

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, 18 September 1985

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

## SPORT AND RECREATION

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

Hon. N. F. Moore presented a petition from 12 residents of Western Australia who were concerned about Government funding of a square-rigged sailing ship.

(See paper No. 163.)

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL: STANDING COMMITTEES

### *Select Committee: Report*

**HON. V. J. FERRY** (South-West) [4.33 p.m.]: I have the honour to present the final report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into a committee system for the Legislative Council.

The Select Committee was first appointed under an order made on 23 August 1983. Subsequently an interim report was made to this House on 3 April 1984 and today, 18 September 1985, I present the final report. It is appropriate that the terms of reference of the Select Committee be noted, and I quote as follows—

Pursuant to an order of the House made on August 23 1983, a committee was appointed "...to inquire into and report on:

- (a) what committees of this House additional to those already in existence might be appointed with a view to the more efficient, proper and orderly passage of the business of the House including the support of its review and investigatory function;
- (b) the constitution, manner and form of operation of any such committees;
- (c) such other matters as may be appropriate including proposed rules relating or incidental to the appointment and management of any such committees, ..."

Considerable research and investigation has been undertaken by the members of the Select Committee—Hon. J. M. Brown, who was co-

chairman with me, Hon. I. G. Pratt and Hon. Mark Nevill—and I want to record their dedication and earnest endeavours in what was a monumental task.

It is appropriate that I also record the thanks of my colleagues and my own thanks for the very considerable work and assistance given to the Select Committee by the Clerk of the Council, Mr L. B. Marquet, the Clerk Assistant, Mr L. A. Hoft, the Second Clerk Assistant, Mr I. L. Allnut, and other members of staff from time to time. The nature of our work required technical advice and we were grateful for the prompt and efficient attention given by these officers.

It is not for me to elaborate on the contents of the report at this time; however, I commend the document to all honourable members for their study. I believe the recommendations and other information contained in the report will serve as an informed and sound base from which the role of the Legislative Council may be better understood, and indeed be more effective in its role as a House of Review. I add that the Select Committee was a bipartisan group comprising two Liberal and two Labor members.

I stress to honourable members that the report does not bind the House or its members to the suggestions and recommendations made. This House, under its Constitution, is master of its own deliberations, and unless the House otherwise orders, certain things or procedures may happen. The House will always exercise its own will in these matters.

I move, without notice—

That the report do lie upon the Table and be printed.

Question put and passed.

(See paper No. 164.)

## SESSIONAL ORDERS

### *Standing Orders Committee: Report*

**HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH** (South) [4.37 p.m.]: I am directed to report that pursuant to an order of the House, the Standing Orders Committee has carefully considered the operation and the effects of the sessional orders governing questions, petitions, business after 11.00 p.m., and motions for disallowance.

I move, without notice—

That the report do lie upon the Table and be printed.

Question put and passed.

(See paper No. 165.)

## BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Amendment Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Employment and Training), and read a first time.
2. Liquor Licensing (Moratorium) Amendment Bill.  
Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Minister for Racing and Gaming), and read a first time.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TWELFTH DAY

### *Motion*

Debate resumed from 17 September.

**HON. JOHN WILLIAMS** (Metropolitan) [4.40 p.m.]: I rise to support the motion before the House. At the outset I can only back what every colleague in this House has said about the Governor and his wife. They have been a remarkably refreshing choice for that position. They are wonderful company, and certainly Mrs Reid has endeared herself no end to the ladies in this community by her enthusiasm for her task and her interest in whatever is going on. We have been privileged on many occasions to be at official functions with her and she really is a delight. The Governor of course is no stranger to parliamentary proceedings. I suppose every Sergeant-at-Arms thinks he has a Governor's commission in the mace, but if they all turn out as well as His Excellency they will have no reason for regret.

Mine is not the sort of electorate with which one can do a geographical tour combined with everything else, as Hon. Tom Knight does. He started the craze in this House of touring the electorate in a speech and picking out different aspects. It is a good thing; it illustrates to the community a member represents that they are well represented and that people are aware of their problems. However, when one reaches the stage of having 90 000 people in an electorate the problems are somewhat more difficult to identify. They are there, and in abundance.

One of the things I have always tried to do since coming to this House is to ensure that at no time would I knowingly or falsely mislead the House. Unfortunately it has been brought to my attention that I did that in a question I put on notice a fortnight ago. I did mislead the House in that question, albeit unwittingly. I posed a question about the Mickelbergs, and in it I referred to a Mr Peter Wilsmore as a

convicted felon. That was a misleading statement and I apologise to the House for it. Mr Wilsmore was not a convicted felon; he was an insane killer. I would like the record put straight that at the time Mr Wilsmore was before the court he had killed someone but was insane and therefore he was not convicted. There is a difference.

I know that Mr Wilsmore, who is now the secretary and editor of *Gaul News* will be informed of my remarks this afternoon because he has taken the trouble to write to me. It is on this very point of insanity and criminal activity that some of my remarks will be addressed.

It is an astonishing thing that Mr Wilsmore recovered his sanity after a short period within the confines of one of Her Majesty's institutions. It is quite surprising that having recovered his sanity he then introduced a case virtually suing the State on a constitutional matter. He had a right to do that, but in so doing it involved bringing ultimately the seven judges of the High Court of Australia from Canberra to Perth to listen to the case. They did so, and delivered their judgment and found against Mr Wilsmore. My point is that that did not cost Mr Wilsmore one red cent. It all came from legal aid. There are hundreds of people out there crying out for help and the Government cannot afford to make more money available when a huge lump sum like that goes out on a constitutional matter. I make no criticism of the Government in saying that. There are people who can no longer be helped because the money is not there in the legal aid kitty.

I have spoken of this matter before and no doubt I will speak about it again. Something must be done; some Government has to grasp the nettle in relation to cases where insanity is involved. If a person is insane he needs treatment, and people who treat insane persons do not want to be part of the prison system. Yet those people must be confined for the safety of the general public, therefore one cannot release them to a normal hospital. There is a strict detention clause and people working in hospitals do not like treating patients under those circumstances.

To use a current colloquialism, it is a catch-22 situation. It goes far deeper than that. There exist in the UK system of justice—and it is not perfect—other places for those who have committed offences and have been found by a jury to be insane. That does not mean to say that insanity *per se* means writing off a person as it used to do 30 or 40 years ago and incarcerating him forever behind some high security wall

with no chance of rehabilitation. A person who is insane is as badly off as a person with a broken back or leg, or a person who suffers from some form of disease. Such people have the human right to be treated, and if medical science continues to develop they can be treated.

If these people take action in society to kill, maim, disfigure, disrupt, and destroy, we as legislators must grasp the nettle and say that a certain procedure must be followed once the matters are proved and that person must be taken to where he can receive the best treatment at the time. It is a vexed question and one which the judiciary and legal circles grapple with daily.

Proving insanity in a case is a very difficult and complex procedure. I believe the first procedure was laid down by a UK judge, Mr Justice M' Naghten and it became known as the M' Naghten rules. The rules stayed within the judicial system for years and have only recently been revised. They were a good yardstick by which people could judge other people's insanity and whether they were guilty or insane at the time of committing an offence. I appeal to this Government to look at this problem. Perhaps the Attorney General will tell us at a convenient time that indeed this will be among the reforms now being promised within the legal world.

I commend the Government. I am not one of those mealy-mouthed people who say that because I am a Liberal everything this Government does is wrong. That is not the case, and nobody in this House can ever accuse me of that.

Not that I have ever been that way inclined. However, I do say that the Government is promising reform. We do know, although we are not allowed to talk about it, that in another place at this very moment a piece of legislative reform regarding the judicial system is ready to come to this Chamber. That is all I can say about it because Standing Orders prevent me from saying more. That is one welcome piece of news, if the Bill is in the right form.

Generally speaking, however, if one moves around this city and the metropolitan area and tries to put one's finger on what is worrying people—apart from the things over which we have no control, such as taxes, defence, foreign affairs, and South Africa, all of which do not concern us other than as individuals in this

place—one finds that one of the greatest causes of concern is the issue of offences committed against the person and property.

It is a terrible state of affairs that we have come to when the older generation no longer feel comfortable. No longer can they stroll around the city as they remember it. Naturally, the increase in population has contributed to this state of affairs, but there is, and always has been in areas where there is unemployment to any degree, a marked rise in the incidence of crime. People steal and plunder, and adopt various other methods of crime. Last night we heard Hon. Peter Wells going on at great length about the neighbourhood watch, but all the neighbourhood watch in the world and all the increased police forces in the world will do nothing unless we start educating our children for living, as I have said in this House before.

Too many parents today have abdicated their responsibility to their children and have put all that responsibility on the educational system. They themselves were not taught properly and therefore they are unable to pass on to their children the wisdom that sometimes comes with parenthood. They are floundering, and the children are left to an educational system which, in part, itself requires attention.

An extraordinary number of people tell me that they have no control over their children. An astonishing number of children appear to me to be without parents, and these children wander the streets of this city at night. They look only about 10 or 11 years of age, and roam around at one, two or three o'clock in the morning. They have nowhere to go. One boy I spoke to, in company with some other people, was told by his father at the age of 13 that unless he could contribute something to the home he was no longer welcome and he could get out; and that was reinforced physically. The boy did get out, and today he is working for a cause which is truly remarkable, looking after other displaced people who are on the streets.

I recall that in 1972 in this House—and I am sorry that Hon. Lyla Elliott is absent on other duties this afternoon—we talked about, and presented a report on, the drug problem in Perth. We were laughed out of the place. We were told it was never going to happen in pretty Perth. Hon. Lyla Elliott would have confirmed this. But let me say this: It has happened in pretty Perth, and nothing has altered since that report was published—nothing at all. The report said then, and has since been backed up in 1985, that there is a huge drug problem in Perth right now. The reason for this huge drug

problem is that, despite all the romantic stories and mystery and what-have-you attributed to our great north-west and our undefended coast, 90 per cent of the drugs coming into Australia via Western Australia come via Perth Airport or the Port of Fremantle.

Other forces can take care of that, but those other forces must be backed up by a Police Force, properly equipped, using the same sophisticated methods that are used to get the drugs in here in the first place. I can well remember when the just retired Deputy Commissioner of Police, Des Ayres, was a sergeant in the drug squad. He pleaded with me once, quietly and nicely, to use some form of influence in Parliament to enable the four-man drug squad to concentrate on drug detection and to have them excused from doing two night shifts to keep up with their standard of police promotion. In 1971 or 1972 there was a total of four people in the drug squad in Perth. Then somebody had the brilliant idea of adding a policewoman to that squad, and then it became an off-and-running proposition.

While I am discussing the Police Force, I have yet another serious request to make. The request is very simple. The Police Force, whether in this State or in any other State of Australia, is not respected by the general public. It is tolerated but not respected, and it is not respected because from time to time someone in the Police Force does something wrong. I am not talking about New South Wales; that is an entirely different kettle of fish. It would appear that 40 per cent of the Police Force in New South Wales is wrong, if we are to believe the media. I do not necessarily believe the media, but they are wrong even so.

One searches for the reason that the Police Force is not respected although it does a good job, particularly in this State. It is a difficult job and the police do it to the best of their ability. Unfortunately, however, over the years the criminal element within the community, because of we legislators, has been enlarged. Everyone in this Chamber today, and everyone outside this place who uses a motor vehicle, is a potential criminal. Let there be no shillyshallying about that. The method of detecting people who drive their cars in an unsafe way due to drink or drugs or any other deleterious matter is well known in this House. We have heard how one member in this House had to go through the due process of law, and I do not think he is extremely well disposed towards the Police Force any more. But when one multiplies his experience a few thousand

times—because it happens every day—one finds the psychological reason for people not liking the police. There is too much contact between them, and thus conflict, over driving offences. Somehow or other we should have taken steps to remove the criminal aspect from these offences.

#### [Questions taken.]

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Approximately 45 minutes have elapsed since last I spoke before questions were taken.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am sure you are much better informed now.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: I consider that the experimental business of questions without notice, which has been inflicted upon this House because of members' listening far too much to what goes on in the Federal Parliament, is a little disarming. The interruption of members' speeches is one of the weaknesses of this experiment. For instance, Hon. Graham MacKinnon was inconvenienced twice during his speech because of the procedures of this House.

A member: He did it well.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: He is an accomplished speaker.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I was interrupted last night by the tea suspension.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Not all of us are as accomplished as my colleague in re-addressing ourselves to a particular point of view. If I remember correctly, the view I was addressing concerned a psychological conflict within the community.

The community is worried about the increasing violence—offences against people and property—and the role of the Police Force. The real trouble stems from the fact that so many of us come into conflict with the police who are carrying out their duties. No matter what the offence, the procedures laid down following a person's detention make one feel like a criminal. For example, once detained a person is searched, photographed and fingerprinted, and put in a safe place until the paper work is completed. I am not aware of policemen abusing the procedures which have been laid down, but the person who has committed the offence is not a happy person when the procedures have been completed and when he has been fined \$200 and has had his licence suspended for three months.

In some way the public must be made aware that there are certain types of offences in which this happens; that is, it occurs in the case of a

victimless crime; for example, driving under the influence of alcohol and where an accident has not occurred. However, the person concerned has been caught for drinking and driving and in such cases we make a mountain out of a molehill and the person is punished to the end of his days. People may ask how that can be. I see the Leader of the House looking at me quizzically. I will explain what I mean.

Once a person has been convicted, fingerprinted, and photographed his offence comes up time and time again during his lifetime. He is often asked to fill out forms—whether it be an application for a promotion in his work or an application for a job—and one of the questions he has to answer is whether he has any convictions.

Hon. Tom Stephens: If you are acquitted your record can be destroyed.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: What happens if a person is not acquitted? A person may fill in an application for a passport 90 years after he commits an offence and he will still have to answer, "Yes" to the question concerning convictions. Insurance companies keep increasing premiums on insurance policies belonging to people who have committed offences. The general public opinion is that once a person has paid his fine he has discharged his debt to society. However, that is not the case.

Every member in this House was, at one stage, a young person.

Hon. Tom Stephens: I am still young.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: Hon. Tom Stephens is young, but let me tell him that one day he may be old. Before one knows it, he is old and before long Hon. Tom Stephens will reach the age group in which Mr MacKinnon and I belong.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Even I am not as old as Mr MacKinnon.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: I am attempting to initiate a procedure for people who commit victimless crimes. I am not talking about a drunken driver who kills a person. I am talking about a driver who is convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol and who has committed no other criminal offence. Perhaps some form of tribunal or assessment panel could be set up whereby a person who has committed two offences, one at the age of 18 and one at the age of 20, could, at the age of 35 years appear before it, having led a blameless life in the meantime. We could then take Hon. Tom Stephens' point and say, "Okay, you have proved that you are not a potential offender or

an alcoholic, you have proved yourself in the community and, as a result, your record will be destroyed."

I think perhaps a whole swag of the population would come back onside. At the moment the only thing the police have going for them is that they enforce the law; but in doing so and doing their job properly they alienate a tremendous number of people. It happens in country towns that police may stop motorists for traffic offences one day and the next night may ask those same people to help them with a house breaking offence. Those people will tell the police where to go and will not help. That is where the system breaks down. There has to be an answer to the problem, but it is too large an issue to canvass at this time in this place.

I wish to canvass another issue, although I am aware that the Attorney General is elsewhere performing official duties. It concerns a 72-year-old—another "vicious criminal"—who along with two of his friends played a game of two-up on Anzac Day, as they have done for many years in the past. The oldest person charged was 78 years of age and the youngest was almost 60 years of age. I read in this evening's newspaper that the men had been convicted and fined \$20, plus \$15 court costs. A situation has occurred previously in which the Attorney General has intervened with a *nolle prosequi*. He could not do the same in this case because it was the wrong type of indictment. However, I ask the Attorney General to show a little humanity in this matter. He is empowered under the law to recommend that these people be given a pardon.

Hon. Graham Edwards: I second that.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: These men did not commit an offence for personal gain. Over the years their money had been given to charity. Let us as legislators try to convince the Attorney General that as an act of charity—and recognising the fact that the law had to take its course—he should issue a pardon. It would be one of the most humane things ever to have been done.

