 1978.

This was not encompassed under the terms of the housing agreement. These arrangements are now included as an integral part of the new agreement.

A departure from the former arrangement is that whilst the Commonwealth Minister had the authority to declare any class of persons as falling within the disadvantaged category, under the new agreement, apart from pensioners and Aborigines, it will be necessary for him first to consult with State Ministers before any such declaration is made.

Apart from the significant departures which have been outlined, the following features will apply—

States will continue to enjoy the right to set the conditions of eligibility for purchase and rental assistance;

the provisions for home purchase assistance are, with one exception, identical to those of the 1978 agreement;

whereas in the 1978 agreement variable interest rates were required to be regulated to 1 per cent below the long-term bond rate, this has now been amended to 1 per cent below the current Commonwealth Savings

Bank rate for housing loans. This will apply to all business written since the advent of the 1978 agreement;

the provisions relative to the rental assistance scheme are also, with one exception, similar to those of the 1978 agreement;

the Bill facilitates the provision of a rental subsidy for eligible persons renting private accommodation. It should be stated that this is an additional option as to the manner in which funds may be used to provide rental assistance and in no way is there a requirement that this option must be exercised; and

the objectives, whilst similar to those of the previous agreement, have been broadened to take account of other aspects resulting from changing circumstances.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Peter Dowding.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) [5.49 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes two amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act.

The first deals with the method of determining the level of hospital charges payable by the employer of an injured worker, and the other deals with clarification of the total entitlement limitation under the Act.

The Workers' Compensation Act provides currently for the payment of reasonable hospital charges incurred by an injured worker. The daily hospital rate for which an employee is liable is set by the Workers' Compensation Board.

As hospital charges in this State will be varied from 1 September 1981, due to changes in the Commonwealth Government's health insurance arrangements, this Government is acting to ensure the worker is not disadvantaged.

Hospital charges for the purposes of compensable patients will be assessed as the actual cost under the Hospitals Act. To ensure

that workers are not placed in a position of being individually liable for the excess of proposed increased charges over the current entitlement, the level of entitlement has been tied to charges determined under the Hospitals Act.

The need for clarification of the limitation as to total entitlement has resulted from the mistaken belief of some compensation recipients that because the prescribed amount is indexed annually, their entitlement, even when the maximum has been received, is subsequently renewed. The Act has never intended that this situation apply, and the proposed amendment clearly delineates the intention in this regard.

Members will be aware that a complete rewrite of the workers' compensation legislation will be presented to Parliament during this current session. This will represent a general consensus of all parties involved and will incorporate these amendments.

This Bill is introduced as a temporary measure to ensure workers are not disadvantaged by amendments to the Hospitals Act which are scheduled to take effect on 1 September, 1981.

I commend the Bill to the House.

THE HON. H. W. OLNEY (South Metropolitan) [5.50 p.m.]: The Opposition does not oppose this Bill, which seeks two objectives as outlined by the Minister. I do not need to dwell upon the primary object which is to facilitate the changeover of the hospital charging arrangements in respect of workers' compensation patients. These arrangements were discussed yesterday in regard to other legislation.

As the Hospitals Amendment Bill was passed by this Parliament, we must accept that this amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act is necessary. As I pointed out yesterday, the Hospitals Amendment Bill could affect the rates of premiums payable for workers' compensation, but that matter has been debated already.

The other aspect of the Bill is a peculiar one which arose because of a decision given about a week ago by the Workers' Compensation Board. The Minister said, very coyly, that some people think there is some doubt about a particular aspect of the Act; that is, the effect of the increase in the prescribed amount. One person who actually does think that is Judge Charters of the Workers' Compensation Board. With respect, in a most remarkable decision given by the board on 18 August 1981, the judge managed, by reasoning which is superficially attractive but basically unsound, to come to a conclusion that whenever the prescribed amount under the Workers' Compensation Act is increased—and

this occurs on 1 July each year—a claimant who has been paid the full amount under the Act in the past, enjoys a revival of his claim to the extent of the increase that took place under the formula in the Act. If the judge's decision were correct, it would mean that since 1912, in every workers' compensation case where the worker had received the full amount under the Act, the claim would be revived on 1 July each year. In other words, the worker would be entitled to additional payments to the extent of the increase.

Another remarkable point about the decision is that the judge came to the conclusion that the increase which took place on 1 July 1980 should be applied in respect of a worker who had been paid the full amount on 26 May 1980 and, weekly payments were awarded as from 26 May 1980. So from 26 May 1980 to 1 July 1981 she was awarded weekly payments which could not have been payable to her at the time by any stretch of the imagination.

I believe the judge fell into that trap because he did not give sufficient thought to the fact that increases granted periodically under the Workers' Compensation Act have been treated as amendments to the legislation by the superior courts. The general rule is that amendments do not apply retrospectively. Had the learned judge looked at the case of *May v. Geraldton Building Co. Pty. Ltd.* he would not have come to that conclusion, I am sure.

So while it appears we are supporting a measure which would appear to take away an entitlement under the Workers' Compensation Act—something we would not normally do—in actual fact I am satisfied that the decision which gave rise to the need for this measure was wrong, and it was patently wrong. That being so, it is desirable that steps be taken immediately to overcome the mischief that has been created.

As set out in clause 2(2) the legislation is made retrospective to 27 December 1973, which is, of course, the date of the proclamation of the amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act which was passed during the term of office of the Labor Government. That amendment brought the variable prescribed amount into force.

It is regrettable that Parliament has to legislate in this way. While I have been heard to be critical of the draftsmanship of some of the legislation brought here—and I am reassured by the statement of the Attorney General today that the Parliamentary Counsel employed by his department are of the highest calibre—the blame for the necessity for this retrospective legislation

cannot be laid at the door of the Parliamentary Counsel concerned.

The provision that is being amended has been in the Act since 1912, although in a slightly different form. In the past the same problem does not seem to have arisen. For these reasons we do not oppose the legislation.

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) [5.58 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its support of the measure, and I express my thanks to the Hon. Howard Olney for his comments.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife), and passed.

MARKETING OF ONIONS REPEAL BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South—Minister for Lands) [7.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is to repeal the Marketing of Onions Act. The Western Australian Onion Marketing Board constituted under the Act was dissolved on 18 August, 1967, following a poll of growers. There has been no approach to the Government since that time for re-introduction of the board.

By arrangement with the producer organisations, money standing to the credit of the Onion Industry Trust Account has been transferred to a special account titled the "Special Vegetable Research Fund". This fund is to be applied to research at, or under the supervision of, the Medina Vegetable Research Station, for the benefit of the industry.

Subsequently, the marketing of onions (dissolution of board) regulations 1967 were

amended to provide for transfer of these funds in accord with the arrangements.

Onions have been marketed satisfactorily in Western Australia for the 14 years since the Onion Marketing Board ceased to operate. There has been no move to reconstitute the board and, as the Act is no longer required, it should be repealed.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. J. M. Brown.

LITTER AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [7.36 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill proposes three minor changes to the Litter Act. They relate to practical aspects of enforcement and do not in any way change the basic philosophy for litter control expressed in the Act.

Two of the amendments relate to the service of infringement notices and the authority to withdraw infringement notices. It is proposed that the requirement in section 30, that an infringement notice be served by registered post, be deleted. That requirement does not serve any significant purpose; it is not a requirement in other legislation of this Parliament permitting the issue of infringement notices, and only adds unnecessary cost to the process of enforcement of the Act.

At present, the Act provides that a notice formally withdrawing a litter infringement notice must be signed by a "prescribed officer". As infringement notices are issued by authorised officers on behalf of the various public authorities which enforce the Act, the amendment provides that the right to withdraw an infringement notice also should reside with the public authority on behalf of which that notice has been issued, and that the documentation withdrawing the infringement notice be signed by an officer appointed for that purpose by the relevant public authority.

The third amendment proposes more clearly to specify the original intention in the Act that any proceedings, whether by infringement notice or court action, taken against a litter offender are

taken for and on behalf of the particular public authority by which the authorised officer is employed or otherwise connected.

This amendment complements the provision that any fines or penalties imposed on litter offenders shall be paid to the particular public authority concerned.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. F. E. McKenzie.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. E. Masters (Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) [7.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The principal amendments contained in this Bill relate to the sale of motor vehicle spare parts and requisites outside ordinary trading hours and to penalties for after-hours trading.

By an Order-in-Council approved by the Governor in August 1978, shops which traded to 9.00 p.m. were allowed to sell motor vehicle parts and requisites without interfering with the service station roster system.

The background to this order arose as a result of an amendment to the Factories and Shops Act permitting all shops to trade to 9.00 p.m. on Thursday nights. The amendment, however, excluded service stations and motor vehicle requisite shops which were subject to specific trading hour provisions. Legal advice at the time indicated that effectively this meant that stores selling such items were not permitted to do so after 6.00 p.m. on Thursday.

In real terms, this meant that, to comply with the law, the stores which would be affected would be required to lock up that particular section of the premises during late trading.

Such a situation was considered by the Government to be both impracticable and unsatisfactory, having the end result of inconveniencing the public who may attend at a store for the sole purpose of procuring motor vehicle parts and requisites. Major retail stores together with most shops selling these items would be affected.

Action was therefore taken to introduce, as a temporary measure, an order to permit certain shops selling motor vehicle requisites, spare parts and accessories, but not fuel, to remain open to 9.00 p.m. on Thursdays. Although the order was approved as a temporary provision, it was requested that the Act be reviewed for any other anomalies.

In reviewing the Act it was found that firms which sell motor requisites as the main part of their business could not trade to 9.00 p.m. on Thursdays.

The Bill proposes to eliminate that anomaly. The Government considered, however, that the same privilege ought not be extended to service stations other than those on roster, as this would manifest into substantial interference with the present roster arrangements.

Essentially, this amendment allows both a parts and accessories shop—requisite shop—as well as such section of a general shop as is located in a shopping complex or shopping area to open on Thursday night to 9.00 p.m., but excludes shops normally engaged in selling petrol and requisites from doing so.

The amendment to section 93B deals with penalties relating to after-hours trading.

Concern has been expressed for some time at the proliferation of instances of unlawful trading, particularly on weekends. The Government is strongly of the view that this increase in unlawful trading can be attributed in part to the imposition of fines of only \$20 for third or subsequent offences even though the Act provides for a penalty of \$500.

Prior to 1970 the maximum penalty for unlawful trading was \$100 for a first offence and \$200 for a subsequent offence. In 1970, because of the increased incidence of out-of-hours trading, section 93B was added to provide maximum penalties of \$200 for a first offence, \$300 for a second offence, and \$500 for a third or subsequent offence.

It is considered that penalties presently being imposed are not acting as a deterrent and obviously are regarded by those who blatantly defy the law as "operating expenses". An increase in penalties in the following terms is essential if the practice of unlawful trading is to be curbed—

First offence	\$500 maximum
Second offence	\$750 maximum
Third and subsequent offence	\$1 000 maximum

The general penalty provided in section 115 also is to be increased. This section provides the base

for penalties generally, unless a special penalty is provided under the section where the offence occurs. The penalties currently provided have not been increased since the Act came into operation in 1964. Consequently, they are no longer considered adequate. The penalties are therefore to be increased to \$200 and \$400 respectively.

In line with the increases in the general provisions, those penalties relating to a breach of regulations provided under section 61(2)(c) and 121(1)(g) are to be increased to \$400.

A further amendment to provide for offences by directors and managers of corporate bodies has been included in a new section 116A. This is as a result of a firm being fined only \$5 on each of 37 charges for breaches of the Act.

In this case, because the company was a "two dollar" concern, there was no hope of the company satisfying its legal requirements with respect to the payment of fines, as it had no funds or assets.

For this reason the current amendment provides that where a body corporate is convicted of an offence, every director or member of the governing authority of the body corporate shall be deemed, without affecting the conviction against the body corporate, to be guilty of an offence against the Act.

An amendment in relation to advertising releases the media from the onerous obligation currently imposed to monitor all advertisements to ensure that breaches of trading hours are not being advertised by shopkeepers. The intention of the existing legislation was not to prosecute the media but to restrict the activities of shopkeepers. For this reason, the Government is of the opinion that the party responsible for contravention ought to be the shopkeeper.

The opportunity has been taken also to make minor amendments for the purpose of updating references to various Acts.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the Opposition).

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 18 August.

THE HON. H. W. OLNEY (South Metropolitan) [7.45 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this measure. The Bill seeks to achieve two objects. The first is to increase the number of elected members of the Barristers' Board from seven to

nine. The second is to remove the requirement that applicants for registration as articulated clerks and for admission as legal practitioners be required to be British subjects.

In regard to the first object of the Bill, the House probably would be aware that the legal profession is regulated by a board under the name of the Barristers' Board. It consists of certain *ex-officio* members such as the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, and each of Her Majesty's Counsel permanently residing in the State. The board consists also of a number of legal practitioners of at least three years' standing in the profession and elected by their legal brethren.

At present the number elected is seven, and that was increased from five a number of years ago because of an increase in the number of legal practitioners in this State. One of the objects of further increasing the number of members of the board is to ensure the expedition of board hearings of complaints against legal practitioners.

One of the unfortunate aspects of life is that in any profession or occupation inevitably a situation seems to arise in which someone is not satisfied with the service he or she has received. The legal profession is no orphan so far as that situation is concerned. It has been a self-regulating profession in this State since its inception. Indeed, the legal profession traditionally under the common law system has been self-regulating.

One needs only to read the history of the Inns-of-Court in the United Kingdom to appreciate the great power members of the profession always have exercised over their colleagues. It is a tradition which should be preserved, but it is a tradition which ought not be followed in a way likely to bring the profession into disrepute.

The prompt, efficient, and fair disposal of complaints made by members of the public against members of the legal profession is something which should occur. In fact, every effort that is humanly possible should be made to ensure that such a disposal of complaints is carried out. I know from personal experience that it is not a pleasant duty as a member of the legal profession to sit in judgment on colleagues, but that must be done. I believe it has been done fairly and efficiently in this State.

Unfortunately fairly limited scope exists in terms of the number of board members from which the board can be drawn to hear complaints. This situation makes it difficult for all complaints to be heard as expeditiously as the profession would like. For the reasons given the Opposition and I, in particular, support the proposed increase in the number of members of the board.

The removal of the requirement that articulated clerks and legal practitioners be British subjects is again a matter which personally I support, and always have supported; and it is a move which the Labor Party supports. It happens to be a happy coincidence that the Labor Party and I agree on this matter.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: They often do with you.

The Hon. H. W. OLNEY: Concern has been expressed that Western Australia will have a flood of American legal practitioners into the profession. I do not know why it is that of all the people in the world the legal profession has some fear of Americans.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: The Americans have the best TV lawyers.

The Hon. H. W. OLNEY: I suppose the Perry Mason television series had something to do with this fear. In this State we have been blessed by the absence of Perry Mason-style lawyers practising in our courts.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: That is with one or two exceptions.

The Hon. H. W. OLNEY: I can think of only one exception. Perhaps there are two exceptions if we include the one who takes his teeth out before getting into the business at hand. However, the point is that Perry Mason never lost a case. He never acted for a guilty man. Perhaps I should correct that by saying he never acted for someone found to be guilty.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I should get him.

The Hon. H. W. OLNEY: I do not think that the Hon. Mick Gayfer, with all his resources, would be able to bring Perry Mason over to handle his problem.

I do not share the view that we have anything to fear from foreign lawyers. The Attorney General accurately and properly pointed out in his second reading speech that the board always has exercised a most responsible degree of care to ensure that professional qualifications of persons seeking admission to the profession in this State meet with the standards appropriate—with the very high standard required of them in this State.

I would like to say something further about the profession in Western Australia. I have had the opportunity of appearing in Federal courts and in sittings in other States; and I have appeared with and against counsel from other jurisdictions in this country. Let me say this: The profession in this State has nothing to be ashamed of. Indeed, I feel the standards we have achieved in our

profession in this State are the equal of any in Australia.

While in the United Kingdom recently I took the opportunity to absorb some of the atmosphere of the Royal Courts of Justice, and paid the inevitable pilgrimage, as all Australian lawyers seem to do when in the United Kingdom, to the English Court of Appeal to hear Lord Denning. I listened to the proceedings and came away with the view that the profession in this State has nothing to lose in comparison with the profession as it is practised in the United Kingdom.

So long as the board insists upon the high academic qualifications upon which it has previously insisted, and insists that admittees to the profession in this State have high personal qualities, I feel nothing would be lost by removing the requirement that a legal practitioner be a British subject.

For the reasons given, the Opposition will support this measure.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Attorney General) [8.53 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill. I assure the Hon. Howard Olney that I share his view that the Barristers' Board has acted and is likely to continue to act in a responsible manner. We have nothing to fear from the slight enlargement of the profession which will occur as a result of the amendment which will delete reference to British subjects.

It was suggested to me in the course of preparing this Bill that we should reduce the quorum required at Barristers' Board meetings, but I felt it was desirable for us not to do that. I felt we should accede to the request to increase the number of elected members, and therefore increase the number of people eligible to be present at meetings.

As the Hon. Howard Olney would know, often it is difficult for the board under certain circumstances to have enough of its members present to form a quorum. This is due to the number of meetings the board must conduct and problems in relation to its disciplinary functions.

I appreciate the support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Attorney General), and transmitted to the Assembly.

**CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 12 August.

THE HON. R. T. LEESON (South-East) [7.56 p.m.]: This Bill will increase the number of diseases affecting cattle for which compensation is payable to farmers who find such cattle on their properties.

At present only three diseases are compensable. One is tuberculosis, another is my old friend brucellosis, and the last is one which I will not try to pronounce. Even the Minister for Lands had a little difficulty pronouncing that disease.

It is very important that in a situation involving diseased cattle the owners of the property on which such cattle are found, are compensated. We all know the cost to farmers if their cattle are found to be diseased.

It pays to make mention at this time of an article which appeared in the Press a few days ago. It relates to meat found not to be beef as it should have been. I wonder whether one of these days we will have before us a Bill to extend the legislation to include meat which is horse or kangaroo meat as has been found in shipments to the United States of meat which should have been beef.

Up to date I have not heard much said in this House about that particular problem. I am not involved with the cattle industry, but I am quite interested in the present situation. Over the last four of five years I have heard strong pleas made by members of this House, particularly from the other side, in regard to the position of the beef industry. We all know what a terrible situation it went through. It is to be hoped that the problem we face now will not bring about a situation similar to the one we had in those days.

There have been some very garbled reports in the newspapers over the last few days about the situation in the Eastern States. I have been reading the articles closely and all sorts of matters have been mentioned. One suggestion was that the Mafia had become involved and the National Party had been brought into alliance with it. I must say that the National Party has been involved in some funny alliances; one that comes to mind was the one with the DLP. However I doubt that the Mafia would be involved with the National Party. Having seen "The Godfather"

twice on 70 mm film, I am sure the National Party would not be involved with the Mafia.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Which National Party was ever in alliance with the DLP?

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: We will get complicated now.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest the member should not pursue the matter any further.

The Hon. R. T. LEESON: I think we all know what it was. I understand that 800 retail outlets in the United States receive our beef. I think that is a tremendous number. As I understand the situation something like 900 crates of beef with either kangaroo or horse meat included were found and that indicates that it was not a small operation. It was not an operation with someone sneaking around the back of a cooler in a utility and swapping a few cartons. It is obvious that it was a large operation which had been going on for quite some time.

I hope that as this is a Federal matter the cause will be established quickly and the culprits will be caught. I hope it will not affect the beef industry because I do not wish a situation similar to that which occurred many years ago to be repeated. Although I did enjoy some fairly cheap beef in those days, I do not wish the situation to return. I would not like members and farmers alike to have to go through that situation again. I support the Bill.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [8.04 p.m.]: I support the Bill. The cattle industry always has been an important industry in Western Australia and I believe it will continue to be so. We are all aware that the cattle numbers vary considerably from year to year and certainly from decade to decade and for many reasons. However, it is important that the cattle numbers in this State do not decline as they did years ago.