I appeal to the Attorney General on the ground that these men have paid their price and been convicted. The law has taken its course; but now at their advanced ages, Reg Meadmore and the other men have convictions recorded against them. It means something to these men to have this stain on their characters. I ask the Attorney General to pardon these men and wipe out the convictions with one stroke of the legislative pen.

Hon. Robert Hetherington: It is the Executive pen.

Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS: It is the Executive pen which grants the pardon on the basis of a recommendation from a person in this Legislature.

I will briefly refer to an item of which I think this House should be apprised. In our sophisticated society today housewives have a hard job coping with their domestic duties and from time to time wonderful products come onto the market to assist with those duties. However, one manufacturer tries to improve upon another manufacturer's product and eventually a large variety is available. I wish to speak about a product—I will not name the product because it would be unfair to the company involved—that is guaranteed to leave the shower recess without a stain, after the housewife has squirted it on the walls and rinsed it off with water. A further product is advertised which cleans the oven in some magical way. I am sure members have seen the advertisement where the housewife is on the telephone and while talking gives the oven one squirt with this product, wipes it off, and the oven is left sparkling clean before she has finished her telephone call.

Last week a member of my family was using one of the shower-cleaning products in a shower recess and she finished up in hospital because she inhaled the fumes given off by the product. No adequate warning is printed on the container. There is a warning, but one would need a magnifying glass of 10 diopetre strength to read it. Housewives are busy and they do their work quickly and this type of warning is not sufficient. The same situation occurs with the product that cleans the oven.

We have spoken in this House at length about products which should carry labels giving clear information about the product. Also, it should be remembered that not all people in this State can read English and the warnings, if any, are printed in English. We must adopt some form of code such as the international road traffic code, which people can readily identify. The products to which I have referred should carry a skull and crossbones, suitably adorned, advising people of the dangers of using the product. I can remember, Mr President, your telling me that you were terrified of a particular piece of domestic equipment, a microwave oven, which if not manufactured to a certain standard and properly maintained would inflict terrible injuries on people.

I want to draw attention to this matter and I advise the Leader of the House that I have reported it to the Department of Consumer Affairs, which has taken up the matter very quickly.

Finally, I will speak about this House and its members. I shall miss the companionship of a colleague of mine which has been afforded to me since I came to the House in 1971. I refer to my learned colleague, Hon. Ian Medcalf, with whom I have had the great privilege of sharing a province. He will leave us next May as will Hon. Graham MacKinnon and Hon. Lyla Elliott. There will be more to say about that at an appropriate time and I will perhaps write about it at an appropriate time. These members must feel as I do—and I have only been in this place 14 years, which is a short time—that we are witnessing the passing of an era of procedure in this House.

It is possible that by the next session of Parliament none of the procedures we now follow will be in vogue. I will read with interest the report of the Select Committee on the committee system in this House. My personal feeling is that there should not be Ministers of the Crown in this House. I do not say that because I have not been one or have no hope of being one; it is not a matter of sour grapes. This Chamber has another purpose; it is acting as a House of Review, but unfortunately the system under which we have grown is slightly imperfect. It is great to see members in this House contributing their time and putting work into reviewing the committee system. People outside Parliament have no idea of the work involved. I commend the Select Committee that has just completed its work. Other committees in this House have worked on particular matters and we shall speak of them from time to time. However, it is a sad thing that in some cases we duplicate the work of another place. We could do a far better job with the legislative process if it were allowed to develop sensibly. People outside do not understand the amount of work that goes on when this House is not sitting.

With those few sentiments and thoughts I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

*Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.*

**HON. I. G. PRATT** (Lower West) [7.30 p.m.]: I would like to associate myself with the congratulation and approval given by so many other members to the Governor on his Speech and his presence amongst us on Opening Day.

Honourable members will be aware that my province stretches south from Kelmscott through the key Assembly electorates of Dale, Mandurah and Murray-Wellington. Members will also be aware that two of those electorates are what are called "marginal" electorates. They were won by quite small majorities at the last election. The electorate of Dale was retained by the Opposition while that of Mandurah was won by the ALP. Obviously, as a sitting member, those two electorates require quite an amount of my attention and I have had the luxury of having a colleague, Hon. Cyril Rushton, as the member for Dale; the electorate of Mandurah I must share with a member of the Government, Mr Read. In recent times I have had occasion to be in Mandurah when the Premier has had words to say about that town and its future. I refer specifically to two occasions. The first was attended by the Premier in his capacity as Leader of the Government of this State.

The last occasion was only a few days ago when the Premier attended a function to raise funds for the Police and Citizens' Youth Club. It was a very nice function and most people enjoyed themselves and I am very glad that the money raised is going to such a worthy cause. However, I was disappointed to find that the Premier in his address to that gathering—which was made up of people of all political persuasions in the community—did not make one mention of the Police and Citizens' Youth Club. I found that extremely disappointing because the people who came did so to support the wonderful work done by that organisation. They would have expected to hear the Premier make some comments about the valuable role that that organisation plays in our society, and not to hear a long speech which was mainly about what good guys the members of the Government are, how the community misunderstands them, and what terrible people members of the Opposition are.

Unfortunately, I do not think the people went to that particular function merely to hear the Premier again getting into his role of distorting the Opposition's view of privatisation, which is what happened at that function. During his address the Premier raised the point that people were wondering where the bricks and mortar were, and what had happened to the promises made by the ALP in Mandurah and, no doubt, in other parts of Western Australia. We remember that the ALP was very free in its promises to the people during the lead-up to the last election.

The Premier's message was that the community should be patient and wait; he described a few so-called initiatives that his Government had taken. We were told, for instance, that a piece of land had been purchased for a hospital in Mandurah. It did not take long for one of the locals to stand up and comment on what an unsuitable site had been chosen. In a beautiful area like Mandurah one might have expected the sick to be sited somewhere where they would have an ocean view and pleasant surroundings. However, the site chosen is probably one of the least desirable in the town, but the Premier said that it was all he could provide.

The Premier then went on to tell us that a new courthouse was to be built in Mandurah. Unfortunately, the site selected does not have access for vehicles. The Main Roads Department will not permit it; thus the Government will have to look at something else. The Premier wound up his speech with an assurance that at some time when all the planning was done and all the decisions had been made we would see some action.

The Premier suggested that this might be in the next six to 12 months. However, in the next six to 12 months the next election will be over. We will be back on the same old "promises, promises" line. We will still be without the bricks and mortar. I wonder whether the message from the people of Western Australia is at last reaching the Premier. People are entitled to see their Government performing and to see the bricks and mortar. They are entitled to hear more than empty promises.

The other occasion to which I referred is a meeting which occurred in Mandurah to discuss the "initiatives" of the Government in relation to the problem of algae in the Peel Inlet. Much was said about the prospect of the Dawesville cut. I might mention that, although the Government is now racing around talking about this wonderful idea of the Dawesville cut, the idea is not new. It has been discussed for well over 20 years but it was something that was seized on by the Government when it felt that it needed to try to promote some electoral following in the Mandurah district. It has developed into what I call the "Willy Weetie" syndrome of this Government. I have not looked at a box of Weeties for many years, but I remember, as a child, my mother would make me eat Weeties every morning. I remember that on the back of the box of Weeties there was a picture of Willy Weetie holding a box of Weeties and, on that box of Weeties, there was

another picture of Willy Weetie holding a box of Weeties, and on that box of Weeties there was another picture of Willy Weetie holding a box of Weeties. The picture became smaller and smaller until Willy Weetie and the box of Weeties disappeared into the distance and one could not see them any more. That is what is happening to this Government. It promises so much and then it says, "We will have an inquiry into it" and, after there has been an inquiry, what happens? We find that there must be an inquiry into the inquiry, and an inquiry into the inquiry into the inquiry.

We can easily visualise a picture of the Premier holding a report and an inquiry with his picture on it, holding a report of an inquiry and so on until he disappears into the distance along with the aspirations of the people of Mandurah. The Premier suggested at that particular meeting that, apart from the Dawesville cut, a programme would begin in the "near" future to deepen part of the estuary, the entrance and the stick channels. That sounds like a pretty good idea.

I think everybody would agree with this idea, but again it was not a new initiative. It is an initiative that was discussed at the time of the change of Government. So the Australian Labor Party just picked up on something we were already working on. The implementation of the initiative depends on the input of money from the shire councils involved and from the subdividers who, in the Premier's words, could be expected to gain from that work. No doubt, the Premier was talking about the two canal developments. It was not a very definite promise: "We will do this if somebody gives us the money." The obtaining of money from the two local authorities is not a very easy matter because the estuary where the actual problem exists is within the Shire of Murray. Most of the people who would be assisted by this work and the money spent on the estuary live in the Shire of Mandurah.

The situation is that the Shire of Murray would be required to perhaps spend money on its property to benefit another shire's people, or the Shire of Mandurah would be required to spend money which benefited its people on somebody else's property. It is not at all a simple matter. The total figure including Government funds and the money which it is hoped to get from the shires and the private companies is approximately \$500 000. That sounds a lot of money, but the priorities of this Government are laughable. We have a Government spending \$5 million to gain the brewery

site, a site which was owned by individuals who were prepared to redevelop it at a cost of \$5 million, \$2½ million this year and \$2½ million next year. The Government then says that to do something about the tremendous problem in the Peel Inlet it will spend \$500 000 as long as somebody else dishes in with the cash. What sort of priority does that show for Mandurah from this Government? I suggest it does not show a very high priority at all. I will have more to say about the brewery site later because I wish to dwell on another matter concerning it.

I have mentioned that the Premier spoke about privatisation in one of his speeches, and several Opposition members have mentioned it during the Address-in-Reply debate. Members of the Government have made a number of interjections on this subject, but the simple fact is that the Liberal Party believes that there are areas of Government operation that could be better carried out to the greater benefit of the people who receive the services and to the better benefit of the taxpayers, if they were performed by private individuals.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Is Mr Herzfeld's list correct, Mr Pratt?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I remember in my days as a shire councillor we used to employ private contractors to do the crossovers or the driveways from the shire property to the private residences. An engineer said we should have been doing this ourselves to provide work for our gangs. He said it would save money and would do all sorts of wonderful things. He was a very intelligent man who held two degrees—an engineering degree and a town planning degree. We pay these sorts of people a lot of money to give us this good advice, so we said to our contractor, "I am sorry, no more work for the shire on driveways." For two years we proceeded with the best organisations and with very qualified men to do it ourselves and we found it was costing us about twice as much as it did when a private contractor did the work.

The other thing we found was that the quality of the work did not seem to be any better for the extra money we were spending. That happens in many areas of Government and semi-Government activity. I am not criticising the people involved. It is often just a matter of filling out time for a machine, rather than taking it back to the depot at two o'clock in the afternoon. It might be a matter of supervisors thinking "If we send the gang back now there is nothing for them to do but sit around", so they



stretch the job out a little longer. It is not really laziness; it is just bad and uneconomical use of facilities which are available.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you accept Mr Herzfeld's list on these things?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Mr Dowding will have his chance to make his speech and I will listen to him when he does, but he is not going to make mine.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You must be embarrassed by it.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: This sort of thing happens in so many areas of Government and semi-Government activity. Rubbish collection is another area. The rubbish contractors which many shires are now employing provide a greater volume of rubbish removal. The prices in some cases have decreased, and most certainly they have not increased as all other shire charges have. This has resulted in a better service and it really has not cost any jobs because people still have to do the work. The contractor quotes for the job, and in many cases where this has happened the private contractor has taken over the same staff and so the same people have the same job, but they are providing a better, cheaper, and more efficient service.

We are not suggesting that every Government enterprise will be sold off. The nonsense that Mr Burke trots out about the decisions that are being made in London and elsewhere is a load of rubbish. It is not what we suggested at all. We have said we will look very carefully at some of these things. Our leader has mentioned some of the matters we will investigate. He has not said that we will sell them off. For heaven's sake, what is dangerous in looking at a Government organisation and seeing if it is efficient, or if it could be carried out better by private enterprise? If it cannot be carried out more efficiently and it is a community service which is a response to an inbuilt need, of course it cannot be privatised. It is a Government responsibility and it will be carried on as such.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Haven't you made up your mind yet?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Premier is trying to suggest that the Liberals would sell off those organisations. It is a load of rubbish and he knows it is rubbish. He is misleading the people of this State. It is a pretty sad situation when the man who is charged with the responsibility of being the Premier of this State goes around

deliberately misleading people and deliberately misstating what the Liberal Party has said it will do.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Haven't you made up your mind yet about what you will do?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I do not make any apologies for my support of privatisation. I have given a couple of examples within my experience of cases where it has worked extremely well. I believe that we have a responsibility to the people who pay taxes to ensure that these things work efficiently. We have a responsibility to the people who receive the services to make sure that they are efficient and effective, and we have a responsibility to the citizens of this State to ensure that in those cases where it cannot be done, the Government provides a fair and equitable service. That is a responsibility that the Liberal Party will never run away from.

Another matter I want to mention about Mandurah, before I pass onto some other general topics which include Mandurah and surrounding areas, is the South West Development Authority which now has an office in Mandurah. The services that come with that authority are now available in Mandurah. It seems to be somewhat of a coincidence that since that office has moved, the member for Mandurah in the Legislative Assembly—and I do not criticise him for it; I am making a statement of fact and bringing the matter to the attention of the House—has moved out of the office which the Government furnished for him and which was set up after the last election. I do know at what cost he did so, but I do know the cost of setting up my own office. I had to move office because the old office I was in had to be demolished to make way for a shopping centre. That cost was \$5 000. The cost of setting up some of the offices that I am aware of has amounted to as much as \$20 000 and some offices may have perhaps cost more. It is rather interesting to find that after an office was set up for the member for Mandurah after the last election, when the South West Development Authority actually opened its office in Mandurah, the local MLA moved to an office next door to that authority.

I do not know what is to be done with the original office. I do not know how the amount of money that the Government spent in refurbishing that office was written off. However, I imagine the expenditure in setting up that office next door to the South West Development Authority would have been quite sig-

nificant. I do not criticise John Read. He has been given a good opportunity by the Government. However, I ask why, and I ask for some justification for the money that was spent. It is my understanding that the office was left vacant and that it may still be empty.

I mentioned earlier that I would venture on to some other areas which concerned Mandurah and other parts of my electorate. I wish to mention briefly the rather controversial topic of schools in the Mandurah area. This matter has received great publicity in the local Press recently. The children of the Falcon area attend the Glencoe Primary School. Their parents have expressed the need for a school within the Falcon area. The children have to travel several miles to the Glencoe school and, with younger children attending preprimary school, parents have to travel the distance a couple of times a day. These days our society is geared to two-income families. This travelling to and from school puts considerable pressure on parents and it limits their opportunities to have many of the things that can be afforded by families that are not hindered by this problem. Naturally, they want a school built locally so that their children can walk to school. The Opposition supports this concept. We see it as a reasonable request.

The shadow Minister for Education, Mr Barry MacKinnon, has given a commitment that after the next election, when the Liberals are returned to Government, we will build a pre-primary school in the Falcon area. That will be the forerunner to a school for that area. As the children grow and the need becomes greater other facilities will be built. No problems would be created for the Glencoe school if that were done because that school is a comfortable size and could do without any additional buildings on that site.

Unfortunately, as this is seen to be a popular issue, controversy has been stirred up by many people including the Minister for Education who has said that there is no need for a school to be built at Falcon. Those people have said the new school should be built in East Mandurah. On numbers alone there is a good case for a new school to be built in the East Mandurah area. There is also a good case for rationalising the attendance patterns at most of the schools in Mandurah. However, that in no way lessens the needs of the people of Falcon. I am perfectly happy to stick by the Opposition's commitment to a preprimary school at Falcon.

I am also willing to support plans for a new school in the East Mandurah area when it is required.

Mr Deputy President (Hon. P. H. Lockyer), you and many members know that I have had a long interest in education both as a Teachers Union branch president and as a State vice-president of the Parents and Citizens Association. I understand the problems of both groups and they have my support. I do not think these matters should become too controversial in order for someone to obtain votes.