I am aware that the cattle industry, along with other primary industries, is a hazardous occupation. No primary industry has a dream run and the cattle industry is no orphan in this regard. People should give some thought to the hazards involved in primary industries, whether it be the fishing, the wheat growing, beef cattle, or dairy industry.

So, it is appropriate that with this legislation we are endeavouring to protect cattle owners who may find themselves involved in circumstances where their cattle have diseases inflicted upon them.

Some 18 months ago there was an outbreak of cattle disease in the Dandalup area, as a result of cattle going to the area from the north-west of

this State. Apparently some cattle were carrying ticks which infected the cattle in the Dandalup area. This in turn caused considerable financial loss to one owner of stock and caused traumas with other cattle owners on adjacent properties.

At that time I made it my business to look at this situation closely. I was impressed by the work done then and which has been continued by the officers of the Department of Agriculture, as well as the property owners themselves. The properties were decontaminated very efficiently and I understand all properties are now clear. I hope that is the case. Additional checks and balances have been brought in with the procedures to ensure that a repetition of the outbreak will not occur in the future. However, no-one can be sure of such safeguards, so it is imperative that we protect the industry.

I take pleasure in supporting this measure.

THE HON. J. M. BROWN (South-East) [8.07 p.m.]: In my remarks in support of the Bill I should like to mention that as a result of the compensation being made retrospective, Mr Redwater, who had 28 head of cattle either slaughtered or die because of disease, will be paid compensation. I think it is important to note that the farming industry and the Government have each contributed 50 per cent towards this compensation. That is a self-help philosophy we of the Opposition support.

The beef industry is in a depressed situation at present. We are all aware of the dramatic decrease in the number of beef herds. I understand some 3 000 farmers have gone out of beef production in Western Australia and there are now less than one million head of cattle compared with 1.5 million some five years ago. That decrease could be attributed to drought as well to the prices being paid for beef.

We do not wish this industry to decline any further and we should be looking at a prices support scheme similar to that which has existed with other industries involved with meat production.

When we consider what has taken place in other parts of Australia where kangaroo meat and horse meat have been included in beef which has been exported, we are aware that the situation is serious, not only for the good name of the producers and workers of this State, but also for the economy of our country, which will suffer. I believe that some \$800 to \$1 000 million worth of meat is exported overseas each year and that the United States is our greatest purchaser. It is disastrous that this matter was discovered in the United States and not in Australia. The situation

must be causing concern to every person in the Australian community as well as to those people involved in the United States.

The President of the United Beef Producers Association, Mr A. Boulbee, predicted that with the shortcomings in the quality of production in Western Australia compared with that in the Eastern States, we will be importing meat from the Eastern States. When there is a prolific production in the Eastern States the WA market is flooded with cattle meat, pig meat, and sheep meat.

We must look at the problems which have occurred with the addition of horse and other meat for home consumption and export. The fact that the penalty has been increased one-hundred fold from \$1 000 to \$100 000 will not solve the problem.

The Commonwealth Police Force has increased its officers from seven to 12 to facilitate the investigation and appropriate action required to clear up this matter. The Minister for Agriculture in Queensland has suggested that truckloads of kangaroo meat, horse meat, donkey meat, and buffalo meat were crossing the borders into New South Wales and Victoria and that there is no way to stop that happening. There is no law to say that that can be stopped. The whole question of what has taken place must be considered seriously and a united effort must be made to bring the culprits to justice. The market would collapse if the export market was not maintained. The prices for beef have declined by 25 per cent over the last 12 months and if we lose our export market and there is a collapse of the beef industry, we will have a collapse of the farming community and people will be asked to bear the burden.

All sorts of scapegoats are being found with regard to this matter. Mr Bruce Brown, the Secretary of the Livestock and Grain Producers Association of New South Wales, has suggested that this action was done deliberately in America to discredit the meat exporters in Australia.

It was Mr Wally Curran, the Victorian Secretary of the Meat Industry Employees' Union, who suggested it was a Mafia-style operation. The Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Nixon) was on leave when the first announcement was made about this matter and Mr Ian Sinclair immediately banned the exports. On 17 August Mr Nixon suggested that there had been an attempt to sabotage the \$1 billion beef trade. That is how Mr Nixon regards the Australian trade. The Federal Police are endeavouring to uncover a racket to substitute horse meat and

kangaroo meat for boneless beef. Such a racket is a tragedy for our industry.

The Australian Cattlemen's Union suggested a judicial inquiry. An inquiry at any level would not be sufficient to repair the damage done to the good name of the people of this country. I trust that whether the Trade Practices Commission, or the Federal Police, or any other body is used to investigate the matter, the perpetrators of this disastrous and tragic event will be brought to justice. Otherwise, it will have serious repercussions on the Australian trade with America and those repercussions will be felt all the way down the line.

I could go further and mention the various problems that have not been highlighted by the Press. The Press has not played up this matter, probably because it is not fully aware of the situation; nor are we fully aware of the situation. However, we are fully aware of the possible repercussions.

When we as legislators are dealing with the Cattle Industry Compensation Act and we find that this sort of thing is happening within the industry, we have to consider the inspectorial side. We have the problem of dual inspection and the Australian Cattlemen's Union and the Sheep Producers' Association have been quite vocal about it. It appears our surveillance has not been satisfactory, and we have to look, not to our laurels, but to the situation to ensure that this sort of thing does not happen to consumers anywhere in the world. We must ensure that this sort of fraudulent activity is not repeated.

The Cattle Industry Compensation Amendment Bill with which we are dealing tonight is on a minor scale when compared with the compensation that we will be required to meet if we cannot make satisfactory arrangements to protect an industry that is so vital to the welfare of the people of this country.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. NEIL McNEILL (Lower West) [8.18 p.m.]: Some of the speakers, including the Hon. Jim Brown, have devoted a deal of time in the course of discussing this Bill to the topical question of the export of our beef and the relationship of trading matters with the economics of the industry, and so on. Obviously they recognise, as we all do, that while the subject is topical, it also has enormous implications for the beef industry of Australia.

We should not lose sight of the fact that in debating this Bill we should restore to its proper place the question to which Mr Brown referred briefly in his closing remarks; namely, the matter

of inspections. As he said, inspections were relevant in the case of the export of beef and other products which should not have been included in the consignments to the United States of America. The same question of inspection is relevant to the subject matter of this Bill, dealing as it does with cattle tick fever.

It is not for me to make any examination of what went wrong in our beef export trade. Let me say, however—and I do not believe that Mr Brown needs any reminder, nor does Mr Leeson, and nor does any of us in this House—that while disaster could overtake us in relation to the export trade, it would not be nearly as serious as the consequences of a large-scale outbreak of a disease such as cattle tick fever or any disease similar to it. Of course, I include such things as foot and mouth disease. There are similarities, not in the diseases themselves, but in their effects. Both diseases require immediate destruction of the beasts, if death is not caused by the disease itself.

In relation to the Eastern States affair, we are still left with cattle with which to run our industry. We are still left with breeding stock. In the case of the disease about which we are talking in this Bill, we would not have the breeding stock. We would lose all the cattle.

That is what the producer in the district referred to in the Bill suffered when the outbreak of tick fever struck him last year. It virtually wiped out the industry on his farm, and that was through no fault of his own. We accept, of course, that he bought the animals, and to that extent, he was, unknowingly, a contributing party.

I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (the Hon. Des Dans) will recall the history of the handling of cattle from the Kimberley in Western Australia. All those cattle came to Robb Jetty by sea. They were virtually in quarantine the whole time. That was one of the great advantages of having the cattle killed at the Robb Jetty Abattoir. The cattle came straight from the ship and went to slaughter. They had no opportunity to spread any disease in the hinterland of the agricultural areas of Western Australia. Essentially, the reason that procedure was adopted was because of cattle tick fever.

It is remarkable that over the many years of cattle production in this State, as so many cattle have been brought from the northern areas into the agricultural areas, we have been free of outbreaks of this sort. From memory, I think there was only one previous case, many years ago. We have led somewhat of a charmed life in that respect—charmed to the extent that we must

make an acknowledgment of the quarantine procedures and inspection arrangements that have to be carried out in the northern areas to prevent the disease from spreading into our agricultural areas. The danger of that has been recognised for a long time.

The case I mentioned was an instance when the disease was allowed to slip through. In the same way, I suppose, one would say that something has slipped through in recent weeks.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: That was organised.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Well, it slipped through. I agree it was perpetrated by certain parties; but it still slipped through the inspection procedures, with disastrous consequences. That is the point I make.

The Hon. J. M. Brown: Or done after the inspection procedures.

The Hon. NEIL McNEILL: Certainly the circumstances are not the same as those involved in tick fever breaking into the agricultural areas. Nevertheless, it still happened.

Although the loss to the grower and to the public purse, which is to be met by the cattle compensation fund, is considerable in this particular respect, it is a small price to pay for the very timely reminder of just how vigilant everyone needs to be to protect us against scourges and diseases of this nature. The consequences of this kind of thing could be absolutely catastrophic in the cattle industry in our agricultural areas, in a way that would make the Eastern States affair appear to be at a low level. In other words, the Eastern States affair would be negligible by contrast.

I am aware of the distress that was caused last year when cattle with tick fever were brought into the agricultural area. The producer was aware at the time that he would have to bear the entire cost. Of course, a shock wave went through all the adjoining districts. Everybody was amazed that such a thing could happen.

Cattle tick fever is a disease which relies heavily on the hot weather. In order to secure the final clearing of that infestation, it is true that we needed the cold and wet of a full winter. It is an advantage that in this year we have had such a cold and wet winter, because it has militated against any perpetuation of the infestation.

I return now to the Bill and its provisions. It enables the Minister to proclaim cattle tick disease, and it enables also the payment of compensation in retrospect. That is only right and proper. After all, for quite a long time the people

who have been affected contributed to the cattle compensation fund in respect of other diseases.

When a disease like this hits producers, people generally would appreciate the actions of the Government in providing this compensation. For the benefit of Mr Leeson, I should mention that the three diseases presently covered by the cattle compensation fund are tuberculosis, brucellosis, and actinomycosis. The Bill gives an opportunity for compensation to be payable in respect of yet another disease—in this case, cattle tick fever. It limits it to the area in which it had its effect.

In his second reading speech the Minister mentioned other implications of the Bill. Normally compensation is not claimed in respect of an animal which dies of the disease. Alternatively—and again this does not apply normally in the cases of tuberculosis and brucellosis—compensation is not normally paid when the Chief Veterinary Officer requires that the animal be destroyed. In this case, an order was made and carried out quickly, and the affected animals were destroyed. The carcasses of any animals that were slaughtered were condemned and normally they would not have been eligible for compensation.

I recognise the actions of the Government in making provision to cover this eventuality.

While it may appear the price is heavy, it is in fact a small price to pay for this sort of safeguard. It should be borne in mind that the great safeguard is in vigilance where we cannot rely on resistance or protection from diseases in agricultural cattle simply on account of their breed. Whilst there has been a considerable spread and development of the exotic breeds based on the Brahman and Zebu-type cattle which are in fact resistant to cattle tick, of course, all European breeds are very prone to it. Therefore, we are a long way from having a natural disease resistance in our breeding cattle in Western Australia. While that position obtains, and I believe it will forever, suitable action must be taken, including not only inspection and vigilance, but also the payment of compensation whenever it becomes necessary.

I support the Bill.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South—Minister for Lands) [8.31 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of this legislation and particularly the Hon. Neil McNeill who has spoken directly to the amendment to the Cattle Industry Compensation Act and its extension to cover tick fever, bearing in mind the recent outbreak which occurred in his electorate and the

fact that compensation can now be paid in retrospect.

One of the matters the Hon. Neil McNeill did not emphasise, and perhaps members should appreciate this, was that the fund from which farmers will be paid is one to which producers have contributed heavily. We are not talking only about Government funds, but also about funds contributed by the producers.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: I did say the producers had been contributing into that fund.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. The Minister cannot be heard.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The debate covered also the issue of impurities which have been found in export beef. That subject cannot be divorced from the Cattle Industry Compensation Act, because the reason we have made such a considerable effort to remove brucellosis and TB from our herds is that our beef will be eligible for export to the American market. It is disastrous that, having made such great efforts to wipe out these diseases in very difficult situations, particularly in the north-west where the cattle are spread over such vast distances, impurities in Australian beef exports should endanger a billion-dollar industry. The impurities found were not offal, which is a by-product of the cattle industry.

I am not quite sure whether it was fair to include the National Party in the allegations as to how the impurities were introduced. At worst I have heard the condemned meat referred to as "donkey pie"; but I have not heard that the National Party was included and perhaps that accusation should be ruled out of order.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by the Hon. D. J. Wordsworth (Minister for Lands), and passed.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT: CYSS

Motion: Leave to Introduce

THE HON. F. E. MCKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [8.37 p.m.]: I move—

That leave be given to move a motion without notice to suspend so much of the

Standing Orders as would prevent me moving the motion standing in my name on the Notice Paper.

The PRESIDENT: Before I put the question to the House, I should like to advise members that the Hon. F. E. McKenzie approached me during the tea suspension seeking my advice on action he could take to achieve the purpose for which he is seeking leave.

I could find no precedent for the action he has taken so far as this House is concerned, although that is not to be taken as meaning that no precedent exists. Standing Orders are certainly unclear as to the position. However, as members would be well aware, it has been an established practice from time to time for this House to refer to *Odger's Australian Senate Practice* when determining actions which are questioned.

In accordance with that particular practice and because it is my belief that this House is the master of its own destiny, I have advised the Hon. F. E. McKenzie that the action he is now taking is in order.

I would, therefore, remind members that the question seeks a unanimous decision and one dissentient voice will preclude his being given leave.

The Hon. R. J. L. Williams: Mine will not be a dissentient voice, but I just wish to—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member cannot debate this particular question. He can raise a point of order if he wishes, but the question is not debatable.

Question put and passed.

Leave granted.

Motion: Standing Orders Suspension

THE HON. F. E. MCKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [8.39 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent me from moving the motion standing in my name on the Notice Paper.

THE HON. R. J. L. WILLIAMS (Metropolitan) [8.40 p.m.]: I bow to your ruling, Sir. I bow also to the Hon. Fred McKenzie in so far as I realise his concern and I am in sympathy with the motion on the notice paper.

In not opposing the motion now under discussion, I also pay my respects to the Leader of the Opposition who, during his tenure of office as Leader of the Opposition, has done what I

consider to be the right thing by the House every time.

As you said, Sir, we are masters of this House. However, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the first hour of business this afternoon, when it was known there was a motion to be debated, was taken up to a large extent with questions on notice, questions without notice, and an emergency motion.

The Hon. H. W. Olney: And a trip to the moon with the Hon. Buck Rogers!

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: I do not know; but we have to be aware that, if we are going to tamper with Standing Orders, there is no point in our having them.

If members want the analogy to the legal situation which might be appropriate to my learned colleague in the Opposition, I indicate I cannot see any member of the judiciary leaning over backwards to allow new evidence to be presented after the jury has gone out.

I have a great deal of sympathy for the motion Mr McKenzie has on the notice paper; but I am fed up with having every afternoon a legal tutorial of questions directed to the Attorney General by two people who, in my opinion, are seeking legal opinions.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind members that the debate on this particular question should stick strictly to whether or not the Standing Orders should be suspended and I ask the honourable member to direct his comments to that particular question.

The Hon. R. J. L. WILLIAMS: Under the circumstances, the suspension of Standing Orders is automatic on my part, but I say that, in other circumstances, mine would be a dissentient voice as otherwise there is no point in our having Standing Orders.

I support the motion.

Question put and passed.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Community Youth Support Scheme: Motion

THE HON. F. E. McKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [8.43 p.m.]: I move—

That it is the opinion of this House that a great deal of valuable work has been done in Western Australia by the Community Youth Support Scheme since it was established in 1976.

Young people without employment have been trained in new skills, provided with the opportunity to occupy their time creatively,

and enabled to use their skills and abilities in community service.

Young people under the CYSS have aided organisations such as Volunteer Task Force, assisted community projects, helped the aged, and assisted schools in projects which would otherwise not have been possible.

Young people have been helped to maintain their self-esteem, and had extended their possibilities for employment.

The scheme has involved the volunteer work of a range of people in the community, including many private firms, public servants, local government employees, elected councillors from local authorities, parliamentarians and concerned citizens.

It has been supported by service clubs and business people who have provided equipment, materials and assistance.

The value of the scheme in Western Australia has derived largely from the gradual build up of goodwill, voluntary assistance, and equipment, all of which will be dissipated if the scheme is abandoned.

This House, therefore, requests that the Commonwealth Government reconsider its decision to abandon the Community Youth Support Scheme, and asks the State Government to convey this resolution to the Hon. N. A. Brown, Q.C., M.P., Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, with the request that it be forwarded to the Prime Minister.

I thank members for giving me the opportunity to proceed with this motion, because had we not proceeded with it this evening, it could well have been that it would have remained on the notice paper until we returned after the recess which takes in all of next week. That would mean the next sitting day would be Tuesday of the following week.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members should be quiet while the member addressing the Chair is speaking. We have suspended Standing Orders to let him speak and members should listen to him.

The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE: The last paragraph of the motion requests this House to ask the Commonwealth Government to reconsider its decision in the recent Budget to abandon the Community Youth Support Scheme. I should like to point out that it is referred to on the Notice Paper as the "Commonwealth Youth Support Scheme", but in fact that terminology is incorrect

and it should read the "Community Youth Support Scheme".

By supporting the motion, members opposite have an opportunity to demonstrate their concern for the unemployed in Western Australia. The evidence I propose to place before the House relates in the main to the particular scheme of which I am chairman and that is located at Belmont. However, I assure members that, as a result of discussions I have had with a number of other interested chairmen of other schemes since the Government's announcement, I have discovered that similarities apply throughout.

For the benefit of members I shall set out the history of the Community Youth Support Scheme.

On 1 November 1976 the Federal Government decided it would attempt to assist the growing number of unemployed by launching this scheme. The Federal Government made funds available, and it was left to the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs to advertise a scheme throughout the various States. That was done in Western Australia and a number of interested people in various areas decided to set up local committees to operate schemes in a particular area.

In the early part of 1977 a number of interested people in Belmont decided there ought to be a scheme in that district. I was invited to join the group shortly after it was formed. Subsequently I was appointed chairman of that scheme. At that time the Victoria Park Commonwealth Employment Service had figures on its books showing that 800 young people under the age of 20 were registered for unemployment benefits. A large proportion of those people came from the Belmont district. After some deliberations by this committee—I think there were six or seven interested people at that time—a project got off the ground and was funded for a six-month period with an original grant of \$12 500.

I think the Commonwealth Government has been particularly harsh in respect of its decision to abandon this scheme, and I will tell members why.

The Community Youth Support Scheme offered young people an opportunity to add to their skills and to keep up those skills which they already had. It gave them guidance and support while they explored avenues for employment. It offered young people, through voluntary work and community projects, the work experience they needed, and gave them a sense of usefulness at a time when "dole bludging" was an expression that was commonly used in respect of them. I

appreciate the fact that as unemployment numbers grew and the term of unemployment was extended, that expression disappeared to a large extent. At this point in time we seldom hear it, but it was a fairly common expression at that time. It resulted in young people and their parents becoming distressed. Many people were too proud; I am aware many parents would not even allow their youngsters to apply for the unemployment relief that was available.

I am not saying the scheme had a rosy start. It did not. It was very difficult because it was something new, and everybody had to feel his way. Whilst the assistance of the Commonwealth Government was gratefully received, it was never given in large amounts. It was very difficult to sustain the scheme, particularly in the early stages. However, as time went on, its benefits were recognised by the community.

The committees, in most instances, were very stable and slowly but surely the unemployed began to realise what was available for them. People in the community realised they were the beneficiaries of the scheme. I have heard members say in this House that unemployed people ought to be employed usefully on community projects. That was one of the main functions of the scheme. Later I will explain to members how the scheme of which I was chairman worked.

We had an eight-man committee. We always had at least eight on the Belmont committee—sometimes extra, but we found that more than eight was a little too unwieldy at meeting times. We met at least once a month. These voluntary people spent many hours pondering matters, trying to ensure that the scheme was continued for the benefit of those people who wanted to utilise it. I cannot emphasise that strongly enough.

Admittedly, a lot of people in the community—the growing bulk of the unemployed—did not take advantage of the scheme. It would be wrong of me to try to portray to members that everybody wanted to become involved in it. Of course every unemployed person did not want to become involved in it. However, there was always a fair percentage of unemployed who did want to do something that they saw as being useful to the community and helpful to themselves. The scheme gave them the opportunity to maximise their chances of gaining a job. The scheme was not an employment agency. I have to stress that. However, its success rate in having people placed in employment after they had proved themselves was fairly great.

If one were to go to Belmont today one would see participants in this scheme engaged in a number of diversified activities, such as typing, shorthand, bookkeeping, welding, photography, and carpentry. They can learn pottery or floral art and candlemaking as well. They are given the opportunity to improve their spelling and numeracy skills. They may participate in courses on salesmanship or learn the basics of driving. Furthermore, as many local organisations are aware, participants are very active in community projects, including a wide variety of work ranging from making adventure playgrounds in schools to repairing equipment and toys for school groups. They also clean out backyards for pensioners and make soft toys for distribution to underprivileged children.

They carry out a number of other tasks, and most certainly if the scheme is wound down, the job of the voluntary task force will be made very difficult; because already those people are under extreme pressure to carry out these duties. The Community Youth Support Scheme took the pressure off other voluntary bodies.

During the last 12 months the Belmont committee closely monitored the results that it achieved in so far as job motivation was concerned, and it can be satisfied with the progress that it made. In fact, last year 220 of those who participated in the Belmont scheme gained employment.

One of the things we insisted on as a committee was that records be kept in respect of the people who participate in the scheme and those who gain employment. In a 12-month period we helped 220 people find jobs. Many of those had been unemployed for periods in excess of three months and had joined the centre at a time when they were completely dispirited and in a demoralised state. They had been continually endeavouring to find employment; they had fronted up for jobs—not all, but a great number of them—and had simply been not successful in gaining employment. They found the Community Youth Support System in Belmont assisted them in many ways. Where they had weaknesses they were tutored so that those weaknesses could be overcome. The result is there for all to see. Two hundred and twenty young unemployed persons who participated in that 12-month period were found employment whilst with the scheme. Probably a great number would still be out of work today if it were not for the scheme.

In addition to the participants in the scheme, retired people and housewives became voluntary tutors. Two project officers were employed who were fully paid and funded by the

Commonwealth; but that staff was not sufficient to cover all the activities we engaged in.

Quite a number of people have volunteered their services to the scheme to assist the unemployed in maximising their opportunities for obtaining employment. The Commonwealth Government's decision is disheartening to the committee members who gave up hours and hours of their time. There were people in the community who were prepared to assist. I want members to understand that also we had supporting us a number of business houses and a number of service organisations. I will deal with the service organisations later on.

Members of this House would be aware of the work Rotary clubs do. I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to clubs in Belmont, because they have been very helpful to us. In addition to the Rotary clubs, we had a lot of assistance from firms in the district—firms too numerous for me to mention. I refer to firms like Coates Hire Service, and Bunning Bros., which gave us tools. Coates gave us a free loan of many items of equipment that otherwise would have been beyond our reach because funding for that sort of thing was just not available. We had assistance from Rostrum, the National Bank, the Royal Automobile Club, the Road Traffic Authority, and others.

I would like to read out to members of the House, in case they have any doubts about the help that was available to the community from participants in the scheme, a letter dated 4 August 1980, about 12 months ago. I did not have to go back too far to take a few pages off our records. The letter is from the Principal of the Whiteside Primary School. He writes as follows—

Thank you for your invitation to attend the next meeting of C.Y.S.S., unfortunately I have a previous commitment.

I would like the Committee to know that as a school we are delighted with the very real help we are receiving from the people associated with C.Y.S.S.

The four people who are working in the "aide" capacity at the school have settled in well and from all accounts have not only helped the educational programme of the school but it has also proved of value to the people from C.Y.S.S.

We are also very impressed with the enthusiasm, efforts and co-operation of the project officers.

I trust that we as a school can continue to be assisted and assist the C.Y.S.S. programme.

There is another letter from OSCCAA—the Out of School Child Care and Activities Association—Carlisle Branch. It is dated 18 July 1980, about the same date as the previous letter. It reads—

In appreciation for the work you have recently completed at the Centre, I wish to thank you and the boys for your support once more. Being an association like ours, our funds are very limited as we are a non-profit organization, we rely a lot on voluntary workers.

(Signed) Bette Manwaring,
Treasurer,
OSCCAA Carlisle

I have another letter from the Out of School Child Care Organisation which reads as follows—

Now that our shed has been erected and the children have an extra indoor area for their activities, I am approaching you again for more help if your time permits.

Could you build a few steps and lay some slabs in this area adjacent to the shed, with the rainy season, this place has become a pool of water and access to the shed is difficult.

Forgive me for taking liberty in asking your help again; I cannot get much assistance from our own group as most of our children are from single parents; I feel you are the only people I can depend on.

Also could you possibly fix a couple of shelves in a cupboard for us, so that it can be used for storing our equipment.

Awaiting to hear from you.

Yours sincerely,
Marie Middleton
Supervisor OSCCAA

That letter was written on 25 July 1980. Coming more to the present time, one of the problems we faced was that the Commonwealth Government was short of funds. We recognised that, and so it was necessary for us to seek assistance from the service clubs.

The welding machines which were being used at the Belmont CYSS were a fairly heavy single-phase type. Because of the heavy usage, they were breaking down continually. The firm which had supplied the welders was very helpful, and it continued to repair them. However, we could not carry on in this fashion as we realised the welders were being overutilised and it was unfair on the firm concerned to expect it to repair them all the time.

We then decided to approach the Rotary clubs in the area in an endeavour to obtain some new welding machines, and at the same time we approached some business houses to seek assistance with the wiring of the premises. Members will realise that as we were changing from single-phase to three-phase welding machines so the wiring had to be changed also. The Rotary Club of Welshpool replied as follows—

We have pleasure in advising you, that the board of the "Welshpool Rotary Club" has approved the purchase of a 3-phase welding machine, at the cost of \$260.00. This welder will be made available for your use until such time as your Institution ceases to function. If this happens the welder must be returned to the "Welshpool Rotary Club", as the machine will be on a permanent loan to you. We understand that any maintenance to the machine will be at your expense.

The letter is signed by A. G. Bower.

The Director of Vocational Service of the Rotary Club of Ascot wrote as follows—

We have pleasure in advising you that this Committee has approved the purchase of a three phase welding machine and hand piece, for the approximate cost of \$280.00.

This welder will be made available for your use until such time as your institution ceases to function.

We understand that three phase power has yet to be installed to your workshop and until such time as this is done, we presume that your requirement of a welder is not urgent.

These letters were received about June of this year. At no expense to the Commonwealth Government the wiring of the house was attended to by New Era Electro Service (WA). Mr Tribbick, the manager of this company, wrote to the Belmont CYSS as follows—

We have pleasure in offering our support to your work in this area by donating the materials and supervision for the electrical installation of three only three phase fifteen amp power outlets to your existing welding workshop.

So in all respects this was truly a Community Youth Support Scheme. It was not a great burden on the Commonwealth Government. The salaries of the two project officers for six months and the value of equipment made available by the Commonwealth Government amounted to \$22 000—less than \$1 000 a week. And, with the expenditure of that sum of money, a great deal of

work was carried out for the people of the community. Probably the greatest beneficiaries of the scheme were the unemployed youth of the area. The work they did gave them a sense of purpose and usefulness. They felt that they were participating in and assisting with community life.

On many occasions I telephoned the centre to request assistance for people, especially pensioners. No doubt many other members have appreciated the assistance these CYSS groups have given to aged people in their electorates.

Single pensioners frequently request help with small jobs around the house. Widows find it hard to chop wood or to fix steps.

I would like to read from a certificate which was presented by the Ascot Rotary Club last year to one of the project officers involved. Unfortunately this project officer subsequently left the service—certainly these jobs can be regarded only as temporary. Nevertheless, over his period of employment, his work was of such a standard that he received the recognition of the service clubs of the district.

In the initial stages of the scheme he had to overcome a certain hostility in the community. The document presented to him is entitled "Certificate of Appreciation" and it was presented to Mr Neville Raxworthy in appreciation of the services and co-operation extended by him to the service of youth. It was presented on 8 April 1980, and I would like to read from a newspaper cutting which appeared in the *Belmont-Victoria Park Times*. It reads as follows—

Mr Neville Raxworthy, the Project Officer at the Belmont Community Youth Support Scheme, has been given a vocational service award by the Ascot Rotary Club.

Yesterday, club president Mr Rick Warwick went down to Belmont CYSS headquarters in Great Eastern Highway and presented Mr Raxworthy with a citation, a certificate and a silver plated cup.

The club said that Mr Raxworthy had worked for unemployed youth in Belmont in a way "over and above the line of duty."

He had taken special trouble to find materials for young unemployed people to work with, and had devoted himself to their cause.

The club makes four presentations a year to people who have done outstanding work in vocational service.

Service clubs do not give such recognition lightly, but recognition was given in this case.

Earlier I mentioned to members that the Commonwealth Government would not fund the purchase of new welding machines. These were provided by two Rotary clubs in the area. That must indicate to members that the CYSS is making progress.

I have here another newspaper article which refers to the girls making soft toys for needy people. The toys were given to the Belmont City Council for distribution amongst local needy families and others were given to Nulsen Haven in Redcliffe. So there is plenty of evidence that the scheme is working well.

Of course I have referred only to the scheme of which I am the chairman, but I can assure members that similar schemes operate in many other suburbs.

I realise that funds from the Commonwealth Government have been cut back very severely in many areas. However, I know all members are concerned about unemployment, and we have an opportunity to join together to express our dissatisfaction about the treatment that has been handed out to Western Australia. We have heard that the Federal Treasurer intends to make available an additional \$22 million for education training schemes. That is fine, I am pleased that money should be made available for education; but it is most unfair to take it away from a scheme such as the CYSS which has been operating very satisfactorily. It has given many unemployed people something to do with their time, and it is incumbent upon us to see that this scheme continues.

In April of this year youth unemployment in Western Australia fell to 7 900. In May it had risen to 8 000, and in June and July the figure was 8 600. I indicate that I obtained these figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

The increase in unemployment from April of this year may be seasonal. However, the figure is still far too high; so there is really no justification for the Government to turn its back on the unemployment problem.

I ask members opposite to join me in expressing their concern at the Commonwealth Government's action. I hope they will support the motion now before them.

THE HON. LYLA ELLIOTT (North-East Metropolitan) [9.14 p.m.]: I have pleasure in seconding the motion. Like the Hon. Fred McKenzie I feel I can speak with some authority on this subject because I was involved in the establishment of a project in Midland some four years ago—the Swan Youth Support Centre. I have been closely associated with it as the

chairperson of its committee ever since its inception.

Thanks to some hard working project officers, and some tremendous assistance from the people of the Swan, we have been able to establish a very worthwhile project that has helped over 2 000 unemployed young people in the district.

Just when we finally obtained ideal premises and the whole programme of assistance was working well, it was heartbreaking to all the people concerned to learn we would have to shut our doors in a couple of months' time.

As the Hon. Fred McKenzie told the House, CYSS was created by the Commonwealth in 1976 as one of a number of programmes designed to assist young unemployed youth up to the age of 25 years. While it is funded by the Commonwealth through the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs, one of the good things about it is that it is run by voluntary committees comprising local people, and this has enabled flexibility and diversity in the kinds of services and programmes offered by each project.

It is a unique scheme in that, unlike other Government youth projects which are directed solely towards education—such as the education programme for unemployed youth—or at short-term employment by providing subsidies to employers, such as the SYETP scheme, the CYSS scheme combines three important features.

The first and most important objective of the scheme is to improve job-seeking ability and to teach new work-related skills. The scheme also provides social and moral support for participants and involves young people in helping others through voluntary community activities.

I do not believe—and neither does anyone else who has had experience with CYSS—that any of the schemes announced in the Federal Budget will be able to replace what CYSS offers. A great many young people who attend CYSS centres have more than a problem of unemployment. Often, their inability to obtain and hold a job may be related to some serious social problem or a lack of motivation. These young people need not only assistance to improve their ability to seek or apply for jobs, but also counselling and guidance in respect of some personal problem they may have. They may need moral support and friendship, or they may need assistance with regard to finding accommodation.

We have found the project officers are required to take on a number of roles including mother figure, social worker and counsellor in addition to their primary role of improving the job training and job-seeking skills of teenagers. At the Swan

centre, we have been fortunate in having two marvellous, dedicated officers. Because they care a great deal about the people who attend the centre, we have developed a very successful project there.

Only recently, in a report prepared by the CYSS field officer for the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs there appeared a notation at the bottom of the report which stated as follows—

Swan CYSS appears an impressive project, able to gain creditable results from the efforts of an effective staff and management system.

Only last week, we prepared our submission for further funding and were about to send it off to the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs when we received the very disappointing news in the Federal Budget. However, I think it is important that I quote to the House some of the activities listed in our submission so that members may understand the very diverse activities carried on at the centre. The Hon. F. E. McKenzie already has referred to some of these activities, but I would like to tell members a little about what goes on at the Midland project. Some 35 to 40 young people attend the centre every day.

The first list of activities appears under the heading "Proposed Activities—Employment Related Activities"; however, in effect, they are the sorts of things which have been going on for some time. The list of activities reads as follows—

1. Job application techniques, written applications and use of telephone.
2. Mock job interviews.
3. Work experience programmes in local factories, shops and offices.
4. Tours of industries, business houses and hospitals.
5. General education for employment includes pilot E.P.U.Y. outreach scheme using Midland Technical School Staff and centre as venue.
6. Regular visits to Youth Job Centre and Careers Reference Centre.
7. Films and speakers from organisations include Defence forces, Police, Drug and Alcohol, Public Health, Health Education.
8. Introductory Courses using professional tutors, films and speakers e.g. Catering—

Commercial Course—covers all aspects of office procedure
Shop Assistant
Barmaid/Waitress

Mechanics
Welding
Childcare
Photography
Silk Screening
Landscape Gardening

These courses and others all include written job applications, mock interviews, visits to factories and business houses, grooming and deportment and practical work. Most participants follow course with work experience.

Information is given on further education and training available.

I repeat what I said earlier: The activities carried on under the CYSS scheme will not be duplicated by any other scheme listed in the Federal Budget; those schemes were directed purely at employment or education. One of the good things about CYSS is that it combines community service with employment training; it keeps young people involved in participating in the community, accepting responsibility, and doing things for others.

Some of the things contained in our submission which actually have been happening at the Swan CYSS centre are as follows—

1. Assisting night shelter by collecting and repairing and delivering furniture and equipment for people leaving shelter.
2. General repairs and painting for Night Shelter.
3. Duplicating and typing for groups and organizations e.g. Swan Clinic Womens Learning centres.
4. Christmas Party for underprivileged children.
5. Fund raising for R.S.L., Geon, Heart Foundation, Red Cross, Holyoake, Meals on Wheels.
6. Assistance in gardening, removal of rubbish, childcare, wood chopping, for the elderly and underprivileged members of the community referred to us through the Department Community Welfare, Mental Health Services and Churches.
7. Childcare for mothers attending groups sessions at Swan Clinic, 12 Holmesdale Road, Mundaring Sharing Centre.
8. Assistance is given at local schools with reading groups.

All this is being done by young teenagers. If that is not a worth-while activity in the community, I would not know what is.

Under the heading "Interest Expanding Activities" we see the following—

Pottery
Woodturning
Leatherwork
Copperwork
Cooking
Hobby Tex
Soft furnishing—lampshades, cushions,
patchwork upholstery
Sewing and knitting
Fibreglassing
Screen printing
Macrame
Copperwork
Candle making
Group discussions
Leadlight making
Picture frame making
Art
Sporting activities

The reason our project officers have been organising courses such as these, apart from the fact they are important leisure-time activities, is that we are beginning to realise many of the traditional jobs which have been available in the past, such as employment in offices, factories and shops, are fast disappearing either through technology, the use of word processors and computers in offices or automation in factories. We are all aware that shop assistants are being replaced by the self-service system.

The type of jobs which are disappearing are those which used to be filled by young people without academic qualifications or those who missed out on an apprenticeship—people who might be described as semi-skilled or unskilled. So, it is important these young people be offered an alternative means of making a living.

Our project officers have very intelligently decided that one way of doing this is to teach them an art or craft which can be employed in a cottage-type industry. Any person visiting the Swan youth support centre could not fail to be impressed by the beautiful work being produced; he would see leatherwork, lamp shades, soft toys, pottery and even the specialised craft of leadlight making. These are all very practical skills which will allow people to sell their product and make a living instead of sitting around doing nothing.

Our budget has been in the vicinity of \$25 000 to \$30 000 each six months, but we have found this has been nowhere near enough to do all the things we wanted to do. It has met the salaries of the project officers and some tutors' fees and has purchased some materials and equipment.

However, there are many things we require in a project like this which cannot be found from this sort of money.

So, like the Hon. Fred McKenzie, I pay a tribute to the people of the Swan; they have made a magnificent contribution to the centre either in the services they have offered or in the gift of materials or the loan of equipment. I refer particularly to the local authority, to Government departments, business people, service clubs and many individuals. I pay a tribute to the individuals who have gone into the centre and offered their time free of charge to teach the young people and to supervise them; to look after the kitchen; to who assist in mock interviews, and so on. Recently we had a married couple who conducted a catering course. The husband was a chef of some international experience; he made a very worth-while contribution to the centre.

Members will gain from my remarks a picture of a fairly busy centre in which there is a wholesome interaction between the community and the young unemployed people who are being assisted. They themselves are contributing something and participating in community life in the process, rather than sitting at home watching television, or wandering the streets, which will be on the cards if the Federal Government abolishes CYSS.

I would like to think there is no longer any need for any unemployed youth scheme, but unfortunately there is a great need and it will be with us for a long time. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has supplied us with figures for this State for June 1981 showing that unemployed youth in the 15 to 19 age group comprises 14 per cent of girls and 11 per cent of boys. The same young people who are about to lose this support scheme are expected by the Federal Government to exist on an income below the poverty level. The unemployment benefit for young single people under the age of 18 years has not been increased since April 1975 and is still only \$36 a week. This is \$37 a week below the poverty level. For a single person over the age of 18 years the unemployment benefit is still \$15 below the poverty level, despite the \$4.65 increase mentioned in the recent Budget which will come into effect in November and take their total to \$58.10 a week.

The Fraser Government has budgeted for a surplus of \$1 500 million. It is unbelievable that it should intend to abolish a scheme which was costing it a miserly \$13 million a year for Australia and only \$1.4 million for Western Australia. The Federal Government's action is even more shocking when we consider the assurances given by the Minister for Employment

and Youth Affairs (Mr Brown) shortly before the delivery of the Budget. He assured people the scheme would not be abolished and would in fact be improved. In *The Advertiser* of 2 June 1981 there was a picture of the Minister meeting with some young unemployed people involved with the CYSS scheme in Adelaide. The article is headed, "No fear on youth schemes: Brown". The article contained an assurance by the Minister that the scheme would not be in danger. The Minister said the changes would be aimed at making the service "run smoothly and consistently".

The article went on to state that changes would include paying CYSS grants in a lump sum in advance rather than reimbursing projects at a later date. It indicated that no cuts were intended, but the Government was looking at the number of unemployed people who have been through training schemes. He said, "We want to see whether unemployment benefits act as a deterrent to work".

The point of the article was that the Minister had said there was no intention of finishing the scheme and that it would be changed to run more smoothly and consistently.

The scheme has been a valuable one and has assisted thousands of young people throughout Australia. The 30 projects run in this State have been run very well and efficiently. They have helped many young Western Australians. It will be a great tragedy if the Federal Government pursues its decision to end the scheme. I therefore ask the House to support this motion moved by the Hon. Fred McKenzie.