There is a need also for another high school to be built in Mandurah in the near future. I also support that proposal. Mandurah is a fast-growing community. The school at Mandurah is a beautiful high school and is one of the best in Western Australia. It was privately designed and constructed and many other schools in this State are jealous of its facilities. I understand the jealousy of teachers who work in some of the conditions which exist in older schools and who, when they attend the Mandurah school for professional reasons, feel very envious.

I travel very widely around the schools in my province and I see a fair mixture of the new and the old. One does not have to stray very far from Mandurah to see the old. Pinjarra High School is quite an old school with many problems. It is situated on the highway and that is dangerous for the children. The heavy traffic noise is also a great disruption. We have discussed with the local shire council the possibility of shifting this school in the near future to a better, more spacious, and quieter site. However, that will cost a lot of money and so it can only be done when it can be afforded.

We are not prepared to make silly promises as this Government did before the last election and then have to hold inquiry after inquiry to justify our not carrying out those commitments. When we can afford to build a new high school at Pinjarra, it will be built.

However, a problem of greater concern is the need for the repair of the existing school. Much has been done to try to update it and to make it more livable. When one walks into the area available for parent discussions and parent-teacher interviews, or when one walks into the first aid room, one must feel sorry for the teachers who work under those conditions. A couple of buildings on the site were built many years ago as temporary buildings. They are made of concrete slabs bolted together, as was often the case after the last war. Two classrooms are built of that material. Because they

are temporary classrooms the department will not carry out any maintenance or repair work on them. Teachers and the P & C A tried to patch them up to make them look tidy but these buildings need decent repair and renovation. It is my intention to make sure that they get it. It will not require a great amount of money. All it requires is the knowledge that they are there and that they need maintenance work done on them. Those buildings have been used temporarily for the last 30 or 40 years and it is about time a review was made of their status.

Another school which is suffering through the passing of years is the Waroona Primary School. Again it is on the highway and includes many old buildings. We are looking forward to shifting that school closer to the high school. One wonders what will happen to the old school buildings then because several generations have passed through the old school. Many older people feel very nostalgic towards that school and would be upset if it was bulldozed. When I and some colleagues travelled to Dalwallinu to pay tribute to the late William Gordon Atkinson I saw that my old school at Pithara was to be closed.

I felt quite sad about it. The other day I was quite happy to find that the headmaster's job was an advertised position and so the school will remain open as a local school. I am sure that my feeling about that school will be shared by the people at Waroona when the time comes to close their old school.

Moving out of the Mandurah-Pinjarra area, I turn to the Roleystone High School, which deserves a special mention. It is not in my electorate as it is just across the boundary, but many of the children who attend it live within Dale and the Lower West Province. It is a beautiful school. It was built to a new concept under which children from primary school age attend the high school. It did not abide by the set age range we now do. It is a very pleasant school with nice children, staff, and parents and citizens' association. It is built on a beautiful site and its buildings have a special character. They are high-roofed, corrugated iron structures going back very much to the style of the older schools that we are now walking away from, however it was built with modern architectural concepts and has plenty of light and air and a very attractive appearance.

Extensions are to be built and in order to cut costs the department has decided that it will downgrade the appearance of the high school.

It will not incorporate several of the attractive features of the present building in the additions, so that we will have two types of building. We will have the original concept which everyone appreciates so much, and the additions which are not up to that standard. I think that is a real shame. Parents and staff feel so strongly about it that they would prefer to see a smaller addition done properly and have relocatable rooms on site until the proper building can be afforded.

Such a preference is a rather unusual twist on an old theme. I am sure that many members when travelling around have received complaints about transportables. I am sure that they are asked how soon schools can get rid of relocatable classrooms. Paradoxically, this school would prefer to have relocatable rooms than to have a substandard extension. I suggest that the Minister listen to such opinions and scale down the additions if the money cannot be found to do the job properly. Part of the project should be built properly, relocatables should be brought onto the site, and the rest of the project should be deferred until the next financial year when it can be done to a high standard.

The Forrestdale Primary School in the small community in which I live has instituted a safety house scheme. I commend it on the fact that it has done so. Such schemes have expanded throughout Western Australia over recent years. People are offering their homes as safety houses and are to be commended for doing so as are those who have organised the schemes. But is it not a sad indictment of our society that we have to set up a safety house system to protect little children from being molested on their way home from school? There should be no need for such schemes. I hope that we can do something about this society to make the need for such schemes much less.

I have a particular brickbat to throw at the Department of Lands and Surveys with respect to two issues. The first issue concerns again the small community of Forrestdale. It concerns the site for a corner store, delicatessen, or whatever we call them today—the little store that sells a few lollies, icecream, cold meat, bread, cold drinks and the like. When the planning was done for Forrestdale it was assumed that the community would grow to be much larger than it has and that it would expand around the lake. However, environmental protestation against the expansion around the lake ruled out

further development and the community is about half the size it was expected to be.

A shop site was chosen initially which would have been in the middle of the town. It is a half acre of land which is zoned commercial. It is found now that it is right on the edge of town. The number of people in the town could not support the shop by itself. However, if there was a site near the hall and sports ground adjacent to the road there would be business from passing traffic and people using the hall and the sports ground. That would make the shop a viable proposition. The gentleman who owns that site had discussions with the shire council which suggested to him that it would be appropriate to make a land exchange with the Lands and Surveys Department for a piece of Crown land in the better area.

I stress that the land referred to is zoned commercial and has a commercial valuation. Its value to its owner is that it is commercially zoned land. It is the only land in the town so zoned because the town is so small. The matter was pursued. The council contacted the Lands and Surveys Department about arranging a land swap. It got nowhere. It persisted and was told that the department would consider it on several conditions. First, Mr Salmeri would have to agree to relinquish the zoning which he owns. Secondly, the council would have to be prepared to rezone the Lands and Surveys Department land. Thirdly, Mr Salmeri would have to compete at open auction for the newly zoned land. The man would be a fool to go ahead under those circumstances. He owns the only commercially zoned land, and he was told to give it away and compete with anybody else who wanted to bid against him at auction. Not only that, he was prepared to give away a half acre of prime lakeside land which our departments and environmentalists are always crying out for the Government to get, land adjacent to the waterways, plus pay any reasonable amount of money to get somewhere between one-eighth and one-fifth of an acre of land. But no, his offer was not taken up.

I took the matter up with the department and the Minister and got nowhere. I was told that it could not be done. That in my opinion is not what Government should be all about. If something which is just and equitable needs to be done and is in the interests of local people, the Government should find a way to do it. If there is a regulation which prevents it, the Government should change that regulation. If a law needs to be amended the Government should

so amend it. Otherwise, what is the point of having a need that is just and equitable? One might just as well have a request that is not just and not equitable.

The second issue for which the Lands and Surveys Department has earned a brickbat arises from the extraordinary things that happened to some people by the name of Marshall in Mandurah. It again concerns commercial land. The Marshalls bought land which became zoned commercial. As part of the zoning condition there was a requirement that 12 feet on each boundary of this triangular block be ceded for parking. No money was to be paid for that land. It was just to be taken away from them for parking purposes. The decision was reached later in conjunction with the shire council that it would not be a good idea to develop that land commercially. It was rezoned to residential development.

The town planner then said to the Marshalls that the land given for parking for a commercial proposition would be returned, as the proposition would not proceed; the arrangements would be made. The Marshalls rang up and made some inquiries. The planning department said, "Yes, you can take your land back, it is not needed for parking, but it will cost you \$50 000. You can buy back your land which you had to give for parking, it can be put back on your block which you are not going to use for commercial purposes for \$50 000."

The size of the block of land was such that to build on it the owners needed the land back. They went to the department and to the Minister. Unfortunately they did not speak to me, I was not aware of the problem until it had come to its sorry end. However, they agreed eventually to pay \$35 000 to get back the piece of land which had been taken away from them for a purpose for which it was not now required. They were told those were the rules, nothing could be done about it.

Hon. C. J. Bell: A new form of taxation!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Government is not there to say it will take out these areas, it is there to serve the people. The department is there to serve the Government and the people. If there is some special reason why these people cannot be given back their land without paying this ridiculous price, that reason should be changed. If it is a regulation, the regulation should be changed. If it is an Act of Parliament, the Act should be amended. This is pure thievery. If some private person were to do that we would put him behind bars—and justly so.

Coming away from the brickbats, I am sure members who have been here for a few years will be surprised when I say I want to praise the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority. They will be further surprised when I say I am referring to Wungong Gorge. I record my thanks to the present Chairman of the MRPA, Mr McKenzie. Hon. Phillip Pendal has asked me to include his thanks for the treatment that authority, under Mr McKenzie's chairmanship, has meted out to landowners who asked us to disallow that metropolitan region scheme initially.

Members should be aware that the authority did a sort of three-card trick on us after we rejected the plan; it put in a planning control over the area, which I believe was in contempt of this Parliament. However, the authority has now taken the advice that we gave at the time; that was, to delete those two properties from the scheme. Mr McKenzie deserves great credit for that humane decision. It has taken a tremendous weight off the minds of my constituents, the Crooks.

I mentioned before that I would return to the brewery site. Here we find the opposite situation. The Government is grabbing the land off someone who does not want to sell it. The Minister for Planning said that the owners would not be permitted to develop it, so they would be forced to sell it. They were forced to sell it.

Why is it that that land must be owned by the Government? After coming to an agreement with the owners—reluctantly I might add—about the purchase, the Minister for Planning then said the Government would approach private enterprise to assist with the redevelopment of the site.

How ridiculous! Here is a property in respect of which the Government says, "You are not allowed to own it, we want it; it is too good for you because you are only a citizen." Then it says, "We are going to get private enterprise to donate money to help us to develop this site."

If the brewery site was so important that there should not be any commercial development on it, why not bulldoze it and grow grass on it? But that is not to happen. It was bought by the Government with a shotgun at the head of the owner and now the Government will do something else with it.

I return to the priorities. The cost was \$5 million for the property to stay there, perhaps to be cleaned up; \$5 million we as taxpayers provide, money which would go a long way to do the work required on the Peel Inlet. The

Government says, "We will do the work on the Peel Inlet if we can get part of the money from the shires and developers." The decision could be made tomorrow, but there is still a lot to be spent on other things. I am sure there are many areas in your electorate, Mr President, where you would like \$1 million spent; things which would be of great use to many people. I am sure Mr McKenzie has many items as well.

Continuing on the line of land being bought, I would like to refer for a moment to the Dawesville cut. The Government has tied up a lot of land in that area. People have had their dreams and hopes shattered in respect of land they have bought and planned to do things with. What is going to happen to that land if the Dawesville cut does not go ahead? What will happen to the dreams and aspirations of those people? I wonder if the Government has thought about that.

I would like also to refer to the land purchased between Brunswick and Australind for the alumina smelter. The smelter is now not on, so what will happen to that land? That is good farming land.

What a ridiculous situation has occurred in regard to that smelter! It was on and off with much the same sort of irrationality as that shown by Manson when he went around slashing people and daubing slogans all over the place for no rhyme or reason. Helter skelter was the keyword phrase of Manson. This could be Brian Burke's helter skelter smelter, the way he went around daubing slogans and then slashing hopes, and finishing up with nothing.

At the time his Ministers had assured the people in the south of the State the smelter was due to go ahead, but since then it was announced that it would not, and he knew it.

Another thing which is causing some concern is the ridiculous 100-year flood level which has been threatened in respect of low-lying areas adjacent to rivers and waterways. Shire councils were advised that they should not allow people to build in areas subjected to this supposed 100-year flood level. Some councils have done that. They have told people they cannot build on their blocks of land without ridiculous fill levels because, according to the report, some time in the next 100 years it may be flooded.

The people who own that land, quite justifiably, are saying, "What do I do with my land?" Some of that riverfront land is very

valuable. Some of them are threatening to sue the shire councils. The shire councils are the meat in the sandwich.

There is a very easy solution to it. Firstly, land that is within flood areas should have a notation on the title that it is land designated as flood land under the 100-year flood study. This would mean that anybody building on that land would know that the land came within that flood plain. If he then decided to go ahead and build, he would have no-one to blame if his great-grandchildren were flooded in some 80 years' time—if it ever happened.

The other thing that would need to be done is to legislate quite clearly to exempt the shire council from any claim for damages for having issued a building permit. This is the worry of the council. If a council issues a building permit and a flood comes, the council may be liable. It would be a simple matter to legislate to solve that problem, and then the landowners could take their chances. Many of the people who own land in those flood plains would be quite happy to take their chances and build a house in the hope that a flood does not come during the life of the dwelling they erect.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: They built the casino on a flood plain.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: The way of the Government, Mr Wordsworth, is "Do not do as I do, do as I say." Do members not realise that? Many people have, and before the next election many more will. The Government definitely does not apply the same rules to citizens as it applies to itself.

Another very serious point I wish to make relates to the treatment of a young fellow in the Armadale area, whom I used to teach many years ago. I do not apologise for saying that he is a slow learner. He is quite aware of it and has learned to live with the disability. His parents have also learned to live with his disability. It became quite evident in his primary school years that he would have tremendous learning difficulties. He can do some basic reading and can write to a limited extent, and he did attend special classes.

About 14 years ago, when I was a councillor on the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire Council, the council took on some staff in the gardening section and young Robert applied. He was given a trial and it was found he could do the work. He was enthusiastic and extremely meticulous with the work he did, so he was retained and appointed to the permanent staff.

A few years later his father joined the council and was eventually elected Mayor of Armadale—and I make these comments with the full approval of Robert and his family.

We would not expect in this day and age that people who have learning disabilities would be made fun of in the workplace and treated, as they used to say in the old days, as the village idiot. Unfortunately, there are people who have chosen to do this today. I believe it is a cruel way to treat a person—to poke fun at him because of his difficulty in learning. That difficulty in learning affects the way one reacts to such treatment. People of that very limited ability have difficulty accepting such cruel behaviour which you and I, Mr President, might be able to shrug off. It has been happening for a long time. My late son was working for the council in the gardening section some three years ago, and he commented on the way the guys were always taking the mickey out of young Rob. If there was a joke to be played, it was always played on Robert Blackburn.

The matter culminated this year, when some snakes were placed in Robert's utility. It turned out that the snakes were dead and that they were probably placed in the back of the utility, but they upset him considerably. The snakes were placed there by members of the outside staff who, it appears, had brought them into the depot. Why would anyone bring dead snakes into a council depot? Obviously with the intention of doing something with them. In this case, it was obviously with the intention of "playing a joke" on young Robert.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members, I have been very patient. I have warned members on previous occasions that these audible conversations are not only rude but totally out of order. If honourable members want to have a meeting, there are places provided in this building for that purpose. I suggest that while members are in this House they refrain from carrying on those various meetings.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: No matter what the facts of the issue were when they happened, I believe it is quite probable that by the time young Robert arrived home he was upset and believed that the snakes were alive and in the front of his ute. Knowing the boy and the problems he has, that is the sort of thing that would have happened. He told his parents; his parents rang the police, who conducted interviews, and it was established to their satisfaction that the snakes were dead. Robert was charged with giving false information.

It was a very sad case, and should never have happened. What actually happened was that some members of the staff—and I say some because I have known many of the members of the Armadale Town Council for many years and many are friends; we have played sport and served on committees together; I have coached their kids in football and they have coached mine; and they are a good bunch of blokes in the main—decided to do a bit of a stir on this. They wanted a vote to have young Robert sacked because they said he was a troublemaker. They could not get the numbers. The union came out and there was a vote, and the vote was against Robert being sacked. Those same staff members then took up a petition, and I know because some people have said to me that they refused to sign the petition and told the people doing it that it was wrong and that they would not have a bar of it. Eventually they gathered a few names to the petition and it was presented to council.

That is sad enough, but the saddest part is that the council acted on it and sacked this kid—the guy who had given 14-odd years of absolutely satisfactory work. In actual fact, on occasions he had to be stopped from going back and finishing jobs on Saturdays, he was so keen. There were many occasions on which he was told he could not get equipment out of the depot and that the job would have to wait until next week. That might be the key to why somebody wanted to get rid of him.