THE HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife) [9.35 p.m.]: I listened with great interest to the previous two speakers. There is absolutely no doubt they were sincere and genuine in their desire to have this House support the motion. I recognise they are involved in the various CYSS operations in their particular electorates.

I do not think there is anyone in this House who would argue against the operation of many of these schemes. Of course, obviously there are some schemes which have not been as successful as others. We know the schemes have done a great deal of good in the community and we know there has been a great deal of community involvement, with the young people becoming involved and doing a great deal of work. We know other community groups have joined forces with these young people. I do not think anyone would deny what has been said about the worth of CYSS.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: What about in relation to this one?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am being reasonable and attempting to make the point that we have no argument with much of what has been said tonight. Indeed, most members, one way or another, have been involved in a scheme in their particular electorates. They know what this is all about. In many cases they have assisted these schemes.

It is quite true to say that other groups have joined forces with members of Parliament and worked together to assist these young people. In my own electorate there was a CYSS operation in Kalamunda and there was a great deal of input from the community. I have been very much impressed with some of the things that have been done, but not with everything. With some I have been a little disappointed. Some schemes have had faults and could have been improved.

Quite naturally, in many cases there are instances where CYSS operations in particular towns or districts have not worked very well or have not got near to achieving what was intended. It is fair to say this would apply to any group of organisations where there is good and bad management. In some cases the community joins in and in other cases this is not so.

In a few of the CYSS operations in this State there has been an attitude where perhaps people have felt the centres could be used as drop-in centres. There has been the encouragement of dependency on that particular operation rather than the idea of getting people out into the field and looking for job opportunities. I am not saying that is the case in all instances, but most certainly it is the case in some instances.

The intention was to prepare young people so that they could take up job opportunities. The intention was to give them confidence to go into the work force.

There are most certainly a number of successful operations in the metropolitan area. I understand there are 19 CYSS centres in the metropolitan area and 11 in country areas, with a total attendance of perhaps 600 daily. That means many thousands of people have been involved over a period of time.

What we must understand is that the Government of the day, be it Federal or State, has the responsibility of monitoring and assessing the operations of such organisations as CYSS. A Government has to evaluate the operations and try to understand what is happening. If it is considered that the money could be better used in other areas, a decision must be made. That is

something on which Ministers and members of Parliament have to decide every day of the week. That is why they are in the job.

The Commonwealth Government has looked very carefully at the CYSS operations. It has considered other options and has recognised the real problems which face young people looking for work in our community. The Government has sought to come to grips with that problem and has brought forward new initiatives. The Government's initiatives include a programme to train young people for work, and to train them in the right areas. The initiatives put forward in the recent Budget introduced by the Federal Treasurer (Mr Howard) are positive moves. They recognise where the weaknesses lie and recognise that there is a greater need in particular areas. The Federal Government has recognised that perhaps it should invest money in programmes other than CYSS.

I know everyone in this House at one time or other has read and taken into consideration the Commonwealth Government's new proposals. It is necessary to go through them and place them on record. We should look at just what the Federal Government is trying to do and should try to understand why members on this side of the House believe the new initiatives are positive and will be of great benefit to the community.

The expenditure on programmes designed to expand the supply of skilled labour sought by industry and to assist young people in their search for employment is to be increased by 22 per cent to \$203 million in 1981-82. We would all say that is money well spent.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: Is that happening now?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is necessary that we try to understand why the Federal Government is doing this. We are not knocking CYSS.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You are destroying it.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: We are trying to be reasonable and trying to understand what is happening and where the benefits lie. We are talking about programmes to assist young unemployed people obtain prior work experience. This is very important. Expenditure in this area is being increased by \$24 million to \$65 million.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are you going to say whether you support the motion?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am sure Mr MacKinnon will understand we have to do these

things properly and carefully. He is an expert and a man from whom I learnt a great deal.

The Federal Government intends to assist 100 000 apprentices this year. They are to be assisted in craft areas, areas where we are short of trained people in a country that is developing slowly but surely. We are not in a mad rush; we are developing in a positive way.

Expenditure on school-to-work transition allowances will rise by \$8 million to \$13 million—a very worth-while proposition. I am explaining these programmes because it is important to understand where the money is to be spent and why these decisions have been made.

A total of \$20 million—an increase of 35 per cent—is being allocated for training in skills which are in short supply. Surely that is to be supported very firmly. When we look at this sort of expenditure we understand more money is being spent in these areas, and that money has to be taken from elsewhere.

It does no good talking about surpluses; and it does no good talking about money coming from somewhere if we want it. There must be a balance of any financial decision and responsibility taken.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: There is a \$5 million surplus.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The honourable member knows as well as I do that we cannot work on the basis of deficits. We cannot say simply we will spend whatever we want to spend and work out the result later. There must be a positive and careful process of financial management. The honourable member knows that must be so.

The Government agrees with part of the motion before the House, but cannot go along with the last two paragraphs of it. If the Hon. Graham MacKinnon would like to pay attention he might understand the kindly manner in which I treat this motion.

Amendment to Motion

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The amendment I propose to move would delete the last two paragraphs of the motion so that certain words could be substituted. I move an amendment—

That all words after the word "assistance" in line 25 be deleted and the following words substituted—

This House acknowledges the work of and support given to the Community Youth Support Scheme, and the success it achieved, but notes that the discontinuation of the Community

Youth Support Scheme is made in the context of a substantial increase by the Commonwealth in its expenditure on programmes designed to expand the supply of skilled labour involving assistance to young unemployed people to obtain work experience and practical job skills or otherwise prepare them for employment.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You can do that without our assistance.

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Certainly much of the motion is supported by the Government, but for us to be realistic, practical and responsible the last two paragraphs should be deleted and the words proposed to be inserted be inserted. I urge the House after considering the discussion which has transpired to support my amendment.

THE HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [9.45 p.m.]: I support the amendment. It is tremendous how CYSS has succeeded in spite of its critics. The Federal Government has not held back in its efforts to create employment prospects, and that can be understood when one considers that the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs will spend this year 77 per cent of the amount which has been referred to previously on creating positions for apprentices and on other training programmes directed towards assisting young people.

For the sake of members who have not listened to the debate, I will refer to some of the Press statements made in relation to the Community Youth Support Scheme. Members may be able to read these articles for themselves when they have time to do so. In *The West Australian* of 26 August the comments of the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs are reported. The article states—

Mr Brown replied that the Budget had increased enormously the funds for training. "We will be abolishing CYSS from October 31 because circumstances have changed and because young people are in need of skills and work experience," Mr Brown said.

The Hon. F. E. McKenzie: That is quite different from what he said a couple of months before that.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: I listened without interjecting to the speech made by the Hon. F. E. McKenzie and I hoped he would give me the same courtesy. I did not think he was the type of man not to return a courtesy.

Mr Kevin Love wrote in *The West Australian* of 26 August on the subject of youth employment. The article states—

Youth employment had grown considerably in the past year and money was now being redirected to training and manpower, he said.

"What young people now need is training in skills and the work experience and ability employers insist on."

The scheme began in 1976-77 with a budget of \$570 000 and grew rapidly until its abolition last week.

It is quite interesting to hear such remarks when one considers the remarks of critics when the scheme commenced.

I refer the House to the time when the Government took the initiative of introducing the Community Youth Support Scheme. Members of the Opposition have accepted now that the scheme has had some success and we on this side recognise it has made a contribution to the relief of unemployment.

In Federal *Hansard* of 21 October 1976 at page 2170 the remarks of the Federal Labor member for Gellibrand (Mr Willis) have been reported. He said—

At a quarter past eight tonight I found in my office the latest Press release from the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr Street) announcing yet another program. This one is called the Community Youth Support Scheme, otherwise known as CYSS. What a miserable little kiss it is, too. . . I cannot imagine that most young people will be attracted to the scheme by that miserable additional sum over and above the unemployment benefit.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: They were attracted to it out of desperation.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am quite certain the Hon. F. E. McKenzie did not agree with the remarks of Mr Willis.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: I now refer to remarks made on 23 August 1977 by Mr Armitage in the House of Representatives. He is another member of the Australian Labor Party.

Opposition members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: He referred to the Community Youth Support Scheme which has proven to be of assistance in the community. Mr Armitage said—

With regard to youth employment, the honourable member for Bradfield (Mr Connolly) mentioned the community youth

support scheme. It is peanuts. It is giving very little benefit to the community.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That is true.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: To continue—

It is oriented to teaching young people how to find jobs and not to providing jobs for young people.

That was Mr Armitage of the ALP. I am saying it is good to see that the Federal Government has won support, despite these ALP critics. Let us move on to 1978 when Dr Jenkins, another member of the ALP, criticised this scheme. One would not expect those remarks. Perhaps we should refer to one of the backroom boys who perhaps is not known very well, particularly in his party. A man named Mick Young wrote the book titled *Positions Vacant—I Want to Work*. When referring to this particular scheme—a scheme already acknowledged in the debate tonight as having made a contribution to the Government and the community—he described it in these words, "The scheme is no more than tokenism, confined to creating drop-in centres providing 'cuddle therapy' rather than the jobs young people really need". I gather Opposition members would not accept what he is saying because I have just been told the scheme is working. I am glad that it is working.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You are going to destroy it.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: The CYSS scheme succeeded in spite of the critics. Mick Young wrote the book *Positions Vacant—I Want to Work* which I got from the Parliamentary Library. I will return it to the library tonight so members can look at it to check up on me. I have quoted page 106.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: We own it.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: He went on to say that this scheme has made tremendous contributions. I agree. I have had contact with people who have worked under the scheme. I am certain the Hon. Fred McKenzie and the Hon. Lyla Elliott would support the success of this scheme rather than the remarks of their colleague.

An Opposition member: Why don't you support Mr McKenzie?

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: The book goes on to say "The guidelines even limit training, preventing formal education classes or instruction in job skills, as normally provided by educational or training institutions". I am referring, of course, to the book written by Mick Young. He then goes on to say "The \$12.26 million would be better

spent on genuine job creation and training programmes". That paragraph follows the one which refers to cuddle therapy.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: What do you think he meant by "cuddle therapy"?

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: The honourable member had better see the Hon. Lyla Elliott about that. She is probably more experienced in that particular area than are the rest of us.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Make a cheap, sexist remark! That is all I expect from you. That is disgraceful in Parliament.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to refrain from continual interjections which they know are out of order. I ask them also to discontinue the audible conversations which are being carried on.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: Thank you, Mr President. I apologise to members opposite if they took offence at that remark; I meant no offence by it.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You are too ignorant to know.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: However, I do not apologise for quoting from Mick Young's book. I assume that since this motion was introduced by a member of the Labor Party, members opposite would be interested to know the views of Mick Young. He went on to say in his book that it would be possible to make something of all three schemes if they were converted into genuine job creation schemes. The interesting thing about the remarks of Mick Young, and particularly those relating to formal education classes and skill instruction, is that very often the Government is accused of not listening to those who offer advice. Occasionally the Government listens to the advice it receives and if it is good advice it takes the initiatives suggested.

Let us move out of that 1976 era, when it was recognised the time and climate were right for CYSS, and move into the next stage. Certainly the budget indicates the money involved because the assistance to young people by way of training programmes for unemployed youth increased by 67.8 per cent. The amount increased from \$47.5 million to \$79.4 million. Two schemes are involved. There is the standard scheme for youths who have been four months out of work. That scheme looks after some 54 000 applicants. The other scheme is the extended one which caters for youths who have been out of work for eight months or more.

It was expected to help at least 12 000 people in the private sector and 3 600 in Commonwealth establishments under those schemes.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Doesn't this offend the unfair advertising legislation?

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: We will have to check on that. However, I can give the total; as many as 69 600 people would be helped under this scheme.

The school-to-work transitional allowance has been increased from \$4.7 million to \$13 million. This will cater for some 16 000 young people. It is an increase from 8 800 to 16 000 young people attending pre-apprenticeship training, pre-vocational training, pre-employment training, and a number of other things. These are the things Mick Young was referring to. What about the important area of apprentices? We need them in the State.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: We need to talk in terms of training our own apprentices. What are we doing about it? A total of \$76.5 million has been provided for trade training, an increase of \$8.4 million. That will cater for 95 000 apprentices, an increase of 3 000 who will be handled under this scheme. Under this scheme employers are given an incentive to employ apprentices.

The CYSS scheme is to be phased out on 31 October 1981 because circumstances have changed since its introduction in 1976.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: Since then the Government has increased the resources devoted to youth unemployment and training programmes, including special youth unemployment training programmes, special programmes for youths out of work for eight months or longer, increases in educational opportunities for young people experiencing difficulty in the transition from school to work. This scheme is carried out under the Commonwealth school-to-work programme, and \$75.4 million of Government funds has been made available for this. The counselling facilities made available to young people through the Commonwealth Employment Service have been extended to cater for more unemployed young people.

An Opposition member: Are non-existent. You know they are non-existent.

The Hon. P. H. WELLS: The people concerned should take the opportunity to find out what is available. The Commonwealth Minister for

Employment and Youth Affairs (Mr Brown) said in the Federal Parliament yesterday that officers from the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs will visit all CYSS projects to explain the Government's programme, training allowances, and the facilities available in this area. This is to be done so that unemployed young people can take positive action to acquire the skills, work experience, and ability they need in order not only to acquire jobs, but also to keep them.

CYSS has made a contribution to the community. I feel sorry that Mr McKenzie has interjected because I support what he has said in this area. I support the amendment because it spells out the initiative of the Federal Government introduced in its Budget. The Government is progressing in order to provide initiatives which critics said were necessary, but now appear to be screaming about.

THE HON. PETER DOWDING (North) [10.01 p.m.]: Whilst supporting this motion I should like to make reference to the tragedy that it does not matter what effort members of the Opposition make to present a proposition which ought to attract the broad consensus of approval of the members from both sides of this Chamber, and it does not matter what efforts we make to have a definitive statement in respect of CYSS; no matter how much we try, members on the other side of the House are determined to make sure there will be no decrease in the support of an ailing Federal Government.

They do that because they know, as does anyone who knows anything about the electoral system, that the members on the opposite side of the House have the power to rule this State without the support of the majority of Western Australians.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: They have achieved that because we have a system in this House where one member of Parliament can represent a disproportionate—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the honourable member of the motion we are discussing and I suggest that he should make reference to it.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: It is for that reason that members on the other side of the House—

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the honourable member wishes to defy the Chair then the opportunity for him to make any further

contribution to the debate is fast drawing to a close. I certainly do not wish to stop the member from speaking. I will protect his right to speak provided he speaks to the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: It is for certain reasons that honourable members opposite will not support the type of motion we have put forward in this place. That is the arrogance which comes from the sort of power they have; it leads to the refusal to support a motion, the terms of which are innocuous and which could possibly improve the situation for the State of Western Australia.

However, Mr Wells is prepared to mouth platitudes and state that in 1976 the Labor Party pointed out that in a time of crisis and unemployment something much more than CYSS was required. It is quite ridiculous to criticise because the statement at that time was fair comment. It was not a panacea, it did not create jobs. It was an attempt to do some justice to the young people in this country who were being forced into unemployment by the policies of the Liberal Government.

Mr Wells cares so little for those people. He is quite happy to support a proposition which removes from the motion the following words—

The value of the scheme in Western Australia has derived largely from the gradual build up of goodwill, voluntary assistance, and equipment, all of which will be dissipated if the scheme is abandoned.

Mr Wells seeks to have those words removed whilst we are attempting to gain some unanimity in this House and when the State of Western Australia so desperately needs something for the young people who are unemployed and who have no prospects of employment because of the policy of the Government.

The Opposition is seeking to help young people who have no chance of employment. More words of policy and promises of Government spending from Canberra will not help them gain employment or ease the tragedy of unemployment.

Last night I spoke about how this Government was not prepared to care for disadvantaged people and young teenagers who, year in year out, have not been able to obtain employment. I would like to see a scheme which was more than words and more than paper. I would like to see a scheme which did more for the unemployed. In the meantime, I would like to see the position of those young people alleviated to some extent. This will

not happen overnight; yet the CYSS scheme is to be abandoned overnight.

We have seen Mr Wells presiding over the death of the CYSS scheme. In the measured tones we can expect from Mr Wells he has delivered a eulogy. Mr Wells would be living in cuckoo land if he thought any measure taken up by the Federal Government to alleviate youth unemployment would work overnight.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to cease their interjections and I ask the honourable member on his feet to address his comments to the Chair.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: No doubt, at the next Federal election we will be told by the Liberals—and the members opposite who are trying to support an ailing Federal Liberal Party—that these things take time to get under way. It does not occur to the honourable members on the opposite side of the House that it takes time for these projects to get under way and that these young people will have nothing to do because there is no work available for them and they have no opportunities to find work.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: CYSS does not find work.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: When will these people be found apprenticeships? This year? Next year?

Several members interjected.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: One of the tragedies of the situation is that because of the fantasies Mr Wells perpetuates it is believed that young people will receive apprenticeships. It is ludicrous to pretend that there will be a solution in the immediate future for these young people. They will not receive apprenticeships immediately. They will not go immediately into retraining schemes. The young people who are using CYSS—

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Will CYSS retrain them?

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr Lewis can thumb his nose at CYSS—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind honourable members that interjections are out of order. I recommend that the honourable member on his feet address his remarks to the Chair and ignore the interjections.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr Lewis can thumb his nose at the CYSS operation and talk about it and others—

Several members interjected.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: He can make noises about the operation being therapy—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Point of Order

The Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr President, I should like the words “thumbing your nose at various organisations” withdrawn. The honourable member is going beyond the bounds of reality.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the honourable member to withdraw those words.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: I withdraw.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: The point I am attempting to make is that honourable members can joke about it and pretend that the scheme is some sort of therapy or pretend that it is unnecessary; but I ask them to put themselves in the position of a disadvantaged person, a young person who has never had a job or who has perhaps been rebuffed 20, 30, or 100 times when he has applied for a job. What will he do during the day to fill in his time if there is no CYSS scheme? I would prefer there to be work.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: They have much better opportunities now.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: It would be far better for the Minister interjecting to direct his attention—

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. H. W. Olney: The Minister is out of order.

The PRESIDENT: All members interjecting are out of order.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: It does not lie easily in the mouths of Ministers, particularly the Minister for Conservation and the Environment and other things to laugh about these projects; they never care about the people of this State. I said last night that one of the greatest concerns to me is the way in which this country is being destroyed because the “haves” represented by members opposite are concerned primarily with keeping what they have, and not sharing it with the people of this community who need it. All the giggles, smiles, and smirks we see from members opposite when we talk about the CYSS scheme does them no credit whatever.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: Would you set your bank balance against mine?

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: I would be quite happy to.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: I hope you say that outside the House.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members are trying the patience of the Chair. I recommend they cease their interjections. I repeat to the member on his feet that he is not to address his comments to those members who are interjecting. He should address them to the Chair, from which he will receive no interjections.

The Hon. PETER DOWDING: The tragedy is that we have moved a motion, the purpose of which was to make a combined attempt to make it clear to the Federal Government that we in Western Australia were unhappy about the deletion of the CYSS scheme; that we did not accept that the great promises of new arrangements and new funding mechanisms were going to solve the immediate problem; and that the immediate abolition of the CYSS scheme was simply another attempt to get at the people who have least chance of fighting back.

I will bet 10 bob to a brass watch that the Federal counterparts of members opposite are not sitting as smugly as members here in this gerrymandered House, and that we hear more about the CYSS scheme before the end of this month. I can tell these smug members opposite who apparently are quite happy to accept new Federal promises and to see the CYSS scheme destroyed that their Federal back-bench counterparts are not taking it so easily and I expect there to be some changes. The tragedy is that members opposite are not game enough to support a joint and tempered approach to try to maintain the CYSS scheme for the State of Western Australia and its people.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [10.14 p.m.]: I wish firstly to remind the Hon. Fred McKenzie of an experience I had some two years after entering this Chamber when I had the unfortunate occasion to mention to the Hon. Lyla Elliott that a matter she had raised very seriously and sincerely and which she had actually convinced a couple of Government members to support had gone down the drain by the vindictive and personal attack of one of her own colleagues; it completely demolished all the good work she had done. However, on this occasion, I do not intend to allow the attack of the Hon. Peter Dowding on members on this side in general—after hearing only two members on this

side speak—dissuade me from my decision to oppose the Minister's amendment.

Although I agree with the things the Minister said in that the Commonwealth Government is doing a tremendous amount in the initiatives it is taking to assist young people move into the employment field, I believe these initiatives are all of a formal nature.

It is my firm belief quite a large percentage of our young people are in the unemployed pool because they do not respond to a formal situation. They need the type of informal situation that CYSS provides to give them confidence in themselves and to give them the chance to explore various interests and to really become people. It is very disheartening continually to find one's self unable to get a job and to have the knowledge that one's education perhaps is not up to standard; perhaps, in many cases, one's personality does not really help to obtain employment.

I do not believe these people are going to be assisted by the formal type of situation the Commonwealth Government is offering. I accept there are many young people who will be helped tremendously by these initiatives; however, a certain section of our young unemployed will be even more disadvantaged by the offering of formal assistance over a wide scale.

So, I believe that whilst the initiatives announced by the Commonwealth Government will go a long way towards assisting young unemployed people, they will not assist a certain section of the community. The Commonwealth would be well advised to retain CYSS, perhaps on a reduced scale, perhaps on the understanding that it will be gradually phased out. In this way, the Commonwealth will be able to assess the degree of assistance provided by its new initiatives and will be able to establish whether my fears will prove to be a reality; namely, that there is a group of young people who will be even more severely disadvantaged by the abolition of CYSS.

I believe the most important word in the name "Community Youth Support Scheme" is the word "support". There are young people who will still need support when these other programmes come into operation.

It will be a shame if we dismantle CYSS and find we have created a vacuum which will need to be filled and we then have to turn around and assemble something like CYSS, perhaps on a smaller scale, to meet that need.

I completely agree with the motion moved by the Hon. Fred McKenzie and I cannot support the Minister's amendment.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [10.18 p.m.]: I simply wish to say a few words to show that nothing has really changed—

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Since 1892.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is very apposite that the Hon. Lyla Elliott should interject so early in my speech because it is with regard to her predecessor that I wish to make some comment. The time was when the sort of outburst we have heard from the Hon. Peter Dowding would have excited comments from his own party; it was a little extreme.

In the case to which I am referring, a matter came up which was very near and dear to the heart of the Hon. Ruby Hutchison—a lovely lady who used to sit alongside me. Gilbert Fraser, who was sitting where the Hon. I. G. Medcalf sits today, was the Leader of the House. He knew Ruby would not be able to contain herself and if she made the same sort of speech the Hon. Peter Dowding has just made he feared all the Liberal members would vote against him. In those days, the Labor Party held almost half the numbers in this House. So, he arranged for her to be called out and he locked her in a common room, which is now the Cabinet dining room. He returned to this Chamber and got his motion carried with the help of the Liberal Party and then sent an attendant down to unlock her. He was not game to do it himself.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: Why did you not tell us all this before?

The Hon. H. W. Olney: That is what Tom Dadour did.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There is a lesson in a story such as this. I can assure the Hon. Fred McKenzie that he had quite a lot of sympathy on his side, because his motion really is quite innocuous.

It would have been good politics to have accepted the motion. The important part of the motion—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If they work hard, they might get back in.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No, they cannot come back in. We even go along with terrible speakers from our own side, and they go along with worse speakers from their side.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: Do you know how to get your own back?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I know precisely how. I have been out in the wind, too.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Part of the motion reads—

This House, therefore, requests that the Commonwealth Government reconsider its decision to abandon the Community Youth Support Scheme.

That is, the Commonwealth Government should reconsider it, have a look at it. The motion continues—

...and asks the State Government to convey this resolution to the Hon. N. A. Brown, Q.C., M.P., Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs, with the request that it be forwarded to the Prime Minister.

That is the sort of motion which, in fairness, we could have carried. By interjection I asked the Minister what he was going to do. I must admit that I was surprised when he produced the amendment. Having read the amendment, I thought, "He is a friend of mine. I will be prepared to go along with that".

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I am sorry about that. I thought better of you.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Hon. Mr Gayfer said that that is not what I said to him earlier.

I still had a mind to vote for Mr McKenzie's motion, because it is pretty innocuous. It is reasonable, in all the circumstances.

I note also, as do the rest of us, the rest of the motion about helping young people, and so forth. That is true. I will not go over that, because it was better dealt with by Mr Pratt. He dealt with it in a better fashion than anyone else has dealt with it tonight. Mr Pratt made a good speech; and he also enunciated reasons for going along with Mr McKenzie's motion.

Mr Wells' speech polarised the situation to some extent. It was pale and insignificant—that is not quite right, because it was noisy in some aspects. However, in terms of polarity, it was insignificant alongside Mr Dowding's speech.

In all conscience, in the face of Mr Dowding's speech, I cannot now vote for Mr McKenzie's motion. I will not vote for Mr McKenzie's motion. Indeed, I will vote for Mr Masters' amendment, not on the basis of Mr Masters' greater logic—

The Hon. D. K. Dans: What logic?

The Hon. H. W. Olney: What about his pretty face?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Not even for that. I will vote for the amendment simply

because I took objection to the sorts of statements made by Mr Dowding. They did not win him any friends. They did not allow for anything but polarity.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: What did he say that was more objectionable than what Mr Wells said?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Hon. Peter Dowding said it in a noisy fashion.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Why should we take it from your side when you will not take it from us?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In the case of the Labor Party, they want the motion carried. When one wants something carried, one speaks softly. When one wants something carried and wants support, one speaks nicely.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Not when we are abused. We don't have to sit here, being abused.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have not abused Miss Elliott, and yet she has alienated me.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Come on, he wants to be friends with you.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I wanted to recount the little anecdote about the Hon. Lyla Elliott's predecessor (the Hon. Ruby Hutchison). You will recall, Mr President, that the Hon. Ruby Hutchison prepared us very well by telling us constantly, with great repetition, about the lovely person who was going to replace her. We have not been disappointed.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You changed all that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: We have not been disappointed. I point out to Mr Dowding, in the hope that he may learn a lesson, that his behaviour is not without precedent. However, Mr Dans was not quite as forthright as Mr Fraser. He did not take the necessary action at the right time to ensure our continued support.

THE HON. H. W. OLNEY (South Metropolitan) [10.25 p.m.]: I propose to make a quiet speech in the hope of wooing my senior colleague on my left back into the fold.

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are trying hard!

The Hon. H. W. OLNEY: I have been impressed by what he said tonight. Obviously he has gone back on what he said last year when I first came here. He said, "Never change a good mind", or something like that. He has changed his mind—for the wrong reason, of course.

Another reason I wanted to say a few words was that I hoped Mr Lewis might make to me the offer that he made to Mr Dowding about swapping bank balances. That would be an offer

too good to miss; and I am sorry that the offer is not forthcoming.

I listened to Mr Pratt, and I disagree with him on one aspect of his speech. He said that the word "support" was the important part of CYSS. I suggest that the word "community" is a very important part. I would have thought it was the most important part of that title, because it encapsules the real concept of the scheme. It is a community support scheme—the community supporting the young people in the community who have no employment.

My mind goes to my recent experience, which made a very vivid impression on me when I was recently in the United Kingdom, when riots broke out in Brixton, Toxteth, and Southall, and a couple of other places. It was a frightening experience to be in a city where riots took place. The post-riot analysis shows that, basically, the riots were not race-inspired although that was the initial response given to them by the newspapers. The riots were inspired by the utter hopelessness of the young people—the people who had nothing to do and nowhere to go. There was just no hope for them. What did it matter if they set fire to police cars, looted shops, and carried on in a riotous way?

Had there been schemes like CYSS in the towns in which riots took place—of course, on a much grander scale because of the huge populations—in which young people could have a focal point and receive support from the community through volunteer workers, trained project officers, members of Parliament, and other people who were sufficiently interested to show concern by promoting the schemes, it may be that the riots would not have happened. Indeed, as I understand it, the remedy that Mrs Thatcher is seeking to implement includes the same concept of community support schemes. Perhaps they will exist under a different name; perhaps they will have different procedures; but the idea is to have people in the community providing a basis of support for the young people who have no employment and who do not expect any employment in the foreseeable future.

Much has been said about the moneys being channelled into apprenticeship schemes. I am the father of two apprentices. One is a second-year apprentice, and the other is a first-year apprentice. One of my children is the beneficiary of a Commonwealth support scheme in her apprenticeship.

I have nothing but praise for the concept of the Government putting finance into increasing the opportunities for young people to become

apprentices. The more money it spends and the more efficiently it spends it in attracting young people into apprenticeships the more happy I would be. However, it must be recognised that apprenticeships are long-term projects; it is four or five years before they produce anything.

I have a 20-year-old son who is married and who keeps his wife—she does not work—and earns something like \$140 a week. That is the pay for a second-year apprentice.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He cannot do much with that.

The Hon. H. W. OLNEY: He does not. While it is some support to young people to have families they can go to in the last resort and look for support, I am proud to say that has never been called upon in my particular case. Indeed, it is those unemployed kids who have families who are better off than those who are single. I am all in favour of apprenticeship subsidies to enable young people to get into the work force and obtain training. But let us not forget the large numbers—and according to a radio programme I heard recently the numbers are increasing—of young people who are homeless and who drift around from place to place; kids who are not living with their families for one reason or another. Many times it is because the family is suffering from unemployment at a higher level in that the parents are unemployed and are not in a position to maintain children in the traditional style of kids staying at home until they are married and have become independent. Of course, I am talking of the traditional style of perhaps 30 or 40 years ago.

I am talking of kids who live in rooms with three or four other young people who have nothing but the dole to live on; kids who spend every cent they have just to exist and who have nowhere to go each day except perhaps down to the unemployment office to look at the board with the same tired old cards asking for experienced tradesmen or part-timers, cards offering jobs from which they will be sacked when they are eligible to receive adult wages. I am speaking about kids who do not fit into the category of those suitable for most job opportunities and who have nothing to do.

I impress upon the House that it is most desirable that the community makes a contribution to alleviate the social ill of unemployment. I do not want the Federal Government to cut one cent of the money it has allocated this year to alleviate unemployment or to provide apprenticeship training or any other training that will see more people obtain work. I

appeal to those in authority to keep their options open.

The Community Youth Support Scheme is not a big money spender. The criticism made in the early stages was that it appeared to be only a token effort. In the overall scheme of things I suggest that it has only ever been a token effort. Nonetheless, it is an effort that ought to be pursued. We should keep these good community workers involved. They have shown their concern and they should be kept working. The Government should find just that extra bit of money so that we can maintain CYSS; so that we have apprenticeship schemes; and so that we have school-to-work transition programmes. But do not let us kid ourselves that we are going to cure unemployment this year, next year, or in the foreseeable future.

THE HON. P. G. PENDAL (South-East Metropolitan) [10.35 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the Government. I would like to make some reference to comments made by the Hon. Ian Pratt, who I thought made a worth-while contribution, albeit somewhat different in approach to that which I intend to take. I shall comment on the worth-while contributions made by the Hon. Howard Olney and the Hon. Fred McKenzie.

I suggest that rather than mourn the loss of a scheme such as the Community Youth Support Scheme we ought to be examining whether we should have had that scheme in the first place. In parallel with that, since CYSS is now effectively at an end and we seem to be lurching from one suggestion to another in terms of support schemes for unemployed people, we now seem to be lurching towards what is famously and commonly known as the school-to-work transition programme.

I regret not so much the passing of CYSS as the effect it will have on the people who have involved themselves in it, particularly those in my own electorate in the last several years. They are people who, without exception, have had an enormous commitment and sometimes enormous pressures, people who have been genuinely assisting others less fortunate than themselves. So my regrets are directed to those people rather than to the passing of this programme itself.

I would hope that at no time in the future will I have to express any grief at the passing of the school-to-work transition programme, because I would hope this State Government, along with other Governments around Australia, will do all in its power to re-examine its commitment, so called, to the school-to-work transition

programme. I think it will end up doing less for unemployed people than CYSS has done and will produce fewer tangible results.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: The Minister seemed to think that was a good thing.

The Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I beg to differ from the Minister. I accept there are many people of all political persuasions who see the employment salvation for young people in school-to-work transition programmes. I do not.

Members may have read an article in *The West Australian* of 18 August in which the education writer had this to say—

In schools all over the country students are taking part in transition programmes as varied as setting up their own market gardens, rebuilding bicycles in school sheds, going on bus trips to look at factories, learning horsemanship on remote stations or keeping bees.

Everyone will recognise how enormously helpful those things are going to be to get people into the work force!

In all honesty, it is a lot of tommyrot to say that suggestion can be taken seriously. There is no way in the world those things are meant to do anything other than to occupy the time of the kids, in the belief that, ultimately, by keeping them out of trouble they might be slotted into some work later on. However, such a programme does nothing whatsoever to prepare a youngster for the work force.

On a positive note, I suggest we do away with not only CYSS but also the school-to-work transition programme. We should do away with the several other major youth employment support schemes that operate in this country. We should redirect that money in a massive way into technical education.

The Hon. Ian Pratt made a valid point when he said we have all these young people who have already rejected the formal learning situation and therefore are not going to be helped by a new formal learning situation.

I put it to the House that we are talking about preparing people for the work force—preparing people to take up worth-while jobs, no matter what types of jobs they might be. I suggest perhaps the way out of it for us is a massive redirection of funds which are currently being put into these palliative-type programmes which just nuzzle around the edges without getting to the root cause of the problem. In any case we should not need a school-to-work transition programme if our education system is working correctly.

I come now to the point mentioned by the Hon. Howard Olney. Certainly there must be jobs for these people to go to if we have a massive redirection of funds totally and solely into the technical education field. I accept that; but I took the trouble today to check where in Western Australia at the moment we have any shortages in the skilled or semi-skilled areas.

As members know, we have severe shortages at the moment in the skilled metal and engineering areas, and that covers welders, boilermakers, draftsmen, and some forms of non-university engineers. The fact is shortages existed a year ago. Indeed, there were shortages two years ago and, in some cases, three years ago.

At a time when I was involved in the situation, when people could foresee there would be massive shortages of skilled workers for such enterprises as the North-West Shelf project, the argument which was put forward frequently was that the employers knew they would need these people in a few years, but they simply did not have the money to pay for their training. I accept that as being a fair proposition.

At the same time there were Governments around Australia which also foresaw that need. However, Governments in the economic tradition of the time, found it was necessary also to restrict their own spending and they too said the money was not available. Therefore, we are now three or four years down the track and we have the classic conflict—on one hand, we have unemployment and, on the other hand, we have shortages of skilled and semi-skilled people.

Therefore, I suggest the only way to break that vicious circle is not to put people through schemes of a palliative nature, but rather to have a massive redirection of funds from those schemes into the technical education sector, channeling them into the areas where industry advises it will need people one, two, or three years later.

One of the difficulties faced by technical colleges today is that of attracting people to their colleges on the grounds that those people know that, once they leave the world of unemployment and go into the college, they also lose access to unemployment benefits. That is an understandable situation from the point of view of a person who has been out of work for one or two years.

Why is it that the Government cannot again redirect the amount of money it is paying for people to remain on unemployment benefits and turn it into a form of TEAS allowance paid to students attending technical colleges? In other words, instead of a disincentive for people to

attend technical colleges, rather there should be an incentive for them to do so in the full knowledge that they will not lose unemployment benefits. In effect, they will lose unemployment benefits paid in that manner, but they will receive a new form of benefit—a benefit which is available already to people in the tertiary levels of education throughout Australia.

I was prepared to support the Government on the basis of one line which appears on page 13 of the Federal Budget. It is the first public indication of which I am aware in the last five or six years that the Government finally intends to move away from the idea of palliative support measures into the real world of preparing people for jobs. That line reads as follows—

This will allow available funds to be concentrated on programmes more attuned to labour market conditions.

That is the recognition—belatedly, I might add, on the part of the present Federal Government, previous Federal Governments and, indeed, probably previous State Governments—that what we ought to be doing is channeling all our resources, along with industry and technical education, into producing people who can fulfil jobs which will become available in one, two, or three years.

Mr Olney should well know there need not be the fear that an apprenticeship will, in all cases, take four or five years. There is a trend around Australia at the moment to cut down the time of many of the traditional apprenticeships to, perhaps, three years. Beyond that there is even the tendency today to enter courses at sub-apprenticeship level which allow training for only a one or two-year period.

I know the unions have some fears about watering down the qualifications and the level of expertise that is required in particular areas, but, in all honesty, I do not believe that is a valid point. In many cases we do not need to have skilled tradesmen. For every skilled tradesman who obtains a job, there must be people who have other skills to assist him. Frequently they are the people causing the bottlenecks, because they are not available.

I support the amendment.

THE HON. TOM KNIGHT (South) (10.47 p.m.): I appreciate the motion so capably moved by the Hon. Fred McKenzie and the sincerity with which he moved it. I support the Federal Government's move to make more money available for job opportunities. However, I am still concerned about the fact that CYSS has been discontinued. I look at the work which has been

done in my electorate, particularly in the Albany area, by the CYSS and the benefit it has been to the young people there.

A Mrs Margaret Gordon in Albany has spent many hours of her time working to give young people the opportunity to find employment in the region. I consider the proposed new idea on the part of the Federal Government, as mentioned by the Hon. Howard Olney, will make job opportunities available to a selected few only. CYSS was for everyone. It was for every young person who was in the unfortunate position of being unemployed. The young people turned up, received assistance from the community, and in turn were helping that community.

When we examine the proposal put forward now by the Federal Government, it is clear the situation will be organised in such a way that jobs or apprenticeship training facilities will be available to a limited number of people only and, as I said before, to a selected few.

In Albany CYSS had a tremendous amount of community support. Last week I made the comment in Albany that I was disappointed CYSS had been discontinued and I hoped the community would look at the situation and see its way clear, by some means or other, to assist in the continuation of its work.

The Hon. Ian Pratt said CYSS should be phased out over a period of time, because a number of young people who have come to rely on the facilities of the scheme, particularly in Albany, will be destitute if it is cut off at the end of October. CYSS provided a venue to which young, unemployed people could go discuss their problems, and receive assistance as far as job opportunities were concerned.

CYSS was not involved so much in the provision of job opportunities in the fields of skilled labour and apprenticeships; rather it worked in an area in which a number of employers would not look for young people. However, as a result of the time and effort expended by a number of people like Mrs Gordon, employers were contacted, and jobs of this nature were made available to young people.

A number of people in the community criticise young people because they believe they do not try to do anything for themselves. They are criticised for sitting around doing nothing, for damaging property and for picking up unemployment benefits. However, the young people who have presented themselves at CYSS have shown some initiative. They have come along and something has been set up for them to do.

I supported the establishment of CYSS and I support any move by the Government to provide employment opportunities for young people. I am disappointed the Government has seen fit to discontinue CYSS.

THE HON. R. HETHERINGTON (East Metropolitan) [10.50 p.m.]: I oppose the amendment and support the motion. I find it rather ironic that I am defending CYSS. I was one of the people critical of it when it was established. I must say that always I have deplored, ever since reading parliamentary debates and listening to Federal and State parliamentary debates, the type of arguments we have from people such as the Hon. P. H. Wells. Such people get up and say, "People here said such and such X years ago in condemnation of this scheme; therefore they are hypocritical". The argument that they are hypocritical does not follow from their remarks. I just wish that the Hon. Peter Wells had taken the trouble to argue the merits of the scheme instead of indulging in reactive remarks. He did not do much at all for the debate.

When CYSS was introduced I regarded it as a cosmetic device, a bit of tokenism. I have not changed my view. However, certain members of this House and other people in the community got down to making the scheme work instead of criticising it. In many communities it became a Community Youth Support Scheme. It was made to work by the devotion and dedication of many people in many communities.

People in this Parliament from both sides of the political fence have been active in their support of CYSS. Two chairmen of CYSS programmes are members of this House, and other chairmen of such programmes are members of Parliament in another place. I would have thought the Hon. Graham MacKinnon would accept this motion as reasonable and capable of being supported. I do not believe, as does the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife apparently believe, just because the Federal Government makes a decision on something, that decision is right.