Also bandied around at the time was the fact that he was a slow learner and only had the job because his father was mayor. What a load of rubbish! That kid was employed before his father ever stood for the council. The unions are now involved and are working to gain some satisfaction for Robert. I sincerely hope they succeed.

I believe there have been similar cases in the Eastern States where councils have acted in this way and have found themselves liable for their actions. I sincerely hope that this council in particular—and I believe that most of them are people of goodwill—and others which have acted a little rashly will think carefully before they take this sort of action, especially in cases like this one where there is a young guy who probably does not have the ability to get another job in competition with qualified people. These days it is quite usual to get somebody with a qualification for a gardening job. One could be an accountant and get a gardening job. What chance does a kid have who can hardly read and write and who has a

special driving licence but who works very hard? He has virtually been committed to a life of unemployment by that action. It is very sad indeed.

The next subject I mention is that of routine police checks. The other day I was talking to my son when he said, "I was picked up by the police the other day." When I asked why, he said, "They just stopped the car." He had been driving my car at the time, and I knew it had new tyres and was in good working order so I knew they would not have found anything wrong with it. He said, "They said we should get out of the car and give them the keys." Apparently the police then opened the boot of the car and searched it and then looked under the seats. When he asked them what they were looking for they said, "It's just a routine search." He said they then got back into their car and drove off.

If this occurred to my son it has obviously occurred on other occasions with other people. The point I make is that citizens should not simply be pulled up and have their cars summarily searched after being told to get out. It is different if the police have some reason to suspect that a person in a car has drugs or stolen goods in his possession. The police cannot simply come into our homes and search them.

Hon. John Williams: Customs can.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I thank the member for his very helpful contribution! I am talking about police officers who stop an 18-year-old boy and girl coming home from a function, kids behaving themselves and acting in a legal way being pulled up and told to get out of their car because the police want to search it. This is an entirely different matter.

This sort of behaviour is not on in our society. It is on in other societies, but not in ours. If this is happening, and it obviously is, and is subject to a law or regulation, that law or regulation should be changed. The police should have a reason for taking this action; they should not otherwise simply pluck someone off the street.

I am sure Mr Dowding would be disappointed if I were not to mention crossbows. This too gets back to a similar question where Governments, or arms of Governments such as departments, trample on the rights of individuals. I am not a crossbow shooter; I have never held a crossbow in my life. I am a keen shooter of rifles and guns and I have a licence for them and I see the reason for them to be licensed. However, I find it amazing that a Minister and

a department should get together and decide to ban the sale of an item without first obtaining police approval, when the police themselves do not believe they have the right to ban those items. This ban has been foisted on us by the Minister for Consumer Affairs and his department, acting against police wishes.

The excuse given for the ban is that incidents have occurred where animals have been endangered and where people have been threatened by a person holding a crossbow. However, when one reads the papers one finds almost every day that the most serious weapon used to damage other people is the common carving knife. Half the rapes committed are committed by someone holding a carving knife against a woman's throat. Are we to arrive at the stupid situation where we have to ask for police permission to buy a carving knife? Are we to get to the stage where we must obtain permission to buy spearguns because they have been used to damage animals and threaten people? I do not condone any weapon being used in that manner.

But it is not the weapon which is at fault. It is the person holding it. A person can do just as much damage with a longbow at 10 paces as with a crossbow. For centuries the longbow was the main offensive weapon in wars, yet this Government is saying it is okay for people to have longbows and to race around with carving knives but that police permission is necessary for a person to have a crossbow.

In this case the rules have been changed without us as members of Parliament having had any say on the matter. I have repeatedly questioned the Minister to see whether there is any way that this action could be brought about by way of regulation, which would mean that we as elected members of Parliament would then have the right to move to disallow the regulation. Mr Dowding has said, "No, we have done it by administrative decision."

Hon. Peter Dowding: I am now looking at the regulation option.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am glad that is the case after the sarcastic remarks the Minister directed at me when I questioned him. I am glad he is seeing sense. Perhaps it is a change of direction.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You might have urged me, but I certainly did not.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: The Minister did not need urging to make sarcastic remarks. It is second nature to him as we have come to

realise over the time he has been here. I am glad he is now considering something suggested to him months ago.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I can assure you that you make it very difficult to be cooperative, but I will still endeavour to be cooperative with you.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I will do the same with the Minister as I did with the MRPA. If he can produce the goods I will congratulate him. If he does not produce the goods, if he shows the same sort of reaction as when I asked my question, he will get what he deserves and he will continue to get what he deserves.

I turn now to the subject of education. As an ex-teacher I have had a lot of teachers speaking to me, and as recently as a couple of nights ago I was with a group of teachers who were expressing their concern about this so-called "affirmative action". It is interesting to note that once it was not called affirmative action but was called positive discrimination. The proponents of positive discrimination found that they could not explain it away, so they found a new name for it—affirmative action.

It is interesting to read in the publication of the Teachers Union that when members are talking about their impressions of equal rights they often seem to lapse into using the term "positive discrimination". It seems they have not caught up with the times. In reality, positive discrimination is discrimination against male teachers who have performed over the years; it is discrimination against the families of those teachers; and very particularly it is discrimination against those family units. These teachers who are now moving into class 1 and class 2 positions have travelled all over the State; they have dragged their wives all over the State; they have dragged their families all over the State. Many of them with children have seen those children attend six different primary schools and three different high schools and never once experience a permanent home over that period. That is the sort of thing they have done and, as fathers and husbands, these senior and hard-working teachers have done this because they believed they would be rewarded for their efforts. They have done this because they have wanted to provide for their families proper homes and good incomes at the end of their career; they have wanted to provide security for their families.



Some women have been prepared to do that too. It is not a fact that all women have been barred from doing so. Once years ago it was the case, but that has not been so for a long time.

This so-called affirmative action is now catapulting women who have never done this sort of service into positions ahead of these men—women who have stayed safely in the metropolitan area or in large country areas, women who have had the security of their husband's job as well, women who have been able to live in established homes, women whose children have been able to attend one school for all their primary school life, women who have been able to hold "the other job" and obtain the things for their families that this provides.

I was talking recently to one man who has just been promoted to a class 2 headmaster's position. He had been something like No. 20 on the promotion list. He told me that a woman who was something like No. 40 on the promotion list—in other words twice as far away from expectations of promotion as he was, had been given a class 1 school position. So, she had not just passed him to get to a class 2 position but had gone ahead to obtain a class 1 position, something he could not expect to achieve for some years, although he is one of those men who has taken his family all over the State to get promotional points. He wrote to the Minister for Education and to the Premier but received no satisfaction at all.

I know of schools where petitions have been taken around which showed that 90 per cent of the teachers in primary schools—and most primary school teachers are women—have been against affirmative action.

Hon. Garry Kelly: The union conference was in favour of it.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Mr Kelly should know how the conference votes.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Its delegates are elected from around the State.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: We all know that a lot of teachers will not have a bar of joining the union, especially since it has affiliated with the member's side of politics. A lot of Liberal teachers are out there.

The Liberal teachers do not think much of the present Government. Have members opposite read the front page of the union paper lately?

Hon. Garry Kelly: You just said the union was run by Labor people. How do you explain that headline?

Hon. Tom Stephens: Silence!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I am being silent because I am letting the idiots opposite rave and ramble, if that is what they wish to do.

I am talking about affirmative action. I know Government members do not want it talked about; they want to talk about DOTT time and other things. I am talking about staffs of as many as 30 people, the majority of them women, where up to 90 per cent have signed petitions against affirmative action. Mr Kelly can rave about his union, but I am talking about teachers in the classrooms—the ones who are doing the work. They do not want it.

Hon. Garry Kelly: So the ones who went to the conference do not work?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: This idiot keeps rambling. One day he will make a speech and tell us how the union presents one view when the rank and file want something different. Perhaps he can explain that away.

Hon. Tom Stephens: At least he has a pleasant nature.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I suppose he has to have something going for him; he needs it.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You have nothing.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Mr Stephens has zero.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: So much for the present situation as regards promotion within the Education Department. I am glad members opposite brought the Teachers Union into the debate because we need to highlight the fact that the union executive has gone strongly against the wishes of its members and the wishes of the people who are non-members but who are in the profession. It makes one wonder whether it should be a teachers' union or a professional organisation.

I was distressed to see in the paper the other day, especially after all the equal rights tribunals have been set up, a Commonwealth advertisement requesting women's organisations to apply for funds specifically for those organisations. If we have equality why was that advertisement specifically for women's organisations; why not for community organisations? It is nears this equality is a very unequal affair.

Hon. Garry Kelly: That is a quotable quote.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Yes, and it is one I will debate with Mr Kelly anywhere, any time.

Hon. Tom Stephens: What about the next State School Teachers Union meeting?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I have been a union branch president, and I was involved deeply in the Teachers Union. I did not go away and say I would not be involved; I worked. Which union has Hon. Tom Stephens been president of? I had guys on my executive like Pat Weir, who was my senior vice president. We worked very well together. Mr Stephens should prove his worth before he starts questioning mine.

The other point I want to raise relates to the death penalty. Last year we passed a law here which abolished the death penalty. It was something I was very sad about because I believe it should not have been done.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You enjoy a bit of killing, do you?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Killing is the reason I believe there should be a death penalty. I believe there must be some sanction so that a person knows that penalty exists before he goes out and commits some of the horrific crimes we have heard about. I know people will object. There are people in my party who do not believe in capital punishment, and I know people in the Government do not agree with it. But there are many people in the community who hold the same view that I do. I would like the people who voted for that Bill to give some thought to the recent public opinion poll which showed the public attitude to capital punishment.

I do not believe the death penalty should be used lightly—

Hon. Garry Kelly: Your last Government never used it at all.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Mr Kelly is making another of his brief speeches by way of interjection. I would rather see it never used at all.

Hon. Garry Kelly: That is another incisive comment.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: It is better than an imbecilic comment.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member not to enter into discussions with members who are interjecting. He should ignore them and I will deal with them. He should concentrate on addressing the Chair.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Thank you, Mr President. I believe the death penalty should be retained as an ultimate penalty, if and when needed. It should not be used lightly; it should be used rarely, but it should be there.

We represent the people of this State and they feel quite strongly—according to the public opinion survey—that there should be capital punishment. We are treating our role as members perhaps a little less seriously than we should. I do not say that unkindly to people with a conscientious objection to the death penalty, but they are representing the people in society regardless of the fact that they object to it. I believe we should reflect the wishes of society. I do not believe we should say, "We know better than you do out there. You may think that, but we know better." We do not know better than the public; we are not better than them. We are ordinary people, as are the people who voted for us. The minute we begin to believe we are otherwise we are in trouble, and our system of government is in trouble.

This is something people should look at. I most certainly will give it further thought as a private member, and I suggest other members do so as well.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [8.47 p.m.]: The State Parliament has begun yet another session—the third of the thirty-first Parliament—and members are contributing to the debate on the Address-in-Reply to the Speech made by His Excellency. I join with others in congratulating him and Mrs Reid on the part they are playing, because they have quickly won the support and respect of the people of Western Australia.

Government members rightly should thank Professor Reid for the manner in which he read an overweight and somewhat biased address. I can only sympathise with him in that regard. Alas, the Government has the usual malady of politics when more words and more laws are meant to be indicative of greater government. In this case it is not better but larger government, and as is usual larger means more expenditure, and that means more taxes, or is it more borrowing?

We will have a better opportunity to speak on the State's financial affairs during the Budget debate. I will use this occasion to address the state of the nation, as it were, if we still have a nation. Alas, it is now so heavily mortgaged that we had better send Mr Berinson to the United Nations to upgrade the world pawnbroking Act. Members will note that I suggested Mr Berinson should go rather than Mr Dowding, who got our own State Pawnbrokers Act into such a mess that the Parliament was promised a total revision within 12 months. The Law Reform Commission has spent a considerable period making

recommendations on this matter, but the Governor's Speech contained no mention that the Government will fulfil its promise and introduce a new Bill. It seems it is yet another promise that the Government will not fulfil.

This week's news headline said that the US debt abroad exceeded that nation's overseas assets. No mention was made of Australia's debts abroad or how insignificant our overseas assets must be in comparison.

One wonders how much property is owned by Australians, particularly when one looks down the Terrace and realises that half the high rise buildings have overseas ownership.

Hon. Garry Kelly: How long has that taken?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It has taken some time.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Half of them are owned privately.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I will go into that, but if members really wish to indicate that the Terrace ownership is historic, what about the overseas ownership of the casino?

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is very minimal.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I am sure it is more, Mr Dans. I often wonder whether projects that have foreign ownership are not indeed financed with Australian capital.

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! Hon. Garry Kelly will cease interjecting. I am in the Chair now.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: This year's Federal Budget rests on high expectations of economic growth and to achieve those expectations Australia's economy will have to grow faster than the economy in any other country.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It was not doing very well in 1982.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I remind members on the Government benches that I have a standard which I require while I am in this Chair. Members will cease interjections forthwith.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: If the target is not achieved a higher deficit, more inflation, higher interest rates, higher unemployment, and higher taxes will surely follow.

In 1984-85 Governments in this country took more than 44 per cent of the community's resources. The Commonwealth Government will take a further \$5 328 million in 1985-86.

The level of Government expenditure this year will be the third highest in this country's history. The two previous record levels were also set by Labor Governments.

Since it came into office the Labor Government has increased Government expenditure by 41.5 per cent and by next year it will have added 1 450 public servants to the Government payroll—an increase of eight per cent.

Administrative costs of Government bureaucracy have risen by an alarming 37.3 per cent and it will rise a further seven per cent in real terms in 1985-86. Government debt has increased by 43 per cent and the annual interest liability has risen from \$3.4 billion to \$6.7 billion. As I mentioned, these increases have taken place during the term of the present Government.

The Hawke Government has chosen to make itself the biggest spending, biggest borrowing, and biggest taxing Government in Australia's peacetime history.

The national debt has increased by \$17 billion since the Labor Government came into power, and that figure represents \$8 400 for every person in the work force. I am sure that members would agree that is a startling figure.

No-one can deny that we have great problems in Australia today with this type of fiscal policy. The depth of Australia's problems is obvious when our economy is compared with the economics of the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation. Let me list four major measures of Australia's current position. The first is that Australia has the highest real interest rate. Secondly it has the second worst current account deficit of all the major OEEC countries—it is even worse than the United States of America in proportion to its gross domestic product.

Thirdly, Australia has had by far the worst currency devaluation in the world in the last year. Fourthly, even with wage discounting, Australia's inflation rate will be at least twice the forecast 3.5 per cent average of the major OEEC trading countries in 1986.

On top of these problems there has been an alarming increase in both our national and external debts. These are the sorts of fundamental weaknesses that must be corrected before Australia can sustain recovery.

Of course, we do not know what will happen in the coming year. Treasury papers forecast the current account deficit to blow out further from the record \$10.2 billion of last year. Forecasts that have been made in regard to the re-

duction of the deficit in 1985-86 will only be achieved by significant increases in the tax take and by the windfall revenue gained by the devaluation of the dollar and Reserve Bank trading. That is not likely to be a continuing thing.

With regard to the massive increase in Australia's foreign debt—a net debt which I might add increased by \$60 million a day last year and which has doubled in the last two years—the annual repayment of the debt has reached a staggering 33 per cent of Australia's exports. However, the national debt did not rate a mention by the Treasurer in the Federal Budget.

Hon. D. K. Dans: No, because most of the debt is a private debt. It is not a Government debt.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Whether it is a private debt or not, it is a debt to this nation and it is under the control of the Government of the day. The Government is in control of the amount of money that people send in and out of the country. Any Government is in control of that. All the monetary policies are decided by the Government of the day.

I am not the only person aware of the situation. Fortunately I think it is being highlighted more and more in today's Press. It was only on 24 August that Cathy Saunders wrote a particularly good article in *The Western Mail* which was headed, "The Tentacles of Government are Strangling us with Taxes". The article reads as follows—

Like a giant octopus, "Big Government" is spreading its tentacles over the community, tightening its stranglehold on private enterprise.

And in a bid to shake itself free, private enterprise wants governments to abandon growth policies and shrink to a more manageable size.