I can understand the Minister's moving the amendment. He wants to believe that every time his Government makes a decision it is right. Therefore he believes he must support other people in authority so long as they are on his side of politics.

It is a great pity that we will be rid of CYSS. I do not claim it solves all the problems of unemployment, but I do claim it gives self-esteem to a number of young people out of work. It gives skills to a number of young people out of work

and helps some of them find jobs. Certainly I do not believe an expanded CYSS would solve all problems associated with unemployment, and nor do I believe the expanded technical education programme which the Federal Government talks about so vaguely will solve all those problems. Other actions will need to achieve that result.

I was interested in the fervour of the Hon. Peter Wells—the fervour of a recent convert—when he repeated many of the things I have been saying since I have been in this place, and I have been here since 1977. I have not been here that long, but longer than the Hon. Peter Wells. I have been saying many of the things the Hon. Peter Wells said, and many of the things the Hon. Phillip Pandal said.

As Shadow Minister for Education in the Labor Party I helped to work out the Labor Party education policy which included among other things a proposal for a pre-employment advisory council to consider the problems associated with youth employment. That is Labor Party policy and indicates that we are aware of what is going on. When I came into this House I said that if we look forward to the day when a natural gas project will be developed in this State we should start training people, but we did not. We waited too long. Now the Federal Government has received great support for doing some of the things it should have done ages ago.

Of course we should be expanding technical education programmes. This has been Labor policy for some years. In order to expand it adequately we need more funds from the Commonwealth Government, and in order to do other things that need to be done more money must be provided and spent. Time and time again I have made the same remarks in this House. Unfortunately the money spent on the school-to-work transition programme is not regarded by everybody as being well spent. Before we destroy CYSS we should determine how well the school-to-work transition programme is working. The evidence before me suggests it is not working well at all.

Not long ago I mentioned this matter in this House when making a speech attacking the Minister for Education. I have made several such attacks and no doubt will do so in the future. It had been reported in the Press that the Minister would try to persuade the Federal Government not to allocate further funds to the school-to-work transition programme. I assumed that was this Government's policy, but I believe divisions have occurred. The Minister believed the programme was not the best way of spending available funds.

Even though I attacked him on that occasion, I applaud his initiative. I think he was right.

The Minister in this House who has just mentioned education has not shown he knows much about education, if anything at all. However, he can argue the point with his colleague when they meet in Cabinet. No doubt they will match experts to determine the winner. They need experts because neither of them knows much about education.

The Community Youth Support Scheme works in many communities. People are correct in saying that it does not work in all communities, but it has worked extremely well in many communities. I suggest the communities in which it has worked well will lead the way. Their gains would help the scheme to work well in the communities in which it does not work at the moment.

Instead of looking forward to the day when new initiatives will work, and instead of destroying this scheme now, we should wait until some of the proposed schemes are seen to work properly. In that way we might do better. If we now destroy CYSS, as people are trying to persuade others to do, many of the young people going into training schemes will not have the benefit of having their self-esteem raised and realising that they have abilities which previously they did not realise they had.

Many people have carried out a great deal of work to support the young people involved in the scheme. By destroying CYSS we will lose the expertise, initiatives and understanding of such people. The scheme had a slow and dubious start, but it is now doing some useful work. I will not place its benefits any higher than that. Certainly I would not say it is a panacea to cure everything. However, it is at least helping some young people to maintain their self-respect and acquire skills they might otherwise not have acquired.

If the Hon. Phillip Pandal were to wait until some of his grandiose ideas were carried out—

The Hon. P. G. Pandal: They should have been done five years ago.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: I agree with the honourable member; I said so five years ago and have been saying so ever since.

The Hon. P. G. Pandal: Governments and unions wouldn't have a bar of it five years ago, and that is Governments and unions of all colours.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: Unfortunately we have to work through this Government and of course in order to get unions

on side one has to negotiate, discuss, look into matters and do a whole range of things.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: A whole range of employers were not on side, either.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: One has to see what would happen but certainly it is fair comment to say we are going to wipe the slate clean and start off with a brand new initiative. One line in the Federal Budget indicates that the Federal Government has some ideas of the needs in this community. However, we need a great deal more evidence that the Federal Government is really going to do something before we destroy a scheme that is working well.

I hope the Hon. Graham MacKinnon does change his mind again. If he can change it once he can change it once more.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: He never changed his mind.

The Hon. R. HETHERINGTON: People should follow the truth as they see it and I pay tribute to the Hon. Ian Pratt that he has done so. It is the more pleasurable as it is so rarely that I agree with him. On this issue we are as one and I appreciate the things he said.

It seems to me we have the opportunity to do something about employment. We have the opportunity to make sure what kind of skills are required. We do not get this information by asking industry because it does not always realise what is happening in changes of technology, and some industrialists find that much to their surprise things have developed in different ways from what they had expected. We have to try to monitor the situation. I am wondering what the Hon. Peter Wells was talking about in regard to the offences in the present situation. The only thing that he has said is that the Federal Government will do something else. What is inherently different in the situation that was not there before?

For years now we have had growing unemployment of youth, for years now we have had the whole problem of unemployment, and for years now we have seen a shift in the economy. We have seen structural changes in the economy and none of these problems is easy. Certainly one does not solve the problem of unemployment by forcing people into training institutions, training them and then sending them out to find a job. If they do not get a job they are then blamed for not doing so. Jobs are just not there.

We have to recognise the fact that there are vast structural changes in the economy and we have to recognise, as I have said time and time again in this House, we are losing labour-intensive

industry to capital-intensive industry. This gives a whole range of new problems and I am glad to hear an indication that some members are aware that these problems are here. Certainly I do not get much indication from what the Minister says, but then that does not surprise me very much.

I am glad that some of the up and coming young members of this House can see the problems and may do something about solving them. I suggest that this House support the motion. Of course I realise that the motion was factual, sensible and reasonable. Therefore it was embarrassing for the Government to have to vote against it so it has moved to delete part of the motion.

I point out that our motion does not demand anything; we are not tub thumping or abusing the Federal Government. We are asking the Federal Government through the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs to reconsider the matter, bearing in mind the great distress that has been caused to a vast array of people of all political persuasions in the community who have done so much work through CYSS. It is not just the Labor Party which is expressing concern; as Mr Wells has demonstrated the Labor Party has not been very excited about this as a scheme that solves the problems. We recognise the scheme as one that has been established by dedicated community people—it has become a scheme of the people, not just a Government scheme.

The Government has enabled it to become a scheme of the people and it is one initiative of the Fraser Government which has worked. It is limited but it has worked because it has been a populist scheme. It has got down to the grass roots. When something develops like this it is a great pity to destroy it until something else has been developed to replace it.

I suggest that members ignore the amendment of the Minister and that this House, as a House, join with the members of the Opposition and make a request to the Federal Government to reconsider its decision. If we do so I think it will redound to the credit of this House, particularly if the Federal Government changes its mind, and to the benefit of the Western Australian community. I am speaking merely for this State. I commend the Hon. Fred McKenzie's motion and I hope the House will vote for it and vote against the Minister's amendment.

THE HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [11.07 p.m.]: I ask members to reject the amendment and I will speak in favour of the motion. In listening to the debate it strikes me that we are living in 1981 and

a whole range of people from both sides of the House do not seem to be able to accept that simple fact. As far as I am concerned there is no scheme available that will solve the problem of unemployment. It will grow and grow until we manage to redefine the word "work".

In the United States smarter people than I have said that we are poised for a new industrial era. People have gone even further to say that the work ethic, if it is not dead, is dying. One can marry that to the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations that the world needs a new economic order. It seems to suggest to me that what we are talking about tonight is futile.

I was one of the people who condemned the CYSS scheme when it was introduced. I did not think it would work; I thought it was an exercise in futility. However, I have been surprised and impressed with the work it has done, particularly in respect of some of the examples stated here tonight. First of all it has fulfilled a need in the community and has involved the community in its operations. The fact that it has succeeded on the limited funds available to it has staggered me and so has the fact that it has succeeded in the number of areas in which it has had to work. I do not know all the CYSS schemes operating in this State, but I can comment on the schemes operating around Fremantle. The premises from which they have been forced to operate are indeed very depressing. The fact that the scheme has succeeded has allowed me to reconsider my first condemnation of it, which I think someone else has mentioned here tonight; so I am not window dressing.

There are thousands of young people in this country who, despite the new initiatives of the Federal Government—which I laud—are never going to get jobs; who, no matter how hard they may try under any kind of apprentice scheme will never make the grade; and who need the support of others. One has only to consider the slashing of funds for welfare workers in the community and the great need in the community for these people, even in the very narrow approach of the CYSS scheme, to realise what a tremendous job they are doing.

I cannot understand the Minister moving his amendment. The motion moved by the Hon. F. E. McKenzie is fairly light which simply suggests the Government give some consideration to maintaining the scheme. It amazes me that on one hand, the Premier condemns the Federal Government for some of its financial arrangements with the State of Western Australia and on the other hand, stops short of bringing

some of his condemnation to Parliament by moving a motion such as this so that the Parliament of Western Australia can let the Federal Government, through the Prime Minister, know what we as a Parliament think of many of the disastrous financial initiatives taken by the Commonwealth against Western Australia.

Again, tonight, we have seen a certain amount of duplicity. Neither the Premier, nor any of his Ministers, nor any Government back-bencher has come forward with such a motion; yet we saw the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife moving an amendment to the motion. Really, all the airy-fairy criticism of the Federal Government is a whitewash. In reality, the Government of this State is the running dog of the present Federal Government. That is why Mr Masters moved his amendment, despite the plaintive cries by some members opposite that they would have voted for the motion had Mr Dowding not said certain things. The cold, hard fact is that they are not allowed to.

We are looking down the barrel of a Federal Government which, by its action in withdrawing the miserable funds it has allocated for the CYSS scheme, is pursuing the policy it has pursued since it became the Government; namely, the destruction of two generations of Australians. This carefully calculated policy is aimed, first, at the group of people who have never worked, and, secondly, at those people who have worked for 40 or 50 years and now find it is hard to exist.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: If the Opposition were in favour of continuing the CYSS scheme, why does not the motion say so?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: Had we said that, we knew there would be no earthly chance of anyone on the Government side having the intestinal fortitude to support it. So, we moved a motion which we thought was acceptable to this House, on behalf of the people of Western Australia.

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. K. DAns: Mr McNeill can have it his way.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Are you trying to insult me out of supporting your motion? If so, you will fail.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: That is up to Mr Pratt. I took great notice of what he said, and whether he supports the motion or not is not worth a spit because the numbers simply will not be there.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: Then why did you move the motion?

The Hon. D. K. DAns: We moved the motion because we thought that members opposite might

say, "The motion is not couched in heavy political terms. We will go along with it. We will do something for the people of Western Australia, and request the Federal Government to reconsider its attitude".

The Hon. P. G. Pental: You are making no sense. You are insulting the one person who is going to support you.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: Mr Pental knows what I have just said is true. We are dealing with a Federal Government, of which his Government is part and parcel, which is seeking to destroy two generations of Australians.

The Hon. P. G. Pental: That is nonsense, too. You should finish there.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I will finish when I am ready.

I have heard some very weak arguments tonight as to why members do not intend to support the motion, but intend to support the amendment, and why some people have changed their minds, and none of those arguments has any validity. I am one of those people who does not believe the CYSS scheme will last forever. As I said, I was one of its most vocal critics and I was very surprised it worked as well as it did. However, at its very best or worst, it is a community support scheme. It might only teach young people to make candles, paper flowers, or something else; however, at least it will give those young people a sense of belonging. This is what the Federal Government is taking away from them.

I applaud the initiatives taken by the Federal Government in its endeavours to make jobs available. However, those initiatives do not justify taking away this support scheme from thousands of young people who sought the support of the scheme. Perhaps that is where I made my mistake when I first condemned the scheme; I really did not read what the Federal Government had said—that in fact it was a community youth support scheme.

How can members opposite justify taking this scheme away on the basis that it will be replaced by something else? No member sitting opposite could tell me that all the unemployed youth of our country somehow or other will be assisted by these new schemes.

The Hon. W. R. Withers: Be fair. Nor will CYSS.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I have already explained what CYSS is doing.

As has been stated by Labor Party speakers both State and Federally and by the Federal Opposition spokesman on industrial matters (Mr

Bob Hawke), even we accept that by the year 2001, indications are that unemployment will still be rampant. If the present trends continue, it will be even worse, particularly if we continue to try to solve this complex problem by traditional methods. It is not capable of being solved by traditional methods; no amount of shuffling money from here to there will solve the problem.

There needs to be an entirely new appraisal in the area of apprenticeships and of the training of skilled workers; I would be the first person to accept that proposition. There needs also to be a revamping of our technical education service. Perhaps we could start by changing the name; the word "technical" has always had a connotation of second best.

I can see neither rhyme nor reason in removing a community support system. If it does nothing else, it keeps people off the streets and prevents them from getting into mischief. At least it gives them some hope for the future.

I am well aware that many CYSS organisations have succeeded in providing a service well beyond that sort of thing. I am aware that some have not succeeded as well as others. Of course, that goes for life in general. In some areas, some things are performed better than others.

I cannot accept the fact that Government members will not vote for this motion. I do not think we could ever put a motion before the House that contained anything less obnoxious politically. It simply requests that something be done.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: It should be passed by consensus.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: I take the interjection by my colleague that we thought the motion would have represented a consensus view. However, that is not to be.

This will not be the last time we speak about community support schemes. We will not speak only about community support schemes in relation to youth. We will be speaking about community support schemes for a whole range of people. If ever we want the Australian nation to get going, it will have to be done by the community. That is the very concept that the Federal Government is setting out to destroy in this instance.

The Federal Minister has been badly advised in chopping out the scheme with one wave of his hand. Perhaps I would have been able to accept the proposition that the scheme be phased out gradually if, at the same time, we saw other initiatives starting to take shape. Of course, it will not be that way at all. There is no wand, and

there is no financial wizard in this country, in any of the political parties, who can wave a wand and solve all of our problems overnight.

I was interested to read the news that in America, which is supposed to have all the knowledge about the private enterprise system, the inflation rate is now running at something like 15.2 per cent. If it is 15.2 per cent in America now, it is obvious the inflation rate will rise here. I would not like to see that, of course. I agree that inflation is the great killer. As inflation rises, the number of unemployed will multiply very rapidly because of financial considerations. The number will multiply even more rapidly because of technological advances. We do not look at technological advances and say to ourselves, "Well, we can't stop it". We must make sure that along with technological achievement we have social progress. This is the situation in which we find ourselves; and it will become worse.

This motion asks for a breathing space to allow the community support scheme to remain in operation. At least that would give us a chance to have a look at it.

The Government ought to be condemned for not supporting the motion.

THE HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [11.23 p.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition said that we are in the 1981 period.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: Are you sure of that?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: He said that we should not look back. I inform him that in 1971 the proposals put forward this evening were rejected by the Opposition when it was in government. I can understand the sentiments of the honourable member who moved the motion.

The Hon. D. K. DAns: What proposal did we knock back in 1971?

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: He is a sensible person. All I can say is that our educational system is a failure in the area of technical education. It has failed in the area of counselling students at schools and directing them into the avenues in which they will be gainfully employed. Our counselling has failed dismally.

In 1971 it was decided that we should introduce an interim measure for transitional training of the same type as the proposal we have before us now for the shortening of apprenticeships. In 1964, Professor Bowen's report on apprenticeship in this State was produced. That report was disregarded totally by the Opposition when it was in government.

Mr Olney spoke about apprenticeship. When he speaks about the length of apprenticeship, he

should know that the period of apprenticeship is attributable to the award wage rates that will be gained at the completion of the apprenticeship. The trade union movement is endeavouring always to extend apprenticeships from four years to five years in order to obtain a higher basic wage rate.

At the same time, the system is being abused by many employers. In the early years of apprenticeship, the young apprentice is not particularly productive in the true sense. However, in the later years he becomes almost a fully skilled worker. Some employers abuse the system. They want to see an extension of apprenticeship to gain the benefit of a reduced wage level. Many members in this House would condemn that situation. The Confederation of Western Australian Industry has not accepted that philosophy.

In 1971 an attempt was made to streamline apprenticeship in this State. For week after week I sat on a committee with the Under Secretary for Labour and his assistant, Mr Owen Salmon, who is currently the Secretary of the Hospital Employees' Union. At that time, he was co-opted into the Public Service. Week after week we endeavoured to introduce a shortened course of apprenticeship, along the lines suggested in the Bowen report. It was to be in keeping with the modern trends in technical training. I assure the members of the Opposition that the meetings were held every Friday for three to four hours. The proposal was blocked totally at every move.

At that time in this State we had a shortage of technicians. Representations were made to the Government of the day—the Tonkin Government—to overcome the shortage of tradesmen. The situation was becoming quite serious.

In the Legislative Assembly, questions were directed to Mr Tonkin. He was asked whether the Government was advertising in the United Kingdom for tradesmen to migrate to Australia. His answer to that was, "Yes". He said the Government was advertising in the provincial papers in the United Kingdom for tradesmen to apply to Western Australia House to migrate to this State on a permanent basis.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: That is when we had 2 per cent unemployment.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: There was no advertising in the papers! That was a plan to create a shortage of tradesmen in this State, to the extent that it would result in successful demands for increased wages.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: You are off on another conspiracy theory.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I am talking facts. The member deals in fantasy. The Premier of the State was asked, "Are you advertising in the UK for tradesmen in the building industry? Do you understand there is a shortage of tradesmen?" The answer was, "Yes, we know there is a shortage of tradesmen and, yes, we are advertising in the UK". But what was happening? Nothing. I happened to be in London at the time and I went to Western Australia House to ascertain the results. The Tonkin Government said it was advertising and would continue to advertise. However, officials at Western Australia House said they did not even have the money to advertise. Obviously the lines of communication between those officials and Premier Tonkin were poor.

The Government of the day set about creating a shortage of tradesmen to the extent of even turning its back on technical students in our schools and using them to create a wages push by creating a shortage of tradesmen in the State. The statistics are there for everyone to see.

On one occasion I had the fortunate opportunity to attend the office of the Minister for Labour, Mr Don Taylor, to put a case to him. He was sympathetic with what I had to say and asked that I stay longer. I was with a group of people and we explained to him the surveys we had carried out and how we had found shortages in the engineering field and in the building industry. We had checked with companies to find out their short-term and long-term requirements. Mr Taylor was most receptive of the information we gave him.

Do members know what that Minister said? He said he could do nothing. He said he was under tremendous pressure from the Trades and Labor Council to make certain there was no migration into Western Australia. We explained we had a scheme to bring people from overseas and he said, "Please don't go to the UK, because that is where the unions are going". There was something of a battle going on. Mr Fred Haggars and Mr Ray Clohessy were going to the UK to advertise and put fears into the people. They were saying, "Do not go to Western Australia; there are no jobs there".

When we told Mr Taylor we were not going to the UK he said, "Thank heavens for that". We told him we were going to New Zealand. He was under great pressure from the TLC to create a shortage of tradesmen and to have the Government turn its back on the youth of the

State rather than in any way improve the technical education in Western Australia.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: You are talking absolute, utter, arrant nonsense.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: It is unfortunate for the Hon. Peter Dowding that I was actually on the committee. I was in London at the time. I phoned and arranged for the questions to be put to the Premier of the State at the time. Where is the member able to say I am wrong when I was physically involved in this matter, when I was physically in the Minister's office, and when I physically spent three hours with the Minister because he wanted me to stay?

The Hon. Peter Dowding: God almighty!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I suggest the honourable member cease interjecting, and I ask that the member addressing the Chair relate his comments to the motion.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: In speaking to the amendment I am making the point that we have this turn about, this turncoat arrangement, of the Labor Party which is now saying we must look at the apprenticeship scheme and upgrade it. When I spoke on this matter in 1978 all I got from the Opposition was interjections. I suggested an improvement of the apprenticeship scheme; I suggested it should be upgraded and modernised, but all I got was interjections. Now the Leader of the Opposition is telling us we should modernise our scheme and not have it 10 years behind the times.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: One hundred years.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The Leader of the Opposition said 10 years to start off with. The Labor Party is not interested in the youth of this country. All along the way it has put hurdles in front of apprenticeship training and the ability of apprentices to transfer. When it was suggested that we might have pre-apprenticeship courses where we could take in a young person prior to his being indentured, the Labor Party totally opposed the idea.

When we eventually arranged to introduce the first shortened apprenticeship course it was brought about only by a misunderstanding by two union officials at a conference on a Friday afternoon. After something like eight Friday meetings there was a misunderstanding of a question I put to a secretary of a union. When I asked him to repeat himself he was unable to do so but concurred with the proposal, and so the scheme was started. It was a scheme which the Labor Party would not adopt and it was a scheme which the TLC would not have a bar of. It was not part of the Labor Party's philosophy.

When the first shortened course at the Leederville Technical College had finished we had had a change of Government federally. The Whitlam Government was in power. Do members know who came to address the students at the completion of the course? Do members know who came to congratulate the Federal Government, a Government which had been in office for only one week? It was Mr Adrian Bennett who delivered the final address. It was he who said what a wonderful thing his Government had done for the youth of Western Australia.

Incidentally, that was the first such course ever introduced. It was introduced in this State under great difficulties and with great opposition from the Labor Party and the union movement.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: How about telling me the names of those two officials who made that great *faux pas*.

The Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I have quite a few friends in the union movement, and every time I get to my feet the Leader of the Opposition wants me to name them. I have a good rapport with them and I would hate to see the lines of communication broken.

Apprenticeship training schemes should be relevant to what is required; that is, what is necessary and what should be known, rather than all these fairy-fairy padded courses and the extending of them so that instead of being able to accomplish a course within 12 to 18 months people have to undertake them for three or four years.

Some of the equipment used at the Leederville Technical College is very much out of date. Some of the equipment should be catalogued and stored in the Western Australian Museum. It is not equipment that should be used now in technical education. Some of the lathes are of no use at all.

I am pleased to see a move towards a greater emphasis on apprenticeship training rather than these *ad hoc* schemes. The Hon. Des Dans referred to the inability of the Government to meet changing needs. However, I should like to point out an interesting situation which has occurred on the Worsley project. In that case, apprentices are transferred from one employer to another. Members should be aware that, at the Worsley project today, apprentices are being trained by employers other than the Worsley consortium and at the same time are involved in work releases at the Bunbury Technical College. This is the way it should be. It is totally wrong for the Opposition to criticise the apprenticeship system and say it lacks flexibility.

I am aware CYSS has assisted the young people at Kalamunda. The gentleman who runs the scheme is a welder and he conducts a welding course for the young people. Within six days they are working in the Kewdale area, providing the union does not find out about it. It is a most successful scheme.

I thought the Labor Party would be anxious to support the greater emphasis the Federal Government is placing on apprenticeships. Indeed, the scheme protects the rights of indentured apprentices and, because their details are registered, union representatives are able to contact them.

I hope that, in the near future, the apprenticeship training programme is upgraded to cope with modern technology and that we work to the "must knows" and the "should knows", rather than the possibilities of the "could knows" and "may knows". Let us get our priorities right.

I support the amendment. I appreciate the comments made by the Hon. Fred McKenzie; but we need to change direction and establish some sort of long-term employment scheme for our young people. We should not simply set up Band-aid schemes which will give only very minor assistance and which will never produce the long-term stability needed by the young people of our country.

THE HON. W. M. PIESSE (Lower Central) [11.45 p.m.]: I support the amendment. I have listened with some interest to the verbal tears being shed by members on both sides of the House over the withdrawal of support for CYSS by the Federal Government. Some of the comments made seemed to be somewhat in the form of crocodile tears.

I acknowledge that, in some areas, CYSS has provided an interest for the youth of today. In moving the motion, the Hon. Fred McKenzie stressed that the scheme, "has involved the volunteer work of a range of people in the community, including many private firms, public servants, local government employees, elected councillors from local authorities, parliamentarians and concerned citizens". He said also that, "the scheme has been supported by service clubs and business people who have provided equipment, materials, and assistance".

I make the point that, if it has in fact proved itself to be of great benefit to communities, there is no reason that those communities cannot continue this scheme themselves. Surely this is what has to be looked for in any kind of support scheme in any area of society today. If the scheme will not stand alone after it has been supported

for a sufficient length of time and if it is not found to be sufficiently worth while for the local communities to continue their input, it cannot have been such a good scheme in the first place and there must be a better way to achieve the desired end.

I feel rather hopeful that the better way, as suggested in the amendment, although it may not be the absolute answer, will certainly go a little further towards finding an answer that can stand alone.

If the true value of the scheme was the fact that it proved to be so useful to communities, then they can continue it. However, if the usefulness to the community was simply the means of getting hold of a little bit of money for its area, the whole scheme falls down around its ears, as indeed it must do.

Therefore, with hope springing eternal, I support the amendment.

THE HON. F. E. MCKENZIE (East Metropolitan) [11.48 p.m.]: I oppose the amendment in the hope that members will rethink their positions in respect of the motion.

The member who has just resumed her seat made great play of the assistance which has been given by a number of people in the community and the service clubs, as contained in the motion, and then went on to say that, if so much support is available, there is no reason that it should not continue on a voluntary basis. Probably one or two schemes will survive, but that represents a very small proportion when one considers that, on a statewide basis, there are approximately 30 schemes.

A question was asked today about the rural youth support scheme and I noticed the answer provided the information that seven full-time officers were involved in it.

I cannot find the logic in the argument advanced by a country member such as the Hon. Win Piesse when she said funds ought to be withdrawn from CYSS and the scheme should continue on a voluntary basis. Of course, great assistance has been given by these clubs, but a little input from the Government is required and that is what we are trying to retain.

I agree with the comments made by the Hon. Graham MacKinnon that the motion is quite innocuous. Of course, when the motion was framed, I was hopeful the House would support it, because there is really not a great deal in it. We were giving members opposite the opportunity to show for the first time in a positive way that they disagree with the treatment meted out by the

Federal Government in Canberra and that they are prepared to support us on this issue.

I am not knocking the training scheme. I simply agree with remarks made by other members on this side of the House that we should keep CYSS and introduce the training scheme which the Government believes will be the answer to all the problems of the unemployed. If in fact that proves to be the case, CYSS will phase itself out, anyway.

Not every person will make himself available for the training scheme. We must face the fact that jobs will not be provided for everybody. However, the scheme has worked. The Hon. Tom Knight referred to the re-introduction of national service. The Community Youth Support Scheme is a type of voluntary national service and achieves tangible results within the community.

The motion merely requests the Commonwealth to rethink its position. I agree with the remarks of the Hon. Graham MacKinnon. When I moved the motion I hoped both sides of the House would support it, but I was disappointed when the Minister moved his amendment. It virtually supports the Federal Government's decision—nothing more than that.

We have applied the acid test to Government members. At least one Government member—I am not sure of the exact position the Hon. Tom Knight takes—stated categorically that he disagrees with that which the Federal Government is doing to the people of Western Australia. Many Government members and even the Premier have criticised the Federal Government, but in this House tonight the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife supports the Federal Government in its abandonment of this State.

When the Federal Government introduced the Community Youth Support Scheme in 1976 it believed the scheme to be a palliative measure, as I believed it to be. However, the scheme survived. For the first time we saw efforts, such as those we often see in country areas, to keep the scheme going. People were prepared to put something into it. The Commonwealth Government did not think that would happen; and I was surprised it did, especially in Belmont where the scheme is alive and going well.

I oppose the amendment because it will do nothing but support the Federal Government. If that is the desired effect of members opposite, very well; but they should not go into the public arena and bellyache about the treatment this State receives from the Federal Government. They cannot criticise the Federal Government if

they rise here to support it by way of a motion that would not have a great effect in any case. The Government's support of the Federal Government by way of its amendment negates its protests to Canberra in regard to funding cutbacks. Government members agree that to some extent the Community Youth Support Scheme is working, yet they are not prepared to support my motion.

I hope the amendment is defeated and we have the opportunity to carry my motion.

Amendment put and passed.

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.53 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 8 September.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: ORDINARY

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.54 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Litigation

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [11.55 p.m.]: I have no option but to rise at this time. Whilst I thank the Leader of the House for moving the adjournment—I have work to do during the adjournment—I must raise this matter which relates to a statement he made today in reply to a question referring to the Hon. Mick Gayfer. *Inter alia* the Attorney General said that if it could be established as a fact—he was referring to objection being taken to evidence—that the Hon. Mick Gayfer persistently had criticised the Road Traffic Authority not only within the Parliament, but also outside the Parliament, there would be no reason that his statement outside the Parliament could not be referred to. That is fair enough.

The Attorney General went on to say that he checked the position with the Hon. Mick Gayfer and ascertained that no doubt exists as to the Hon. Mick Gayfer's having been critical of the RTA on a number of occasions outside the Parliament as well as in it. The Attorney General went on to say that in the circumstances he has been advised by the Crown Solicitor that the statement in the newspaper report either in its

original or corrected form could not be said to cause any breach of the privileges of the House.

I am not a lawyer, and therefore appreciate that to some extent I take my life in my hands when discussing these matters. Nevertheless, I believe if the reasons given for the decision are the ones actually used for the decision then many questions have been left unanswered. It seems to me that the decision presupposes that the Hon. Mick Gayfer's criticism was made public. I do not think that is a fact; the situation is not clear by that presupposition.

I suggest that if someone listened to members of Parliament talking in confidence at any hotel or any club he would hear those members attempting to criticise or actually criticising the RTA. I suggest that if the Attorney General checked with us he would find, to paraphrase his own words, that there is no doubt on a number of occasions we have been critical of the Road Traffic Authority. I freely admit I have been critical of the RTA. I think most of us who have driven cars in country areas, particularly during recent months, must own up to criticising the RTA.

If the Crown Solicitor based his opinion to the Attorney General that everything is perfectly all right on the fact that the Hon. Mick Gayfer has been critical of the RTA, then I believe the matter ought to be reconsidered. If other reasons exist for the decision, reasons which have not been stated in the statement the Attorney General was kind enough to make today, I would appreciate the Attorney General's informing me of those reasons. I would appreciate his further investigation and examination of the matter so that if possible he will be able to point out the errors in law I have made in my remarks.

It is difficult for me to argue against the advice of the Crown Solicitor, but if a member of Parliament by virtue of his known criticism of a certain authority is to be cited as giving hearsay evidence outside this place, then we have come to a pretty pass. If the situation is as I have suggested then I submit the matter needs further consideration.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF
(Metropolitan—Leader of the House)
[11.59 p.m.]: I have no wish to prolong either this debate or the unfortunate situation in which the Hon. Mick Gayfer has found himself as a result of the publicity he has received and we have all deplored. The matter is of course of concern to all of us. It is a matter of concern for this House to concede that there may have been a breach of

privilege. In light of that fear as expressed in the question to me, I undertook to have the matter investigated.

The matter has been looked into by the Crown Solicitor who has supplied the advice I have quoted. I believe the advice that the Crown Solicitor has given is correct. I have checked the position with Mr Gayfer who indicated there is no doubt that he has been critical of the Road Traffic Authority outside the Parliament as well as within it. Those circumstances do seem to exclude any conceivable proceedings which this House might be able to bring for breach of privilege against the newspaper, and that really is the point at issue. I am not arguing about the detailed evidence in this particular case. I am merely saying that the question of breach of privilege does appear to have been answered.

In the first place, it has been made clear that Mr Davies did not make those comments; the transcript shows that Mr Davies did not make those comments. Therefore the comments must have been made by whoever reported the matter in the newspaper or by somebody connected with the newspaper; I do not know who. If we were to bring any proceedings by summoning to the Bar of the House the editor of the newspaper, the reporter, or any other person from the newspaper, and go through the privilege procedures of the House, we would undoubtedly be met with the defence that it was a well-known fact that Mr Gayfer had made these comments.

Mr Gayfer would be the first to admit that. We all know that he, as well as many other members—as the honourable Mr MacKinnon has said—have made similar comments. But at this particular time we are concerned only with Mr Gayfer's position and not with the views which may have been expressed by other members about the Road Traffic Authority.

Many people have expressed views about the Road Traffic Authority and about many other subjects from time to time, but we are considering a specific case which I asked the Crown Solicitor to look into on behalf of the House. I will examine the comments the honourable Mr MacKinnon has made and see if there is any new item or any matter which has not been taken into account. If there is, I will most certainly take appropriate action and communicate it to the honourable member.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.02 a.m. (Thursday)

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LIQUOR

Wine: Industry

411. The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

With reference to the wine industry—

(1) What is the area of vineyards—

- (a) not yet bearing;
- (b) bearing; and
- (c) total planted;

for each region of—

- (i) Margaret River;
- (ii) Mt. Barker/Frankland River;
- (iii) Swan Valley; and
- (iv) coastal strip?

(2) How many vineyards in each of the four regions are—

- (a) now in production; and
- (b) being developed?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

(1) (a) to (c) Area of winegrape vineyards (hectares)—

	Not yet bearing	Bearing	Total
Margaret River.....	97	275	372
Mt. Barker/Frankland River ..	49	159	208
Swan Valley (includes Chittering Gingin Bindoon).	51	1 719	2 270
Coastal strip.....	17	118	135

(2) (a) and (b) The number of vineyards growing winegrapes—

	Now in Production	Being Developed (new properties)	Total
Margaret River.....	17	8	25
Mt. Barker/Frankland River ..	10	17	27
Swan Valley.....	235	8	243
Coastal strip.....	11	—	11

HOUSING: RENTAL

Rents: Control

412. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is the Minister aware of statements made on the Channel 7 news service on Monday, 24 August 1981, by spokesmen for real estate interests, that rental for a three bedroomed house was likely to increase by at least \$20 per week between now and Christmas?

(2) As the predicted rental of around \$80 per week will place a heavy burden on middle to low income earners, will the Government introduce legislation which will ensure that rents are controlled?

(3) If not, will it legislate to ensure rents are fairly assessed?

(4) If it will do neither, what does the Government intend to do to ensure increases in rents are not exorbitant and unreasonable?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

(1) to (4) No.

EDUCATION: TEACHERS

Training Colleges

413. The Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

(1) Does the principle of autonomy in colleges of advanced education extend to autonomy in recruitment levels for trainee teachers?

(2) What numbers of graduate teachers from such colleges are yet to be placed in teaching jobs?

(3) Is the Minister aware that colleges are still advertising for potential trainees?

(4) If such colleges have autonomy in recruitment matters while graduates are without teaching posts, does it not point to a need to remove such autonomy insofar as it affects the intake into the colleges?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

(1) No. Intakes into pre-service teacher education courses are determined on the advice of the WA Post-Secondary Education Commission following an annual review of teacher supply and demand.

- (2) This information is not available. New graduates are employed by both Government and private schools and no comprehensive details of the number of teachers who are unsuccessful in obtaining employment in schools are available. It must also be remembered that schools need to recruit additional teachers throughout the course of the year to fill vacancies as they occur, and that the number of new graduates who have not been able to obtain a teaching position at a particular point in time will not necessarily reflect the situation at the end of the year.
- (3) Colleges are advertising places in courses in the 1982 academic year. The majority of students who enter colleges in 1982 will not become available for employment until 1985 or 1986. Intake quotas for 1982 will be determined a little later this year when further details regarding the Education Department's ability to employ additional teachers becomes available. In setting intakes for 1982 due account will be taken of the need to achieve a reasonable balance between supply of and demand for teachers.
- (4) Not applicable.

FUEL AND ENERGY: ELECTRICITY

Charges: Rebates

414. The Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

In respect to rebates for pensioners "using moderate amounts of electricity", I understand any pensioner who holds a pensioner health benefit card qualifies—

- (1) Is this rebate available to War widow pensioners who would be eligible for a pensioner's health benefit card, but whose pension is appropriated from the veterans' affairs account?
- (2) If the answer to (1) is "No", will the Minister give consideration to the inclusion of war widow pensioners for the same rebate as currently enjoyed by holders of pensioner health benefit cards?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) Any pensioner who possesses a pensioner health benefit card (PHB2) is eligible for the pensioner rebate scheme. These cards are issued by both the Department of Social Security and the Department of Veterans' Affairs. A war widow pensioner who has a card issued by the Department of Veterans' Affairs is therefore eligible.
- (2) Not applicable.

SHOPPING CENTRES

Development: Report

415. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) When was the joint Government party Committee formed to investigate shopping centre development?
- (2) What were the reasons behind the formation of such a committee?
- (3) When was its report made available to the Government?
- (4) Will the Minister confirm her answer to part 2(b) of question 315 of 4 August 1981, when asked about the committee and its findings, and I quote—

This information will be made available if and when the Government decides to release the report?

- (5) If it was never intended that the report be made public, what was the reason for the Government publicising the committee's formation?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) 15 September, 1980.
- (2) To investigate shopping centre development and the structure of relevant lease agreements.
- (3) November, 1980.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) The Government has made no decision on the release of the report at this time.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Insurance Trust

416. The Hon. W. M. PIESSE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

Where a person is involved in a motor vehicle accident and subsequently

obtains judgment in a court action brought against the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust—

- (1) Does the claimant receive in full the amount awarded by the court?
- (2) Are all medical, hospital and other expenses deducted first from the amount awarded and the balance paid to the claimant?
- (3) (a) If these costs are deducted, are the amounts net after medical benefit fund refunds; and
(b) if not, who is responsible for the submission of these accounts to the appropriate authority for refunds?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) Although the full amount is always paid out on behalf of the claimant he does not always receive that amount personally.
- (2) There is no hard and fast rule as to whether the amount of outstanding medical expenses and the like is deducted by the trust from an award which is intended to cover those expenses. The most appropriate course of action is dictated by the circumstances of the case.
The trust is also occasionally required to comply with orders for certain deductions from damages awards, such as, for instance, outstanding income tax or the refund of social security payments.
- (3) (a) and (b) Medical benefit funds do not pay benefits in respect of expenses which are the subject of third party insurance cover.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Government: Cost

417. The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister representing the Treasurer:

In respect of motor vehicles owned by the State Government, but excluding MTT buses used by paying passengers, and excluding full-time drivers, will the Minister please advise—

- (a) the number of personnel who are currently employed in the care and maintenance of motor vehicles throughout the State;
- (b) the annual cost of remuneration for those personnel, including superannuation and holiday benefits, plus travelling allowance, etc.; and
- (c) the total rates charged by the Government motor pool when hiring vehicles to a Government instrumentality?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (a) and (b) To mount a project to gather the information requested would be an extremely lengthy and time consuming task for officers throughout all departments and instrumentalities, and a definition of what is meant by "care and maintenance" of vehicles would be necessary.

The Government has recently announced its intention to appoint consultants to carry out a study with a view to ensuring maximum efficiency in all aspects of State Government vehicle operations.

It is anticipated that the type of data sought by the member will be collected and analysed by the consultants and will be included in their report at the conclusion of the study.

- (c) Rates charged for the hire of sedans, utilities, vans and station wagons to departments and instrumentalities are as follows—

Public Works Department—Mechanical and Electrical Branch Pool—

South of 26th Parallel—\$42 week or part thereof.

North of 26th Parallel—24c km. (with a minimum charge of \$12 day).

Government Garage—20c per km.

SHOPPING CENTRE

Development: Opposition

418. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that opposition to the uncontrolled expansion of shopping centre developments has been expressed

by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, the Builders, Owners and Managers Association, the Independent Retailers Association, Western Australian Federated Chambers of Commerce, the Central Perth Ratepayers Association, local authorities, developers, insurance companies and superannuatory bodies?

- (2) Is it the Government's intention to take any action to provide safeguards for established small businesses?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) I am aware that some of the organisations mentioned have expressed such an opinion.
 (2) Not specifically; however, the Government has provided an avenue of assistance through the small business advisory company.