According to the Institute of Public Affairs, the past decade has seen government employment increase by almost 50 per cent compared with a meagre 4.1 per cent jobs growth in the private sector.

At this rate, anybody now entering private enterprise will—during their working life—pay enough taxes to finance a government worker's wages

One really wonders how Australia can be called a private enterprise country. For every 100 new Government jobs, 165 jobs in the private sector are destroyed and this has led to the famous

rule of two which states that it costs twice as much to provide a Government service than it does to provide a private service.

Further on in the article it states—

Government influence on Consumer Price Index increases in the past year was one and a half times that of the private sector—6 per cent compared with 3.9 per cent.

Further on it states—

... one of the most horrifying results of Big Government getting even bigger—and financing its growth by borrowing funds—is the staggering interest debt being chalked up.

For example, the Federal Government next year will owe \$6 724 million in interest, which is more than it spends on defence or education and roughly equals spending on health.

To answer the member who made a comment by interjection, it is not only the Federal Government that has been on a spending spree. The article continues as follows—

The past decade has seen total spending by Federal, State and local governments increase almost five-fold, from \$16 147 million to \$77 428 million.

This means that, in real terms, government spending grew by 70 per cent, leaving far behind an economy that grew by only 28 per cent.

That, of course, Mr Deputy President, is spending during the last decade.

I guess that we in this Parliament have contributed our fair share. I notice that the article continues as follows—

API figures show that in the 20 years to 1979, Federal and State governments passed 16 631 Acts of Parliament and 32 551 regulations, totalling 50 000 statutory rules to be adhered to.

And for every dollar the Federal Government spends on a business regulation, private enterprise must spend at least \$3 just to comply.

This cost the private sector an alarming \$3 720 million in 1978/79, or 3.6 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product.

And at the same time, 54 000 private employees worked full-time to cope with the web of government regulations.

In future it is estimated that Australia might end up with double-digit inflation within a year. The article continues as follows—

The traditional way out of this monetary mess is for Governments to turn to the people—and hit them with even more taxes.

By interjection, a member said that it was not all Labor Governments which brought about this national debt. I am quite happy to report to the House exactly how we have inherited this debt. The quotations in this case are taken from an article by Trevor Gilmour which appeared in *The West Australian* on 17 August. He said—

But as recently as 1970-71, the Commonwealth deficit was kept down to \$10 million—representing 0.03 per cent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product.

By 1984-85, the monetary value of the deficit had increased more than 600-fold to \$6 752 million, or 3.2 per cent of GDP.

The Whitlam government's second Budget in 1974-75 was the spending spree that introduced Australia to living way beyond its means.

Declaring the Government's overriding objective to be the reform of Australia's education, health, and welfare systems and upgrading the cities, the then Treasurer, Mr Crean, seized on the emergence of a slow-down in private activity as a reason to boost government spending.

"The relatively subdued conditions in prospect in the private sector provide the first real opportunity we have had to transfer resources to the public sector," he said in his Budget speech.

Mr Crean's extraordinary pronouncement—totally contrary to the tone adopted by Labor and Liberal Treasurers alike ever since—heralded an unprecedented and unsustainable increase of 46 per cent in public spending.

The 1974-75 deficit jumped by more than \$2 250 million to a total of \$2 546 million, or 4.1 per cent of GDP.

It does not take much arithmetic to work out that it was only \$296 million the year before. By 1974-75 the annual deficit was 4.1 per cent of gross domestic product. Bill Hayden then became Treasurer. Of course, the sacking of the Whitlam Government took place at that time, but the Budget was 4.9 per cent of gross domestic product.

The article continued by referring to the time when Fraser came to Government. To give him his due—

... The Fraser government managed to chop it back to \$2 034 million in 1979-80, \$1 109 million in 1980-81 and \$548 million in 1981-82.

That undoubtedly was a great achievement.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It shows how stagnant the whole economy was.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That might be the Minister's answer to it. However, the direction in which the country is heading is important. That is what I think one has to look at and what I am endeavouring to do. It is easy to borrow money and spend it like mad in an effort to boost the economy, but sooner or later someone has to pay the debts.

Hon. Peter Dowding: If nothing is happening, people do not need capital.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I will come to that later.

I was admiring the good job that Fraser had done, but in his last year he went on a spending spree and thought he could buy some votes. What did he do? He brought down a big spending Budget in 1982 that boosted the annual deficit to \$4 473 million. That is shocking.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It just shows what the Liberals do when they get into power.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: What happened when the Hawke Government got into power? The article continued—

Under the Hawke Government, the deficit jumped to \$7 961 million (4.3 per cent of GDP) in 1983-84 before dropping to \$6 752 million (3.2 per cent of GDP) in 1984-85.

That is nearly double.

A Government member: Three per cent of that was the one bit your mob concealed. It has been documented.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: As it happens the deficit Budget Fraser introduced was taken over by the Hawke Government halfway through, so that cannot be so. We cannot blame him if he only introduced it.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It is like a big ship; it is hard to turn around quickly.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It did not take the Labor Government long to turn this one around. In its first Budget the deficit of \$7 961 million represented 4.3 per cent of gross domestic product. To give it its due, the Hawke Government's deficit was lower the following year. It was \$6 752 million, 3.2 per cent of GDP.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: The Ministers that are non-existent in this place are obviously not interested.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It does not matter to them and there is nothing much we can do about their walking out.

Hon. Tom Knight: They have gone to check the figures.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I hope so. I have endeavoured to point out the difficulties occurring in our economy because of the greater increase in the number of public servants employed.

Another frightening thing is what is happening to our welfare costs. I was very interested in a report put out by a Mrs Joan Clarke, who was the research officer for the Mission of St James and St John in Sydney. It has a very large practice in the western suburbs. I was speaking to her about the report and was surprised at the way she has such a grip of the situation. She showed in her research that 50.8 per cent of the population in 1991 will be in a dependent age group. Her classification of this group was under 14 years and over 65 years of age. She estimated that social security and welfare spending will jump from the present 22.2 per cent of GDP to 35 per cent in the year 2000.

Mrs Joan Clarke said that half will be within that dependent age group. I wondered why she said, "under the age of 14" because the average age of people entering the work force today must be nearer 20 and the average age of people retiring is not 65 but probably nearer 60. It might be less than that by the year 1991. I wonder who will pay the taxes in the future and how we are going to live at this great rate.

We have already seen that for every person in the private sector there is one person in the Government and for every person working there is one person not working.

We all know the very major part that primary industries have to play in supplying our overseas earnings. They have always played a traditional part together with the mining industry but when we read our newspapers and if we are unfortunate enough to be involved in the industry we soon realise the difficulty that agriculture is in at present.

I noticed in *The West Australian* on Tuesday, 13 August that Australia's balance of trade for the March quarter showed a deficit of \$5 billion. That is very indicative of what is happening. People are spending to beat in-

flation and because devaluation costs continue to rise, yet our income from our exports is going down.

Mr Dans, the Leader of the House, is very keen to quote from the likes of the West German Economy Institute and the like, so I will give him a figure from that body which he may be interested in—and I quote as follows—

International businessmen are less optimistic about the world economic outlook than they were six months ago, according to the West German economic institute survey.

Those polled were particularly worried about the economic outlook for Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Saudi Arabia and Libya.

What great company we are in! They are really concerned about Australia, New Zealand, and the like. Further, they also expect the investment climate to deteriorate in some other countries. They put them in two classes. Australia was in the worst class. The lesser class and the ones they are less concerned about are South Africa, most of Latin America, Greece, Nigeria, the Philippines, Indonesia, Israel, and Algeria. That gives us a rough idea where overseas people put Australia. They even think the latter countries are not as bad as Australia.

With the large amount of borrowings needed to balance our Budget the Government has to go to the marketplace endeavouring to borrow the deficits that it knows is on the way.

It was interesting to read the *Westpac Economy Review* released this month which said there was—

... a glimmer of hope that interest rates might start to ease.

Reduction in the public sector borrowing requirement from \$15 billion to \$13 billion...

It does not seem a very great reduction to me, from \$15 billion to \$13 billion. But, if we do have less requirement from the Government, it must have some effect. The banks review states that the Government's post-Budget agreement with the ACTU that the dollar devaluation would not be reflected in wages meant both parties had failed to get the message of the devaluation. The message is that Australia has been living beyond its means and some belt tightening is required by everyone. That is a very modest way of putting it, I do believe.

No commentary on Australia's economy would be complete without some contribution by John Stone. We have to thank him for making Australia more and more aware of—

Hon. D. K. Dans: He had plenty of opportunities to do it as head of the Treasury Department.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Perhaps he was the man keeping the deficits down for Mr Fraser.

Hon. D. K. Dans: He had ample opportunity to float the dollar. It should have been done a long time ago.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Later I would be happy to talk about the floating of the dollar and what effect it has had on the farming community.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you suggesting we devalue or revalue?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I will tell the Leader of the House later how much I enjoyed the devaluation!

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am talking about the country, not you.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I hope I am typical of the broad scope of farm investors. Mr Stone said on Monday, 19 August—

Ever since our dollar first crashed last February, the money markets have been kidding themselves, or allowing themselves to be kidded, that the blow-out in the money supply which strongly contributed to that resulted merely from financial deregulation and was not, therefore, a fundamental cause for concern.

I think that will answer Mr Dans' query.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not look upon John Stone as the economic guru of this country, but maybe you do.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I think that he is very sound. Mr Stone continued—

Throughout that time we have read successively wide-eyed stories that monetary targeting was now out of fashion, that monetary policy was now "firm" and that we should not be concerned by the appearance, month after month, of money supply figures which persistently showed the contrary.

Meanwhile, particularly since our dollar crashed again last April, it was suggested that the monetary authorities were now targeting either the cost of cash or the level of our exchange rate.

...selected commentators—were given to understand that monetary policy was again "back on track." Not, you understand, that it had ever been otherwise.

...Ministers... go on boasting that after all the non-farm economy would grow by five per cent in 1984-85.

I have to admit that, as a farmer, I am always rather insulted when anyone starts talking about the non-farm economy as if including the farmer is detrimental. It certainly is not detrimental when one looks at their overall contribution to the economy of the nation. However, when one looks at the broad figures, because farming's contribution to the economy is going down, one obviously likes to keep it out because it ruins the averages.

As Mr Stone says—

In the end, of course, this music had to stop. With broad money having grown by over 15 per cent in the 12 months to June,...

This highlights how we are achieving the growth that these Ministers claim—the five per cent increase in GDP. The Labor Government seems infatuated by this five per cent growth. We saw that when we examined—

Hon. Garry Kelly: It beats minus two per cent.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I do not believe it does, to be honest—not when it is all borrowed money. If we can get it out of true production, then five per cent is great. There are very few countries in the world that have that figure. They are happy with their two per cent, and happy about real growth.

Hon. Garry Kelly: I said minus two per cent.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: To understand the Labor Party's infatuation with this five per cent growth, one must look at the report of the ACTU Congress, and its warning of a 20 per cent jobless slide—and I quote *The West Australian* of 10 September 1985—

Unemployment could soar over 20 per cent by 1990 unless high rates of economic growth were maintained over the next few years, the secretary of the ACTU, Mr Bill Kelty, warned yesterday.

If our economic strategy changes and then this country can easily have an unemployment level over 20 per cent and could easily have youth unemployment of double that," he said.

It later reads—

However, unemployment would reach 20.9 per cent if only one per cent growth was achieved over the next five years. Conversely, if five per cent growth was achieved, unemployment would fall to 3.8 per cent.

In other words, Mr Kelty and his union officers believe that if money can be pumped into the GDP, whether it be Government spending or otherwise, if the five per cent growth rate were maintained, unemployment could be reduced to 3.8 per cent. The article continues—

Over the past two years, economic growth had averaged about 4.5 per cent. In the previous decade it was only about 2.2 per cent annually.

According to Mr Kelty, high growth will continue to be achieved through the accord which was now "updated" to take into account the current situation.

It is interesting to see what the ACTU Congress accepted in its recommendations. The recommendations were fairly broad, and are outlined in an article in *The West Australian* of 10 September—

An open approach by Government to economic management.

Goodness only knows what "open approach" means. It continues—

A comprehensive policy approach supported by fiscal, monetary and exchange rate policies.

An effective mechanism to combat inflation.

There is no mention, of course, that the five per cent increase in GDP and the great increase in Government spending will affect inflation. The article continues as follows—

An industry development policy.

Specific employment and training policies...

Then of course an additional amendment was made to the recommendations which came from the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. The same article reads as follows—

... the left-wing assistant secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union, Mr Greg Harrison.

It called for regulations to control areas in the balance of payments and the current account that were constantly in deficit.

That is very interesting. He recognised that point. His comments are very interesting. The article continues as follows—

It also called for control of the growing private corporate foreign debt and its servicing requirements.

According to Mr Harrison, the new growth industry of the 1980s has seen corporate takeovers financed by foreign money which was being repaid through wage restraint by workers.

It had to come out—the old bogey has to be dragged out to take the blame. Of great concern to the thinking Australian and business in general is the manner in which the Government of the day is joining hands with unions or the ACTU in deciding the future direction of this country. It seems to be coming directly from that body, and, needless to say, I am not the first person to draw attention to it.

I was rather interested in an article in *The Weekend Australian* of last weekend which reads as follows—

With Simon Crean and Bob Hawke, Mr Kelty—

I have just spoken about him. The article continues—

forms perhaps the most powerful political alliance in Australia today; an alliance which is slowly but methodically changing society.

In last week's new Accord with the unions the Treasurer, Mr Keating, supported the principle that, for the first time, every worker in Australia should be covered by the superannuation likely to result from the 3 per cent productivity claim.

Although it will be tenaciously resisted by employers, the Arbitration Commission is almost certain to accept the ACTU's arguments that as there has been a 5 per cent growth in Gross Domestic Product for the last two years, and as there is 5 per cent projected growth for this financial year, the superannuation claim should be granted.

We seem to be going around in circles. We all know there is no such thing as perpetual motion, yet these people seem to think they have indefinite, perpetual finances. The five per cent growth in the economy is nothing but money that the Hawke Government has gone out and borrowed and then pumped into the economy, and the ACTU has had the audacity to claim it as productivity.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: The way they roll it over you would think they invented the wheel.



Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: They have something better than the wheel; they have this perpetual finance. Give her a kick and off she spins. One just fuels her up with more public money. If it cannot be borrowed it is taxed and if it cannot be taxed it is printed. We find the Government together with the ACTU opting for a three per cent superannuation scheme. There will be no discounting of wages to balance the devaluation. Walsh's comments on devaluation are rather interesting. He attended a farmers' convention that I also attended a couple of weeks ago which was run by the Kondinin district farm improvement group.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Is he the same fellow who wants to bring back tertiary fees—

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I think he might be. He made the same point Hon. Fred McKenzie has made at various times: That the farmers have benefited from devaluation. Senator Walsh was reported as follows—

Farmers had focused too much attention on the increase in fuel prices resulting from the dollar devaluation and ignored the more positive gains according to Federal Minister for Finance Senator Peter Walsh.

Addressing farmers at the Kondinin and Districts Farm Improvement Group's farm costs seminar in Perth yesterday, Senator Walsh claimed the devaluation induced increase in farm income would be about 10 times that of the additional fuel cost involved.

Like others, he says, "How lucky we are." I do not know whether I am a typical farmer, but let us say that I am not far off it. Members of this House have often teased me—although they are incorrect—that I have a \$1 million investment in farming. Let us assume I had a \$1 million investment in farming when the Hawke Government came to power. Members would be aware that at that time the exchange rate of the US dollar meant my investment was worth nearly \$US 1.2 million. The Australian dollar today is worth, I think, US68c.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: Very generous.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: So, that \$1 million that I supposedly invested in farming which once was worth \$US 1.2 million is now worth only \$US 680 000.