• TRANSPORT: BUS-RAIL
TRANSFER STATION

Armadale

419. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) During the 1980 election campaign, did the Minister distribute a pamphlet which included a promise that the Government would construct a bus/rail interchange terminal at Armadale?
 (2) Would the Minister table the plans for this project, and advise when building will commence?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) It would appear the pamphlet referred to was the *Perth Passenger Transport Facts* pamphlet issued for the Government of Western Australia by the Minister for Transport and was intended to give the public an understanding of the Government's intentions as to public transport and not related to the 1980 election.
 Under the heading "Policy and Patronage" the following statements were made—

Attracting patrons to public transport is no easy matter:

Convenience is crucial.

Total time and trouble must be acceptable.

Journeys involving transfer from car to bus, car to train, bus to train must have a time and trouble-saving advantage.

Closeness of home, work and shops to each end of the journey has a crucial influence.

Transfer stations are proving successful—

For rail services at Midland and others are planned for Armadale, Gosnells and Kelmscott.

For bus services at Innaloo, Morley, Kwinana, Rockingham, Booragoon and Karrinyup.

Bus-to-train transfer is not practical on Fremantle-Perth line because—

Total travel time would be significantly greater than by direct bus.

People cannot be forced to accept a transfer journey.

To attract customers, we must make transport systems serve people, and not try to make people serve systems.

- (2) In the 1981-82 to 1984-85 urban public transport improvement program a bus/rail transfer station is tentatively included for construction at Armadale in 1984-85. The actual construction will depend upon the progress made with the development of the Armadale subregional centre.

TRAFFIC: MOTOR VEHICLES

Government: Cost

420. The Hon. W. R. WITHERS, to the Minister representing the Treasurer:

In respect of the following categories of motor vehicles owned by the State Government—

- (a) sedans;
 (b) utilities;
 (c) 4WD vehicles;
 (d) trucks; and
 (e) buses other than MTT buses used for paying passengers;

will the Treasurer advise—

- (i) the number of vehicles in each category;
- (ii) the number of kilometres run per annum in each category; and
- (iii) the cost per annum of maintaining and caring for each category, including post sale depreciation, but excluding wages or salaries of personnel?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (a) to (c) The details and statistics requested pertaining to vehicle operations within the Government, statewide, are not currently maintained.

To mount a project to gather the information would be an extremely lengthy and time consuming task for officers throughout all departments and instrumentalities.

The Government has recently announced its intention to appoint consultants to carry out a study with a view to ensuring maximum efficiency in all aspects of State Government vehicle operations.

It is anticipated that the type of data sought by the member will be collected and analysed by the consultants and will be included in their report at the conclusion of the study.

SHOPPING CENTRES

MRPA: Approvals

421. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) How many shopping centre proposals were rejected by the MRPA, but were later approved, on appeal, since the inception of the MRPA in 1975?
- (2) How many shopping centre proposals were approved by the MRPA but have not been constructed?
- (3) Is it intended that the MRPA will have control of shopping centres below 9 500 square metres in area?
- (4) How many approvals have been granted by local authorities without reference to the MRPA for shopping developments above 3 000 square metres since 1975?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) Eighteen.
- (2) Ten.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) This information is not available.

RAILWAYS

"Trans-Australia" Service

422. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

With the recent announcement that a sit-up carriage would be attached to the transtrain between Perth and Adelaide—

- (1) Could the Minister advise whether it is possible to travel to points beyond Adelaide in other States in sit-up carriages?
- (2) If so, will the Minister advise the cost of a single adult fare for sit-up carriages between—
 - (a) Perth and Melbourne;
 - (b) Perth and Sydney; and
 - (c) Perth and Brisbane?
- (3) Could the Minister also advise the pensioner and children's fares which would apply in respect of the destinations referred to in part (2) above?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) \$113.
(b) \$155 via Melbourne.
(c) \$197 via Melbourne.
- (3) \$72.50.
\$93.50 via Melbourne.
\$114.50 via Melbourne.

HOUSING

Denham, Carnarvon, and Exmouth

423. The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many State Housing Commission houses were built in the 1980-81 financial year in—
 - (a) Denham;
 - (b) Carnarvon; and
 - (c) Exmouth?

- (2) How many of these houses were for Aborigines?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) and (2)

	Commonwealth/State Rental	Aboriginal Grant	Total
(a)	Nil	3	3
(b)	35	14	49
(c)	Nil	Nil	Nil

SHOPPING CENTRES

Foreign Investments

424. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Will the Minister advise which shopping centre complexes are either partially or wholly owned by overseas interests?
- (2) Can she confirm that the Karrinyup shopping centre is directly or indirectly owned by Arab interests?
- (3) Is it the Government's intention to introduce legislation to control foreign investment in shopping centre developments?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) This information is not known.
- (2) I understand Karrinyup shopping centre is owned by St Martins Properties (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. I do not know the nationality of the shareholders of that company.
- (3) Not at this stage.

RAILWAYS

Excursion Services

425. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that *The Sunday Times* and *Watsonia* recently ran a chartered 16 coach train from Perth to Toodyay, that the 900 seats were fully booked, that a further 1 500 people were turned away, and that the profit was donated to charity?
- (2) In view of the obvious public demand, why doesn't Westrail show some initiative and run regular weekend excursion trains?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The coaches used on *The Sunday Times/Watsonia* hired special train were the maximum number available on the day.
- (2) It is more profitable for Westrail to hire its rolling stock than to operate excursion trains in its own right. Demand for excursion trains is mostly for weekends and since 1 January Westrail has hired 31 special trains to various organisations.

ROAD

Mt. Magnet-Yalgoo

426. The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

What is the anticipated date for completion of the sealing of the Yalgoo-Mt. Magnet road?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

Work is currently in progress to construct and primerseal the remaining section of the Geraldton to Mt. Magnet Road. Blacktop to Mt. Magnet is scheduled for completion by early May 1982.

Final seal coat on the last approximately 44 km. will be applied during the 1982-83 financial year.

427. *This question was postponed.*

TRAFFIC: ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

Uniform

428. The Hon. P. H. LOCKYER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:

Is it normal practice for RTA patrolmen operating a patrol car to wear leather leggings as part of their uniform?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

No; however officers who normally ride motor cycles, for whom leather leggings are part of their uniform, may be required at short notice to operate patrol cars.

Cases may occur where an officer is transferred from motor cycle duties to patrol cars. In these situations the officer continues to wear breeches and leggings until the next clothing issue.

429. *This question was postponed.*

RAILWAY

"Australind" Service

430. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

In answer to question 208 of Wednesday, 15 April 1981, concerning the future of the *Australind* passenger train, the Minister said, "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"—

- (1) Will the Minister now advise of the outcome of the study?
- (2) Has Westrail imposed a minimum maintenance order, or similar order restricting maintenance on the *Australind* rolling stock?
- (3) If so, will the Minister provide details?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The study has not been completed. Final results are not expected before the end of 1981 as Westrail is seeking further information on new rolling stock alternatives.
- (2) and (3) Pending the results of the study further general overhaul of coaches has been suspended but operating maintenance requirements will continue to be undertaken.

RECREATION: FOOTBALL

Anzac Day

431. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister representing the Deputy Premier:

- (1) With reference to question 348 of Tuesday, 18 August 1981, would the Deputy Premier give a further

breakdown of the details of expenditure on each of the individual games played on Anzac Day 1981, and in particular the amounts for—

- (a) club match expenses;
- (b) ground rent;
- (c) gate staff;
- (d) ground development levies;
- (e) umpires' fees; and
- (f) administration?

- (2) Will the Deputy Premier provide the official attendances at those games?
- (3) Has the method of ground rentals and ground development levies altered since the Anzac Day games?
- (4) If "Yes", in what way?
- (5) Will the Deputy Premier investigate the likelihood of the WAFL making a donation to the Anzac Day Trust to offset the fact that it received no benefit from the WAFL for games played on that day?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) and (2) A breakdown of the figures referred to is not a requirement. A copy of the return submitted by the West Australian Football League (Inc.) is tabled.
- (3) and (4) Not known.
- (5) It is not considered that such an approach is the function of the Deputy Premier.
The paper was tabled (see paper No. 332.)

LAND: CLEARING

Wooroloo Brook

432. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Has any Government department or instrumentality been responsible for clearing of land in the Wooroloo Brook catchment area in the last five years?
- (2) If so—
 - (a) which ones;
 - (b) when did it take place; and
 - (c) what was the size of the area/s involved?

- (3) Are there any current plans by any Government department or instrumentality to clear land in this area?
- (4) If so, what are those plans?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) to (4) Lands Department has not been involved in any clearing operations, over the past five years in the area to which the member refers.

I am not in a position to indicate whether any other Government department or instrumentality has been engaged in clearing operations during the period referred to.

433 and 434. *These questions were postponed.*

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT

Membership

435. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many members of the Rural Youth Movement are there in Western Australia?
- (2) Would the Minister please detail grants made to the organisation in 1979-80 and 1980-81?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The total financial membership of the WA Federation of Rural Youth in 1979 was 876, and in 1980, 883. Membership figures for 1981 are not yet complete, but are in excess of those for the same time last year.
- (2) The grant to the Rural Youth Movement Council from No. 4 Trust Governmental Fund in 1979-80 was \$210 650, and in 1980-81 was \$227 000. No funds are granted directly to the WA Federation of Rural Youth.

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT

Public Servants

436. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) How many civil servants are involved in the administration of the Rural Youth Movement?
- (2) What is their budget?

- (3) Are any moneys allocated to the movement except from the State Consolidated Revenue Fund?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) The Rural Youth Movement Council employs a staff of two seconded civil servants, seven full-time and one part-time ministerial appointments. Three of these staff are partly involved in assisting the WA Federation of Rural Youth with its administration. Five of these staff are involved in extension, adult education work with rural youth clubs and other bodies in rural areas in the south-west of the state. The Rural Youth Movement Council is only partly involved in servicing the WA Federation of Rural Youth. An increasing amount of its time is spent with other groups in rural areas.
- (2) A copy of accounts for the year 1980-81 is appended for the member's information.
- (3) The only moneys allocated to the council other than those detailed above are those in the Davis Legacy, the balance of which stands at the moment at \$14 176.71. There are some restrictions on the spending of this money, the most important of which is that it must be spent on capital equipment.

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT COUNCIL ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30/6/81.

1980	
Balances 1/7/80	
Trust Account Treasury	4 226.73
Building Society Account	13 040.78
Cash Advances	65.00
	17 332.51
Receipts	
Grant from C.R.F.	227 000.00
Special Funds income	
Davis Legacy	
Secured Deposit—4 381	63.89
Savings a/c—30 940.2	398.35
NFT deposit—43 179	598.20
(Shares)	—
	1 060.44
	245 392.95
Expenditure	
101 Salaries	149 565.93
201 Payroll Tax	5 660.20
202 Travel—Interstate	738.12
205 Travel—Other	8 596.66
250 Staff—Training	170.00
260 Staff—Insurance	497.78
270 Superannuation	9 806.92
290 Advertising Staff Vacancies	236.81
301 Telephones	8 608.51
310 Postage	1 054.83
315 Telex—Telegrams	22.55
401 Office Accommodation	5 200.00
409 Hire Equipment & Facilities	474.80
411 Cleaning	1 294.00
445 M/Vehicle Licences	689.57
481 Insurances	1 237.03
483 Printing	3 796.21
501 Stationery	867.32
510 Library Acquisitions	709.29
521 Sundries	353.13
541 M/Vehicle Petrol & Oil	6 912.22
543 Power & Electricity	887.67
601 Maintenance Contracts	968.50

1 896.93	650 Repairs & Parts	2 789.71
16 961.41	712 M/Vehicle Purchases	—
484.45	715 Purchase—Extension consumables	582.91
2 586.19	716 Purchase—Office Equipment	471.90
—	735 Furniture & Fittings	—
206 439.99		212 192.57
NIL	Special Funds Expenditure	NIL
206 439.99	Davis Legacy	212 192.57
17 332.51		33 200.38
62.05	Add Accrued Interest	75.49
17 394.56		33 275.87
	Balances 30/6/81	
13 102.83	Davis Legacy	14 176.71
4 226.73	Rural Youth Movement Council	19 034.16
65.00	Cash Advances	65.00
17 394.56		33 275.87
	These funds held in	
4 226.73	Treasury Trust a/c	19 034.16
13 102.83	Building Society	14 176.71
65.00	Cash Advances	65.00
17 394.56		33 275.87

At June 30 1981, amounts totalling 105.20 (993.38) were due to the Rural Youth Movement Council and 13 245.10 (3 923.46) was owing to creditors.

437. *This question was postponed.*

MINING ACT 1978

Proclamation

438. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister guarantee that the Mining Act 1978 will be proclaimed this year?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

This will depend on how quickly the amending legislation, which is to be introduced into Parliament shortly, is passed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

LAND: CLEARING

Wooroloo Brook

152. The Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Lands:

My question relates to question 432, which the Minister just answered. As Minister for Lands, why would he not know whether any Crown land has been involved in clearing operations?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The Minister for Lands is responsible for vacant Crown land. Other Crown

lands are held by the Public Works Department and other instrumentalities. The Minister for Lands does not hold all land for all Government departments.

STOCK: SHEEPSKINS

Treatment

153. The Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the sheep dip "Clout" and its advertising literature which says the product will "revolutionise the life of the Australian grazier"?
- (2) Is the Minister also aware of a CSIRO research document dated July 1981 relating to the side effects of "Clout"?
- (3) Does the summary of that document say that the product "can cause damage to some skins" and that "the effect is variable but significant and is of great concern to the Australian sheep skin industry"?
- (4) In view of the comments in the research document will the Minister take steps to have the product withdrawn from the Western Australian market?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

I thank the member for notice of his question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) Yes.
- (4) As the product is very effective in controlling lice and as only a proportion of treated sheep are sent for slaughter and only a proportion of the woolskins are affected it has been decided not to have the product withdrawn from the market at this stage. Further action is dependent upon results of investigations by the Department of Agriculture in collaboration with CSIRO, and by the company concerned.

RECREATION: FOOTBALL

Anzac Day

154. The Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

I refer the Minister to his answer to question 431 today. If it is not considered that such an approach is the

function of the Deputy Premier, who is responsible for the administration of the Anzac Day Act?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

The answer to the question was submitted on behalf of the Deputy Premier so, quite obviously, he is the appropriate Minister. I suggest if the member has any further questions on the matter that he place them on notice and I will obtain the information for him.

PRISONS: IMPRISONMENT

Life

155. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Attorney General:

- (1) As a result of a case which has received some publicity, has the Attorney General recently directed his attention to the adequacy of the legal provision applying to the imprisonment of young people who have been sentenced to life imprisonment?
- (2) Would he agree there appears to be nothing in the law which justifies a young person sentenced to life imprisonment being held otherwise than in an adult prison?
- (3) Has he given attention to what appears to be the fact that a person who has been sentenced to death and has received the Royal mercy could be subject to the benefit of section 679 of the Criminal Code, whereas a person sentenced to life imprisonment could not?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) to (3) I am aware of the case to which the member refers. I have seen the reports in the Press; however, I have not seen any reports other than in the Press. At this stage, I would not be prepared to comment on the matters he has raised until I have seen exactly what transpired by viewing the transcript of the case.

On the general question, I am aware of the differences between the situations. There are anomalies in this area and it is a matter to which I shall give attention.

FISHERIES

Scallops

156. The Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) In view of the increasing rate of trawling for scallops does the Minister think the imposition of conservation measures is necessary to preserve the resource?
- (2) If this is the case, what measures are likely to be proposed?

The Hon. G. E. MASTERS replied:

- (1) Rationalisation of the use of the scallop resource is a matter currently under consideration.
- (2) A minimum size limit has been suggested for scallops and publicity is shortly to be given to this proposal with a view to obtaining comment from industry.

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT

Public Servants

157. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Lands:

This question is supplementary to an answer the Minister gave this afternoon in relation to the Rural Youth Movement.

Since the Minister's answer revealed the Government spends the equivalent of \$255 a year on every member of the Rural Youth Movement and as some nine full-time public servants are engaged in administering the Rural Youth Council, I ask the Minister

whether that is an example of a Government working under financial stringencies or an example of a profligate waste?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

That is an opinion which has been requested. An answer is not necessary but the position will be revealed in the next Budget.

The Hon. Peter Dowding: What is yours?

PARLIAMENTARY COUNSEL

Qualifications

158. The Hon. H. W. OLNEY, to the Attorney General:

- (1) From what quarter does the Crown Law Department recruit its parliamentary drafting counsel?
- (2) Is any special training available to qualify as Parliamentary Counsel?
- (3) Are the Parliamentary Counsel employed by the Crown Law Department all qualified legal practitioners?

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF replied:

- (1) to (3) In recent years the Crown Law Department has had a great deal of difficulty in keeping the number of Parliamentary Counsel up to the establishment. In fact, we have had to increase the establishment, because the previous establishment was not adequate to cope with the requirements of the Acts and the regulations which also come under the scrutiny of the Parliamentary Counsel. As a result of these difficulties, advertisements have been placed in publications in other parts of the world and I am pleased to say that the recruits who have been obtained for the Parliamentary Counsel's office are of the highest possible calibre.

As to the quarters from which they have been recruited, they have been recruited literally from all round the world. We have Parliamentary Counsel who have served in the Imperial Colonial Service as legal practitioners in various categories. Some have had previous experience as Parliamentary Counsel

whilst others have had experience in other capacities of a rather senior standing, such as acting as Solicitors General or in some similar positions. They have come from Hong Kong, Africa, and, I believe, the Pacific Islands. Basically they are all highly trained legal practitioners and most of those who come from overseas have English qualifications, although we have not stipulated they should have them. I firmly believe they are all legally qualified.

As to the training, I do not think there is a school for Parliamentary Counsel in Australia. At one stage the Commonwealth Government proposed setting up such a school, but that fell by the wayside some years ago. We have endeavoured to provide some training within our own capacities and I am more than satisfied that today we have Parliamentary Counsel in this State of a very high calibre.

LAND: RELEASE

Roe

159. The Hon. J. M. BROWN, to the Minister for Lands:

My question refers to question 404 in which I asked the Minister the names of the members of a land board. The Minister replied that Mr H. E. Coffey was the chairman of a board and there were two other members. It is customary that one member should be a local authority representative and in this case the position was filled by Mr B. T. Walsh, the President of the Shire of Lake Grace. The other member was Mr S. Porritt, officer in charge, Department of Agriculture, Lake Grace.

Does the Minister recall whether a representative of the Department of Agriculture has been a member of other land boards and is this the usual practice?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

Mr Coffey was the chairman and, under the Act and the regulations, it is required that there be a statutorily declared chairman. The appointment is a permanent one, although it is not necessarily the same for each board.

In the past it has not been the practice always to have an officer of the Department of Agriculture on the board, but it was requested by the Minister for Agriculture. He felt there was a need for this sort of input and valuable aid could be provided by the local officer of the Department of Agriculture in the case of the allocation of rural land which is done quite regularly.

LAND: BOARDS

Membership

160. The Hon. J. M. BROWN, to the Minister for Lands:

In view of the fact that the officer in charge of the Department of Agriculture can sit on a land board by virtue of his office, it can be seen he is then in a position to make representations for farmers who may be applicants to the board. I ask the Minister whether he considers that to be a good practice?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

It probably would be. I am not aware that he has or is making representations. We all face these situations at times and, as members of Parliament, we are put in the position of having to decide whether to give references to people coming before a Government board. At times, one feels it is one's responsibility

to provide a character reference and that is understandable. It is expected of a member of Parliament.

In this case, I do not know whether officers of the Department of Agriculture would necessarily make submissions on behalf of individuals. It is not usually done.

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT

Funds

161. The Hon. PETER DOWDING, to the Minister for Lands:

This question is supplementary to the question I asked to which the Minister answered that there would be some material in the Budget concerning the expenditure of the Rural Youth Movement.

Will the Minister say that the apparent excessive expenditure on this organisation in terms of money and manpower will be reduced in the Budget or will it continue?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

The member knows very well that I did not make that remark. I indicated he asked for an opinion and I said the position would be revealed in the Budget. It was obvious from the member's question that he was referring to the coming Budget.