Hon. D. K. Dans: When Hawke came to Government the Australian dollar was worth US 85c.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That is not so, because in this case I have already quoted that the loss is about \$US 500 000. One might say "Why worry about US dollars? Why not make your calculation in Australian dollars?" But if we are to introduce so many foreign banks into this country and if I have to sell my goods on the world markets in US dollars it is fairly reasonable that I should look at my capital assets in terms of US dollars. That is how much devaluation has cost the farming community. This is one of the reasons the farming community is in difficulty over borrowed money. Bankers are losing confidence in the investments that support those lendings—apart of course from the returns. That is why so many farms are being sold up.

It was rather interesting to listen to Senator Walsh's comments in relation to the OECD. I quote—

He claimed that by the standards of most OECD countries neither taxes, or government expenditure in Australia, were high.

"Australia ranked about sixth lowest of the 23 OECD countries in taxes and government expenditure as a proportion of gross domestic product", he said.

One wonders how he can say things like that when he knows Australia exceeds America, and America is the second highest in the world. I was shocked at the same symposium on hearing his interpretation of the white paper. The *Countrymen* of 4 September reported the taped speech made by Senator Walsh in which—

He claimed two aspects of the draft white paper on taxation relevant to agriculture had been widely misunderstood or misrepresented.

On the write-off of farm losses against income from any source, the Senator said a random check of 116 000 1982-83 tax returns had shown 47 taxpayers reduced their tax assessments by more than \$117 000 by claiming farm "losses" against other income.

"Because of secrecy provisions of the Income Tax Act we will never know the identity of those 47 taxpayers, but I would be surprised if the overwhelming majority were not St. George's Terrace farmers.

"The denial of that shelter to such urban taxpayers was not an increased tax on farmers", Senator Walsh said.

In other words, he began by saying that he would not be surprised and in the next sentence he said that he was. Anyway, because 47 out of 116 000 chosen taxpayers—of course, that is only 0.04 per cent—had high deductions, he stated that they cannot in future balance income earned outside the agricultural industry with losses sustained in the agricultural industry.

Needless to say, it is not hard for members to realise that I am one of those who is balancing my salary with the loss I am making on my farm. The intention in the white paper, and I presume it will take place, is that outside income will not be allowed to be balanced with farm losses.

It is interesting that I can buy a brothel in Kalgoorlie, sleep with my staff, and cause them not to have to make a profit, and be able to put that loss against my salary; or that I can buy a racehorse and race it unsuccessfully and claim that as a tax deduction. However, I cannot do the same with the farm that I have had for 20 years. That is the manner in which this Government is attacking the agricultural industry.

It is interesting, because I noticed that a number of people are protesting. Amongst them is the president of the Primary Industry Association, Mr Winston Crane. Members may be aware that he puts almost all of his time into that position and is given an allowance for it. However, he will not be allowed to offset that allowance against his farm. Nor will the hundreds or maybe thousands of farmers who have advised off-farm investments, because they have been advised by all the experts from the Department of Agriculture and elsewhere to balance their total investments. Many have had to take on businesses off-farm and will not be able to offset those business profits against their farm.

That is a small indication of what this Government is doing to farmers. I believe that primary producers have enough financial problems particularly, as I have mentioned, with the number of farmers who are being forced to put their properties onto the market. We have to do everything we can to encourage others to take up those properties. If we do not have investors, whether they be farmers or St George's Terrace farmers, interested in buying land, we will have a domino situation in which more and more land will be pushed onto the market and there will be a total collapse in land prices.

I believe that, by having a capital gains tax, this Government is setting that domino action

into place. I think it will result in considerable hardship in the rural industry. I do not have to tell members that they have seen a considerable decline in the viability of farming as cost inputs rise and exports depreciate. There is, undoubtedly, a world-wide shrinking of markets for primary products due to subsidisation, such as in the European Economic Community, and the green revolution in the Third World countries. However, I believe that agriculture in Australia will survive. Our farmers have coped for 200 years with droughts, depression, and wars. Undoubtedly, while the rural industries are into a major evolution today, with some help they will survive. But they will not survive if they are caught up in some ideology based upon the redistribution of wealth which can only pillage the productive for the sake of the non-productive, or because some new fiscal policy is fueling the inflation cycle because of deficit spending by Governments in the hope of expanding the national economy.

I believe that, at the next State election, we will see that the public are beginning to understand a little more about the economy of this nation and it will reflect in the way they vote. I support the motion.

**HON. MARGARET McALEER** (Upper West) [9.47 p.m.]: I join with my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the way in which His Excellency, the Governor, Professor Reid, has fulfilled his role as Governor. I extend that appreciation also to Mrs Reid. I believe that the Government was very happy in its choice of Professor Reid as Governor and that we are all very lucky that he and Mrs Reid felt able to accept the position. I know that we all agree that they have performed their duties with graciousness, with informality, and with friendliness wherever they have been. I am particularly glad that His Excellency and Mrs Reid felt able to take up residence in Government House. It is a house and a rather lovely house. It deserves to be lived in. I think it is fitting for a Governor of this State to live in the centre of the city so that people know he is there, can observe the place in which he lives, and know where to find him.

Perhaps because I grew up during the long period that Sir James Mitchell was Lieutenant Governor and Governor, I find it natural and comfortable to have a Western Australian or an Australian, whether by birth or by adoption, as Governor of this State. Some members will remember and others will recall having heard

that Sir James Mitchell was appointed to the position of Lieutenant Governor by his political opponents, the Collier Government, when he lost the premiership and his seat of Northam in the Legislative Assembly.

That was a very generous gesture by a political opponent, and it was no less generous because it was well deserved. I say it was well deserved because not only did Sir James Mitchell become a great Governor, he also presided as Premier of this State over a period which was just as important as the period of development under Sir John Forrest. Sir John Forrest was the Premier when we had the great opportunities offered to us through the discovery and development of the goldfields.

From earliest times Sir James Mitchell saw the opportunities that were offered when a wheat market became available to us in 1906. He did his very best to have the wheatbelt developed. That was of paramount importance to Western Australia. Later he endeavoured to do the same for the south-west and the dairying industry with the group settlement scheme. That could not be said at the time to have been such a great success. Sir James Mitchell was fond of repeating a particular theme, even in his old age and in the last years of his time as Governor. I refer to his saying: "Nobody knows what an acre of land can produce." I will return to that theme, but I continue for the moment with my thoughts about Sir James Mitchell, because, in a sense, they have always coloured my views of the role and position of the Government.

Sir James Mitchell was not a wealthy man, and the parsimony of successive Governments and the occurrence of the Second World War ensured that there was no great entertainment at Government House. A number of people, of course, complained about this; but when Sir James walked down the Terrace every day in his bowler hat or went in his railway coach up and down the South-West Land Division, he was a very much loved and respected figure. He embodied to very many Western Australians of that time their efforts, aspirations and ideals.

At that time I was certainly not in politics and had no thought of becoming a parliamentarian, except for childish thoughts of being Prime Minister like the younger Pitt at the age of 21. I thought that it was the role of a Governor not simply to represent the Queen to the people of Western Australia but also that in himself he represented Western Australia and so was our representative to the Queen or to

the world at large. I am not saying that we should always have Western Australian Governors to fulfil this role, because I think that there is value in having Governors from Great Britain or other Commonwealth countries to bring to us a wider experience than we can gain in Australia or Western Australia. But I think that the role of Governor in this State is central to the consciousness of the people. I say this because as a parliamentarian I have often found that ordinary people look on the Governor as a sort of court of last appeal when they feel they are suffering from a very great wrong which they cannot get the Government, department, or any court to redress for them. They then have the thought of appealing to the Governor. I know that this has no constitutional standing, yet I feel that some Governors, through their influence and concern have at some time redressed wrongs that people have felt. But constitutionally speaking, the Governor is in fact here as a representative of the Queen.

I still find it strange and inappropriate that when the Governor is present we play "Advance Australia Fair" and not "God Save the Queen". I know that many people feel this, and that it was shown publicly when people spontaneously sang "God Save the Queen". Partly this relates to their feeling for the Governor, partly to their feeling that they have somehow been deprived of the national anthem without their consent. I believe that when "Advance Australia Fair" was chosen as our national song it was understood that it would be a national song and that we would still retain the anthem. Now we find that it is probably only when the Queen is present that it is allowed to be played on official occasions. I admired the ingenuity of the Returned Services League on Anzac Day when it was able to have "God Save the Queen" by calling it "A hymn for the Queen's Majesty", but I thought it was a great pity that it had to use that device in order to have it sung at all. I ought to say that for myself I am happy to be a "Waltzing Matilda" fan. In fact, had the Government of the day chosen "Waltzing Matilda", I would have been a great deal happier. It was said at the time, I think by Mr Whitlam, that it would be impossible to play "Waltzing Matilda" at State funerals, but I think that that was a reflection of the fact that he did not know anything about New Orleans funerals.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: How would you overcome the wording though? I agree with you about the tune.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: The words of "Advance Australia Fair" have been changed considerably. The official version which is now out bears very little resemblance to the words of the song when it was first chosen. Those words were all about Britannia and were far more British orientated than "God Save the Queen". Thus I dare say one could have changed the words. However, I think the words are rather fun. One can be too dignified about these things, and as a nation with a sense of humour we should have enjoyed the words of "Waltzing Matilda". It does in fact reflect a period of our past.

I feel like that about the national flag also. I think it has many messages for us from the past. It has historical associations, and it is an immature attitude on our part to feel that we must always have something new, that we are worrying about our quest for national identity.

Of course we have a national identity. We have been 200 years developing it, and we are still developing it. Obviously we have a long way to go and a lot of effort to put into it. What is probably more important is not that we lack a national identity but that possibly we lack a sense of national purpose.

I wish to address some matters which have a special relevance for my province. I come back to the words of Sir James Mitchell, that nobody knows what an acre of land can produce. When I first heard those words I used to think that it was rather stretching a point because we all knew that the land in Western Australia was rather poor and infertile. It seemed only too obvious that there was a limit to what we could produce. For that reason we were all going in for extensive farming in a very big way. In a sense, although we have lived through a time of extensive farming, and although even now people are still adding more and more acres to their properties in order to become viable, that saying has become more relevant and the time for getting bigger or getting out may in fact have come to an end, at least temporarily, because the people who have been producing acres and acres of wheat over the last few years, or endeavouring to do so, are now cutting back on production. The reason they are cutting back on production is because the cost of the inputs is so great. They have come back to looking for that ideal of Sir James Mitchell, namely, to try to find out what an acre can produce so that from each acre or from a smaller acreage they can produce a great deal more for less input.

My colleagues, including Hon. David Wordsworth who has just sat down, have spoken about the hardship in rural areas. I will not canvass again the very many reasons for the situation in which farmers now find themselves, but I do want to raise just three matters. Three extra blows have descended on farmers recently. The first is the possibility of the imposition of a dumping duty on fertiliser.

DAP, to the uninitiated, means di ammonium phosphate. It is fertiliser with nitrogen content added to superphosphate, and it is very important to Western Australia. In fact, Western Australia is by far the greatest user in the Commonwealth.

I know it was not the Government's fault that the fertiliser companies drew attention to the fact that they believed the price to be a dumped one, and therefore the Federal Government could not halt the process of investigating it. As many members will know, it has caused extreme concern through the wheatbelt. In my province well attended meetings have been held to protest against it. This is quite apart from the protests raised by the organisations and by the leaders of the farming industry. These have been principally rank and file meetings.

While farmers were extremely angry with the fertiliser companies for making this claim, they were also very upset and angry that they were not receiving support from the State Government in their protests.

At the Geraldton meeting on Friday 13 September, the member for Geraldton, Hon. Jeff Carr, represented both the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture. He let it be known that Mr Evans had spoken to his Federal counterpart, Mr Kerin, to see what influence he could use. Mr Carr himself had had some words with Senator Button, who is the Minister responsible for customs and in charge of the inquiry into DAP. On the previous Monday the Premier had sent a telex to the Prime Minister. The result was that he said nothing more could be done.

In the first place, about 16 days had elapsed since the announcement had been made of the possibility of the imposition of dumping duty. It was 16 days before the farming people or the public at large heard that the Government was making some effort on their behalf. Certainly nobody could have said the Government was making a public effort to support the farming industry in this State. I do not know why the

Government considered it necessary to do it so quietly, but it left everybody feeling abandoned.

Hon. Graham Edwards: They knew there was a stockpile.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: This is a very serious matter and one which deserves every support from the State Government. It is not good enough to say, "We have done everything we can, we have reached the limit." The Premier has telexed the Prime Minister. Many more efforts are necessary from the State Government to prevent this dumping duty from being imposed.

The inquiry is not finished. It is possible it will not be found to be a dumped price because it is said the price at which the fertiliser is sold in the United States is even lower. That seems quite a good case.

Even if this does not hold water, the Federal Minister still has the power to use his discretion and not impose a dumping duty. In that case it is important that the State Government should be pushing the case of Western Australia, the only State which is vitally concerned in the matter. I hope it will continue to do its best to do just that.

There is a further corollary to the DAP matter; that is, the Act itself. It is the contention of the PIA that fertiliser has never, in fact, been sold at dumped prices in Australia and therefore the Act should be changed so that it is no longer susceptible to the claims made by our own fertiliser companies and so that we should at least be spared this duty which is always hanging over our heads. This is not the first time farmers have suffered from this particular trouble.

The second blow to the farming industry has been referred to already by Hon. David Wordsworth in the shape of a capital gains tax. It is often said farmers live poor and die rich, which simply means that their assets are worth something whereas their income is very little. If they do not choose to die rich they have the possibility of selling their farms in order to enjoy some profit at the end of a hard-working career. Having lived on the smell of an oil rag for so many years, when the time comes to cash in on the assets it is unfair that they should be afflicted with a capital gains tax.

This does not apply only to farmers. Every week when I am in Perth I visit small shops like delicatessens where the people work from early in the morning till late at night. I know that the reward they receive for this hard work comes

more quickly than it does to the farmers, but when they sell their businesses and enjoy the profits from them, these, of course, will be limited by the capital gains tax.

This tax will further depress the land market and the market in businesses. When death duties were removed from all the States following the example of Queensland there was fresh investment in Australia. With the imposition of a capital gains tax, especially if—it is still a question of "if"—it forms a type of death duty, then investment will be further discouraged.

The third disability from which farmers particularly are suffering is interest rates, which they greatly resent. We can take it that the average indebtedness of farmers is \$150 000 or more. Some people obviously have smaller debts than others, some have loans only for working capital, and many others are far more in debt than that. Anyone who bought land in the last four years bought it at a high price and incurred a very high rate of interest. With the fall in land values such people have lost equity in their land, but still have a very high rate of interest to meet.

As Hon. David Wordsworth said, this means not only a loss of equity for the borrower, but also for the lender. While mortgage sales are occurring, unfortunately buyers are very scarce. Some say the buyers are out there in the wide blue yonder, but they are hoping land values will drop further, so they hesitate to buy now. Certainly local farmers are not able to afford to buy large parcels of land. However that may be, the fact is that lending institutions like banks and stock firms, as well as farmers themselves, feel the need to have some sort of floor put into the land market.

I do not know how this can be done or what mechanism may be necessary to do it, but it has been suggested, with some reason I think, that if the restrictions on foreign capital were lifted the amount which might be brought in to invest in land could be raised and this would enable foreign buyers to invest in land here. This would provide a number of possibilities for leasing land back, for developing farms and for giving confidence back to the industry.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: It would be detrimental in the long term.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: I cannot see how foreign investment could be detrimental in the long term. I do not imagine that foreign investors will buy up all of the wheatbelt; I hope that the whole wheatbelt is not for sale. I believe that a number of foreign companies

and individuals have been operating here with a great deal of success. In some districts—and certainly in my own—they have brought a great deal of expertise to the farming in the region, and by their good example they have improved our own farming practices in some respects. I think that one can jump too much at bogeymen, and at the thought that we will be taken over by foreigners.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: Peasants in our own land.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: As things are going, we will not even be peasants in our own land. We will not even have any land to be peasants on.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: People who are farming land in countries overseas which are going bad are generally people who do not own their own land.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: We are going back in Australia where we own our own land, so I really cannot see the relevance of that argument.

In a speech I gave some months ago, I sketched a proposal for the use of the Rural Adjustments and Finance Corporations to try to give protection to farmers who are faced with a set of mortgagee sales. The Government took no interest in the scheme—perhaps rightly so—and I received no comments and heard nothing further from the Minister regarding any investigation or interest in that scheme. In the meantime however, the Minister for Agriculture, Mr Evans, met with banks and financial institutions and requested them to hold off their mortgagee sales and to try to advance money to farmers. The Minister threatened that if the banks did not do so, the Government might find itself obliged to do something else. In addition, the Minister for Agriculture has announced a series of two hour consultations with private professional consultants to be given free to farmers.

Hon. J. M. Brown: I think they pay a third of the fee.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: Yes, that is right. I think these attempts by the Government really are efforts to help the farming community but they strike me as being of very small value. Indeed, they are band-aids when something more serious and important is required. The Minister announced a long-term measure the other day which would increase the funds for research, and I agree with him that this is important. I was glad to hear that there is to be better agricultural representation

on the research councils and that there will be better input into the priorities of research projects and better accountability to the farming community.

That is all in the future, but it is a step in the right direction. We also need a much better extension service than farmers are currently getting. I hope the new guidelines will include that as well, but the point is that if we are to benefit from measures such as that proposed we must be able to keep people on their farms. Some way will have to be found to assist them.

In the meantime the agricultural industry needs assistance. The Department of Agriculture and other agriculture-related institutions have been running seminars at a great rate in order to assist farmers and it has become rather obvious that the department now feels obliged to recoup some of its costs. One might say that the department is trying to make a profit. There was one such seminar at Three Springs on how to get the best out of sheep or something or other and everyone who wished to come along was asked to contribute \$65. This is quite a lot of money to pay just for a day's outing which did not even include a feast and on which one might be lucky if one heard one or two new ideas. It is not the sort of thing which encourages farmers to feel that they are being assisted. Had 100 people turned up at the seminar, the Department of Agriculture would have made \$6 500, from which sum it would have paid one or two consultants' travelling and speaking fees. This seems to me to be a quite unreal situation. It is almost an insult to the farming community. I do not know how many farmers in the district I referred to went to the seminar, but I do know that many farmers who are keen to benefit from new ideas and would like to go along to field days and seminars did not go. As I said, none of them went along to the seminar I described earlier.

I turn now to another problem in the country, which does not strictly concern farmers. The upgrading of nursing training which is now occurring means that the only hospital-based training left is for 15 State registered nurses. This training course is run by the Western Australian School of Nursing and it is a general nursing course. The Western Australian School of Nursing had an intake of 50 students which it is now upgrading to 75; there will be three intakes a year for the next two years but after that it will cease altogether. Those people who wish to become State

registered nurses will have to enrol at the Western Australian Institute of Technology or at the College of Advanced Education at Nedlands.

The School of Nursing takes responsibility for the accommodation of students who come from rural areas, it provides housing for them and makes sure that they have reasonable food. Of course these students are paid a wage. As matters stand, this means that there are very limited opportunities for people living outside the Perth metropolitan area to train as nurses. Many of these people would be very interested in nursing and I speak particularly with reference to people in my own area of Geraldton. However, many country people may not be accepted by the WA School of Nursing and they do not have the money to finance themselves in training at WAIT or at the CAE at Nedlands. They must find accommodation and they are not paid a wage, although they do receive a TEAS allowance, if they are eligible.

However, if country students cannot now find places to train in nursing, it will be worse in two years' time, when the WA School of Nursing ceases to operate a training scheme. One possibility is still open for those people who wish to be in the nursing profession, and that is to become State enrolled nurses instead of State registered nurses. A State enrolled nurse is the new name for what was previously a nursing aide.

Seven centres provide places for country people to train as enrolled nurses, and those centres include Bunbury, Derby and Port Hedland. However, between Port Hedland and Perth no school is available to train enrolled nurses. The obvious place for a school for enrolled nurses is—

Hon. Tom Stephens: Karratha.

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: That is near enough to Port Hedland. The obvious place is Geraldton. It has a regional hospital, which could provide accommodation for those students from country districts; and being a town of very large population—on the verge of cityhood—it would find a number of applicants within the town itself, who could live at home. Indeed, in Geraldton there is considerable inquiry for just this sort of training. I ask that the Minister for Health be requested to give serious consideration to establishing a school for enrolled nurses at Geraldton, where the hospital has indicated it could support at least one intake every year. It must bear thought that with the upgrading of the nursing profession there must indeed be a greater re-

quirement for enrolled nurses, first because duties which registered nurses formerly performed might not be performed under their new system, and secondly because some people will always prefer the more practical hands-on type of nursing experience and to have the ability to break away from the new registered nursing scheme.

Hon. E. J. Charlton: Do you think the new scheme is an improvement on the old one?

Hon. MARGARET McALEER: Medicine has become very complicated and advanced, and undoubtedly there is a place and a requirement for an upgrading of nurse training, although it will not remove the need for the sort of nursing that went on before and therefore that gap has to be filled, too. Since the State is already very short of nurses and has been in a crisis position for some time, it is very foolish to limit the opportunities available for people to train in this work.

Another matter I raise is one which has received a lot of publicity, and I refer to the rapist who is at large still in the town of Geraldton. I know the Government has taken a lot of measures to try to capture this person. It has provided extra police, with 24 hour patrols; it is paying for the lights of Geraldton to be kept on all night; it has offered a reward of \$15 000 in the hope that someone will come forward with information.

Unfortunately, all these efforts have met with a complete lack of success and I understand that the police attribute their lack of success in capturing this man to the paucity of public information coming forward.

Nevertheless, in spite of the Government's efforts and in spite of the fact that the people of Geraldton realise the Government is doing what it can, a great deal of concern still exists in the town.

As many members know, last week in Geraldton a group of concerned women, who happened to be members of a study group, arranged for a meeting of women so that those women might be better informed about what they should do in the circumstance of rape, what medical help was available to them, what social and psychological help was available to them, and what legal possibilities were available to them. It was a well-attended meeting with about 150 women in attendance. A panel of speakers included visiting policewomen and the local policewoman, a doctor from the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, community health workers, Margaret Mallard from the Aboriginal

Medical Centre, and a number of others. I will not try to name them all because I am sure I will miss out someone.

Individual members of the panel addressed the meeting and gave information to the best of their ability as to what was available in Geraldton, what help people could expect, and what measures women ought to take, and afterwards considerable discussion took place.

It transpired that, in spite of all the very good information, given by the policewomen for instance, in the particular situation that had existed so far in Geraldton all the measures one might take in other circumstances when assaulted, such as screaming, tearing the attacker with one's nails and so forth, were all ruled out in this instance because the rapist invariably acted in such a way that the first time a victim was confronted by him she was in the middle of sleep and she was awoken with a knife at her throat. The possibility of struggling and resisting has been limited indeed.

In the same way, it appeared that while the local hospital could provide very good medical attention through the local doctors, absolutely no possibility existed for a woman to get any counselling in the circumstance of rape because the hospital was not so equipped. All it could do was to arrange to ring Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital and have the victim talk to a councillor there.

Finally, it was obvious that while a very efficient and willing young policewoman was on the staff of the Geraldton Police Force, she was only one and had other duties to perform and so could not always be available when required. So out of that meeting a number of recommendations came, which in due course will be sent to the appropriate Minister or department. There was a request for another policewoman to be provided for the staff of the Geraldton police station.

Another recommendation was for the appointment of a counsellor who might be able to be with a victim right up to the time of the trial, and who could go with the victim into the very trying circumstances of the court or be available to lend an ear to the victim during that long lead-up period to the trial. As I understand it, a need exists after such a horrible experience for the rape victim to rehearse again and again what has happened and to relive the situation again out loud with someone.

There was of course nobody at all to attend to Aboriginal women. It was said and believed that two Aboriginal women had been victims of

the rapist, but that because of lack of experience, counselling, and shyness, and so on, they did not report the rape at the time.

When the meeting was held one of the thoughts of the people who organised it was that they might ask the Government to set up a sexual assault crisis centre in Geraldton, but it became obvious during the course of the meeting that while the rapist is at large, and has been for some time and may be for a long time to come, the number of victims is not such as to warrant that sort of establishment. I hope that the Government will at the same time realise that although such a large and expensive establishment is not called for, it would be helpful to raise the standard of aid to people who are victims of the rapist.

The police in Geraldton have complained that they feel people may not be reporting all the attacks which occur. They also complain, and it is a serious complaint, that people are not taking the simplest precautions; they do not lock doors, pull the blinds, and secure windows. The police said that one could drive anywhere around Geraldton that night or any other night and find women alone sitting by windows. They pointed out that in none of the rapist's attacks has he actually had to break into the house; he has always been able to lift a window or open a door.

The police have made their complaints as public as possible. They have used the media, and the media have cooperated in spreading the message, but it is obviously not nearly enough. One still finds that people around Geraldton are not locking their doors, closing windows, and pulling the blinds.

The lack of information the police are getting in spite of the offer of a reward also suggests that somehow or other the message is not getting through. The police speak of the apathy of the people of Geraldton. No doubt there are people who feel secure and so are apathetic. It seems to me, after thinking about the speech made last night by Hon. Peter Wells in relation to the neighbourhood watch—which has been established for some time in Geraldton—that perhaps our organisation there is also lacking. Perhaps the police have not been able to mount a sufficient effort to organise the neighbourhood watch programme so that it is effective. I wonder whether the Government might be keeping them too short of money to do the job effectively.



If we are to take Mr Wells' examples to heart a person-to-person effort is required, not just police-to-people; police must enrol people who will in turn enrol others. In that way we will make sure that whole sections of the community become part of the neighbourhood watch scheme and that there are not sporadic groups scattered around town. Geraldton is a spread-out town with a number of vacant blocks, and it is not an easy town for anybody to watch. It would require a concerted effort, and a big effort, to induce the population to take part in such an exercise.

I feel it is necessary because the police cannot work on their own and without information. More could be done to organise the town to catch this man.

Another matter in Geraldton is causing some concern to a particular section of the town. I refer to the Geraldton senior citizens' centre. This has been a dream of many senior citizens for many years now. It took them rather a long time to convince the town council it was a valuable thing to do. When the council was finally convinced the town should have a senior citizens' centre, it somehow got the wrong steer and applied for money for a community centre only to find that the Federal Government guidelines did not allow money to be used for that particular project. So the town council reapplied for a senior citizens' centre. Then the new arrangements for the home and community care scheme between the Commonwealth and State Governments intervened, and the centre seems to have had another setback. The town council believes the centre still has a high priority, but it feels that priority may not come to anything for a long time, if ever. It is anxious to have an assurance that it will get funds shortly. In the meantime the senior citizens who are not in the happy position of the town council in receiving information, little though it may be, have a feeling of considerable despair and believe they have lost the possibility of getting the centre.

Even though only a percentage of the older people in Geraldton will actually enjoy the centre—I think it is 30 per cent or 37 per cent—those people have a strong desire for it, and they have general community support. The Government would do well to give an assurance or some concrete information about the probability of the centre coming into existence.

I want to refer to a couple of other matters arising in my province, two of which have to do with schools. The first relates to my home town of Three Springs. It has a very good primary

school which had very decorative, well-designed additions built in 1983. Unfortunately no provision was made for the staff; most importantly, no provision was included for separate toilets, washrooms, or shower facilities for the staff. Up to 12 women work in the school at any time, and they have to share facilities with 70 girls; between them they have four cubicles. A rather extraordinary situation seems to have arisen because the toilet block is a long way from the classrooms. The children are required to use the block in the recess and at the midday break, and the staff are encouraged to use it in class time. That means they have to leave their classes unattended, if only as briefly as possible.

When visitors, including school advisory staff, dental nurses and even State dignitaries attend the school, the problem is aggravated and becomes embarrassing. The sum of money required to overcome this embarrassing and difficult situation is something more than \$25 000, and I know that it has been put forward for consideration in this year's Budget. I hope that the Government will find its way clear to allocate the money for this project.

Further down the line at Carnamah there is a district high school which serves not only Carnamah, but also Three Springs, Eneabba, Leeman, and Coorow. After much agitation the school has been renovated and upgraded in a considerable way. I am glad to say that the school is much improved, although it is not yet finished. The facilities, as far as the staff is concerned, are now good and are appreciated. Thanks to the present and past principals much work has been done to the school grounds, and it is something of which they can be proud. Of course, things do not rest there and there are some serious faults as far as the Carnamah District High School is concerned.

There are three proposals to improve the school which I will mention. These proposals have been put forward to the Government and I hope that it will consider them seriously. The first proposal is to build an adequate manual arts facility. This does not sound very much if people think in terms of woodwork and the traditional courses which are taken. However, one must bear in mind that not only do the pupils who go to the school come from small towns or farms, but they also live in isolated circumstances. In many cases they do not have many age group peers. Therefore, they lack many experiences which children in large

towns have the opportunity to get, and they lack the opportunities for the development of skills for their future employment.

The manual arts centre proposed for the Carnamah District High School is not simply for woodwork or metalwork. It would be used for other industrial training such as fusion welding, concreting, plastics, electronics, and photography. These would be additional options offered to the children attending the school, and they would be better off for staying at school.

It is thought that the present manual arts centre could be converted into a library. The existing library is a prefabricated building which is very hot in summer, and it is inconvenient for it to be used as a library as well as for ordinary classes, special classes, and other facilities because it is entirely open. It is not suitable for use as a library.

The existing library could be used by converting it into a performing arts centre. The Carnamah District High School is placed in an unusual position as far as country schools are concerned because its numbers are increasing instead of decreasing. Of course, this is not only due to the mining at Eneabba, but also, in these times of hardship, to the fact that people are keeping their children at home and sending them to the local schools because they cannot afford to send them to private schools.

It is important that a school which is actually growing and which is serving a large area should be able to provide children with as many advantages as possible, and I hope the Government will consider this request favourably.

Finally I mention one cause which I support strongly. This matter is not in any way confined to my province, although it does benefit from it. I refer to the request for Government funding for the braille talking book library and particularly to funding for an audio production centre.

The Association for the Blind of Western Australia (Inc.) operates a lending service of talking books and, as well, it makes available talking book machines to many of its clients at no cost. In Geraldton where there are about 61 people who make use of this service the sole representative of the association, Mrs Audrey Kershaw, has under her care three or four talking book machines which are available for use. More important is the fact that the association's library provides to its clients another service because it has an audio production

centre. Thanks to the generosity of the Lotteries Commission the association was able to upgrade its capacity for producing talking books last year. It is able to produce originals which are both fiction and non-fiction, and which are of very high quality.

It was surprising to learn that these talking books are in very short supply in Australia because there are very few agencies within Australia which produce the cassettes. The cassettes produced by some agencies are often of not very good quality. Good quality material can be obtained from overseas, especially from Britain, but the cost is very high. Not only are the clients of the Association for the Blind benefiting from the production of cassettes, but it is also estimated that 14 per cent of the Western Australian population are print-handicapped and a number of those people go to the State Library for their requirements. However, the State Library has to obtain its material from the workshops belonging to the Association for the Blind.

When one talks about "print-handicapped", it does not refer only to people who are blind. It can refer to people who are illiterate, to migrants, to people who have learning difficulties, and to some people who are intellectually handicapped. It is particularly interesting to note that because the work is done locally at the association's library, any teacher or the State Library can ask for particular works to be put on cassette at a particular speed to be used as a suitable method for teaching intellectually handicapped people.

In the same way, people who have English learning problems, such as migrants, can have special cassettes ordered for them. The State Library is probably the largest single client of the Association for the Blind as far as talking books are concerned. The State Library is trying to develop a substantial special print-handicapped service of its own. It is short of stock, and it is short of funds to buy that stock from the Association for the Blind even though the material is sold to it by the association at extraordinarily low prices. For instance the association sells to the State Library cassettes at about \$4 each. If it were buying cassettes of a British make commercially, it would probably be paying \$10 each for them. The number of cassettes involved in making a talking book is between four and six and, therefore, the cost of similar books being transcribed on British made cassettes would be between \$40 and \$50, and in one case the cost has been as high as \$100.

There is a need for the cassettes because with 14 per cent of the population being print handicapped, it means that unless we can provide them with something in the nature of talking books, they are being deprived of the opportunity to have access to information and recreational reading. I think it would be the Government's wish, and in fact the wish of everybody in the community, that people who are handicapped in this way should have that disadvantage remedied. Up to the present the Association for the Blind has received no help from the State Government. It receives a grant of approximately \$30 000 from the Federal Government which represents about eight per cent of its production costs for the audio cassettes. Its total cost of production is approximately \$368 000 for the present financial year.

It seems reasonable that as the association is catering for such a substantial proportion of the population at no charge—it does not require its clients to pay or there is very little charge as far as the State Library is concerned—that the Government should make some allocation to help it. Although the Government already gives money to the State Library, it is short of funds and has been for some time, to buy new material. Therefore, it can be imagined how little it can spare to buy this audio material from the Association for the Blind or from anywhere else.

I hope the Government will take the request from the Association for the Blind very seriously and to heart. I know that times are difficult but, as many members have said, money is spent in many directions and probably could be spent more wisely and usefully, and on more worthwhile causes such as this.

There are many other matters in my province which I will not raise at present because other opportunities will be available to me.

I support the motion.

**HON. GRAHAM EDWARDS** (North Metropolitan) [10.43 p.m.]: I support the motion and say how pleased I am that on at least one issue this House has been able to overcome politics and put forward a unanimous point of view. I echo that point of view; that is, to commend the stature and bearing which His Excellency Professor Reid has introduced to the position of Governor. Both he and his wife have brought immense pleasure and pride to the people of Western Australia as they go

about their duties of State. I wish them both a long and pleasant tenure of Government House.

I want to spend some time talking about equal opportunities for disabled people. Members of this House will remember that in November 1984 Parliament passed the Equal Opportunities Bill. The Act was proclaimed on 4 July 1984 and it made it unlawful in various situations to discriminate on any of the following grounds: sex, marital status, pregnancy, race, and religious or political conviction. Discrimination involving sexual harassment in employment, education, or accommodation is also unlawful. The situations or activities in which discrimination is unlawful are: work, education, access to places and vehicles, except on the ground of religious or political conviction, provision of goods and services, and access to facilities, accommodation, clubs of not fewer than 30 persons, and on application forms. Members would know, however, that the Act does not include discrimination on the ground of impairment. At first sight this is a serious omission. However, the Government assessed the experiences in other States and recognised that more background work and study needed to be done on the implications of equal opportunity legislation covering the ground of impairment.

As a result Cabinet established a working party, which I chaired, to develop draft equal opportunity legislation covering people with disabilities. The terms of reference are—

- (1) To consult associations and informal groups of disabled people about equal opportunity legislation on the grounds of physical impairment or psychiatric disorder;
- (2) to examine comparable legislation from overseas and interstate;
- (3) to establish principles of equality in such fields as access to buildings, the provision of facilities in the workplace, flexibility in working hours and organisational practices, parity in employee benefits, other matters deemed relevant to the working party; and
- (4) To make recommendations to the Government about the above matters.

The method of the inquiry has been to seek initially public submissions, and following the establishment of the working party we wrote to

approximately 350 individuals and organisations advising them of the working party's terms of reference and suggesting that they give thought to making a submission. The official call for public submissions was made a few weeks later when notices inviting comments on matters raised by the terms of reference were placed in *The West Australian* on 12 and 19 January 1985. We were especially keen to hear from people who had disabilities and we would like to thank all those organisations and groups which passed on our message to their members. We received a total of 114 written and verbal submissions. Of these 31 were received by the advertised closing date of 28 February 1985 and a further 39 by the extended deadline of 14 March 1985. We accepted also 44 submissions received after this date. A list of submissions to the working party is available if any member is interested in looking at it.

More submissions were received from organisations than individuals. Support organisations for, rather than of, disabled persons represented 36 per cent of the submissions. However we were pleased that 23 per cent of submissions came from individuals who had disabilities. Eight per cent were received from individuals who had a relative, usually a child, with a disability, and a further five per cent from groups of people with disabilities. It was interesting to note that almost one-third of the individuals who had disabilities preferred to make verbal submissions and that these accounted for more than half of the 16 verbal submissions received.

Two other distinctive categories were those of professional individuals and organisations working with people who had disabilities. Twelve per cent of the submissions were from Government agencies, and nine per cent were from sections of those agencies. Two submissions were received from employers or employer organisations; two from companies selling aids or equipment; one from a union; and one from a political party. No submissions were received from ethnic groups or other interest groups. I think one of the reasons for that is that ethnic groups have not really attempted, until recently, to tackle the problem of their disabled. It is pleasing to note that this is now happening.

In addition to the 114 submissions received, we held discussions with a number of people, both informally and before the working party as a whole. A list of people who attended discussions with the working party is available.

We also received about 100 telephone calls from people inquiring about an enormous range of disability-related matters. About half the callers subsequently made submissions, and the bulk of the remaining calls related to matters outside our terms of reference.

As required by our second term of reference, we have examined comparable legislation from interstate—New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia—and Great Britain, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States. We found that the Australian legislation provides the most relevant models, and we will concentrate on those.

The next step for the committee is to adopt a discussion paper which will be circulated throughout the disabled community of this State and to anybody else who is interested in the matter. Following that, discussion will be entered into with the community, and final recommendations will be made to the Government. Following that I would hope that we will be introducing legislation in the autumn session of 1986. If members have any interest in the matter further to what I have had to say tonight, I would be only too happy to discuss the matter with them.

There are a couple of other matters I want to briefly touch on. One was raised by Hon. John Williams this evening in relation to the fining of the war veterans for playing two-up on Anzac Day. I felt quite angry, and I am quite saddened over this because I believe it to be a most un-Australian thing to have happened and I believe it does fly in the face of the spirit that has made this country so great. That spirit should be one fostered and strengthened, and not weakened or pulled down. I join in asking the Attorney General to examine the case; and if he can take the appropriate action, then I believe he should. Failing that, a fund should be established to pay the fines, and I would be more than happy to contribute in the vicinity of \$100 to such a fund. I make the point that it is not the money; it is a matter of principle which is at stake. If those Second World War veterans have not earned some flexibility and consideration before the law and those who make the law, then I believe we, as a community, have very short memories. I feel quite strongly about that issue, and the courses of action that have been suggested ought to be taken.

I was advised recently that Malcolm Sargent, the Town Clerk of the City of Stirling, is to retire. That is rather unfortunate because he has held that very demanding position since

about 1979. He attained this position after being with the City of Stirling for some 17 years. I believe he started about 1964 as a cost clerk, and worked his way up the ladder to eventually become the town clerk. Malcolm Sargent has built up a reputation for being very much a person of diligence and honesty and has always had a purely professional approach to the business of local government. I know there are a number of people in this House who have been councillors, and they would appreciate the demands made on a person in that capacity, particularly a person in the largest local authority in this State and certainly one of the largest local authorities in Australia. I wish Malcolm Sargent well. It is disturbing that he has joined a rather long list of senior staff from the City of Stirling who have, over the last 12 months, chosen to retire.

I believe it is important for the Liberal councillors at the City of Stirling to take stock of what is happening, because if they do not I can assure them that the ratepayers of the City of Stirling will, and those Liberal councillors will soon find out that councillors are expendable. Senior staff of many years' experience are not.

One further issue I will touch on is the situation with the marina at Sorrento. I am sure that most members in this place have read something about the debate that has taken place. I would refer them to an item in the local paper in about March 1985. A number of politicians were asked to state where they stood on this issue. I am very pleased to say that Pam Beggs, the very hard-working MLA for Whitford, stated clearly and strongly that she was in favour of the marina, as I certainly did.

Jim Clarko has been very honest, I must admit. He said he felt the marina should go to Ocean Reef. He is one of the few members of the Opposition to have made some clear statements on this issue. For instance, Mr Wells said he was waiting for further information. I do not know whether he has that information now.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: The public have not yet got that information. The marina was forced through by a Government decision against all environmental advice.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I am quite pleased to have this conversation with Mr Lewis. He has spent a lot of time talking with his colleagues, and talking with me will be the only intelligent conversation he has tonight.

The Opposition does not seem to know where it stands on the marina issue. Mr Wells said some time ago that he was waiting. Mr Nanovich does not seem to know what is happening either, and the newly endorsed Liberal candidate for Whitford has said he wants up to three marinas along the coast, but does not seem to know where he wants any of them.

Most amazingly, we have the shadow Minister for the Environment, Cyril Rushton, saying—

We are not in favour or against the marina.

This followed a statement made a week before by Mr McFarlane, who consulted with the Opposition and who advised the local paper that he in turn had been advised by the Opposition that if the marina was to go ahead, and if the Liberal Party won Government, then it would dismantle the marina and turn it into a set of groynes.

Hon. P. H. Wells: He had no authority from the Liberal Party to say that.

Hon. GRAHAM EDWARDS: I have a very good letter here from a member of the community, Mr Garth Harvey of Padbury. He has written to say that he wants the truth of the matter. That is a fairly reasonable request. He has summarised his letter by saying—

Can Mr McFarlane state categorically that he has received such an assurance?

Mr Harvey also asks—

Can Mr Ken Shultz please state in very clear terms whether he would advocate stopping the construction of the marina? Who is stating the truth?

That is an answer we in this House are entitled to hear, and surely the voters—the members of the community in the northern suburbs—are entitled to hear it, too. They need to know where they stand and it is important for the Opposition to at least attempt to set out where they stand.

As I said initially, I support the motion.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.00 p.m.]: I thank members for the contributions they have made to the Address-in-Reply debate to which we have all listened attentively. Members have covered a wide range of subjects and, as is my practice after Address-in-Reply debates in the past, in regard to every point that has been canvassed either the appropriate Minister will

reply to the member concerned or I will reply to him, as I do not intend to go over the whole debate tonight.

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

*Presentation to Governor*

On motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), resolved—

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

**CONTRACEPTIVES AMENDMENT BILL**

*Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House), read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.02 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Contraceptives Act to allow more retail outlets to sell condoms and so encourage their greater use as a preventative health measure to lessen the spread of AIDS.

This Bill has been introduced following a strong recommendation from the Commonwealth Task Force on AIDS that the use of condoms be encouraged in an effort to lessen the spread of AIDS in the community.

Professor David Pennington, head of the Commonwealth AIDS Task Force, warned bluntly that sexual practices—particularly among the “at risk” groups—will have to change if the spread of the fatal acquired immune deficiency syndrome virus is to be slowed.

He is advocating constant use of condoms by people in the high risk groups and it is reported that, as a result of his warnings, groups alarmed at the spread of the disease have launched an ambitious educational campaign to alert the public to the disease transmission risks.

In the absence of any scientific breakthrough leading to the discovery of a cure for AIDS, education campaigns in the groups at risk become the key public health option most likely to achieve any worthwhile result in the lessening of the spread of this disease.

Because an individual can contract the disease without showing any symptoms for years, there is a distinct possibility of the disease being transmitted to others during this incubation period before the carrier is aware of the potential for passing on the disease.

While medical scientists have not yet found a cure for AIDS, they have identified the means by which it is transmitted and are recommending measures for slowing its spread. One of the measures recommended is the use of condoms during any sexual activity.

Transmission of the virus is effected by the transfer of semen or blood from a person having the disease to another person through physical contact of such a fluid, through a break in the protective barriers of the body.

Consequently, it is believed the use of condoms can lessen the likelihood of spreading the disease through sexual activity.

The State has a responsibility in this regard to allow condoms to be more readily available, especially to people in the high risk groups.

At present, the Contraceptives Act limits the sale of all contraceptives to pharmacies.

The amendments propose to increase the number of outlets to allow approved retail shops and all licensed premises to sell condoms without committing an offence against the Contraceptives Act.

This should allow greater access to condoms by people in the high risk group by providing more convenient retail outlets and a greater period of availability each day.

The educational campaigns and greater availability of condoms to the high risk groups should go a long way in lessening the spread of AIDS. In fact, the greater availability should also help the control of other sexually transmitted diseases.

Because of the proposed amendments, the emphasis of this Act will be more on a public health protection theme than on policing the unlawful sale of contraceptives as is the emphasis of the present Act.

For this reason, it is seen to be more appropriately administered by the Commissioner of Health than the Commissioner of Police. Appropriate amendments in this Bill will allow this change to occur.

It is proposed that retailers who wish to sell condoms should apply to the Commissioner of Health for a permit to make these sales. Sales by vending machines will not be permitted.

An advisory committee will be formed to examine and make a recommendation on each application received.

It is proposed the advisory committee be chaired by the Director of the Communicable Disease Control Branch of the Health Department, or his nominee, and comprise representatives of the Department of Consumer Affairs, the Pharmacy Guild, the Retail Traders Association, the Family Planning Association of WA, and a member of the public.

Upon the approval of the commissioner, a permit will be issued in respect of a particular person and named premises and this may contain conditions applicable to sales of condoms.

Once issued, a permit will not have to be renewed each year and can be surrendered by the holder at any time or revoked by the Commissioner if conditions on the permit are not observed, or if the permit holder ceases to occupy the premises concerned.

The Bill contains the usual but necessary provisions detailing the committee's functions, voting procedures, members' terms of appointment, and the methods of making application for and approving of permits. Power is provided to revoke a permit or surrender it and for a person aggrieved by a decision on a permit to appeal to the Minister.

Because the police will not be involved in the general administration of the Act, nor in always conducting any prosecutions, power is provided to authorise other persons or classes of person to carry out the monitoring of the provisions of the Act and conduct any prosecutions considered necessary.

Provision has been left, however, for a police officer to still prosecute on behalf of the department when so authorised.

It is believed the measures in this Bill will provide significant assistance in the fight against the spread of AIDS through the general community.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. John Williams.

## **WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Employment and Training), read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**HON. PETER DOWDING** (North—Minister for Employment and Training) [11.08 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The proposed changes contained in this Bill relate to four law-enforcement aspects of the Wildlife Conservation Act.

The present penalties in the Act have not been changed since 1967 and are clearly in need of adjustment. This need was highlighted late last year in the case of two Americans convicted of nest-robbing. Although the eggs were reportedly worth \$75 000 on the overseas market, the maximum fine which could be imposed under the existing scale of penalties was only \$1 200. There was widespread community support for increased penalties when the proposal was announced earlier this year.

Two of the remaining changes remove anomalies relating to the possession of fauna. In the first instance, the Act currently prescribes a higher level of penalty for an offence which involves the unlawful taking of rare fauna, but does not prescribe a similar penalty for an offence which involves the unlawful possession of such fauna. The penalties for both these offences should be identical. The proposed amendments will achieve this. Secondly, it is currently an offence to possess the skin or carcase of protected fauna unless lawfully taken, but is not an offence to possess a live specimen. The proposed amendments correct this anomaly.

The other amendment extends the period in which proceedings for offences may be made. At the present time, complaints must be made within six months from the time when offences against the Act occur. This has presented problems where complex and time-consuming investigations are involved, where offenders have been difficult to trace, or where serious offences are not detected within six months of the event. Similar problems were experienced under the Fisheries Act before it was amended in 1982 to extend the period to two years.

The proposed amendments will result in significant improvements in the area of wildlife law enforcement.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. A. A. Lewis.

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.09 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 24 September at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: ORDINARY

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [11.10 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

#### *Interest Rates: Government Assistance*

**HON. NEIL OLIVER** (West) [11.11 p.m.]: I draw the attention of members to a statement relating to housing interest rates which emanated from the Department of Premier and Cabinet today. It is probably the most badly targeted, ill-conceived, and economically inefficient housing scheme that has ever been introduced in Australia. It was made because housing interest rates have risen to an almost all-time high. That is contrary to statements which were made this year by the Prime Minister, the Premier, the Federal Treasurer, and the Minister for Housing, which built up false hopes for homeowners. They said that interest rates would fall. To the contrary, they have skyrocketed. Today we have seen an artificial money scheme introduced in an attempt to manipulate the money market; and we all know those schemes fail.

The proposal put forward by the Premier is that an estimated 40 000 families will receive help from the State Government with their mortgage repayments. It is suggested that the assistance will wipe out the expected building society interest rate rises which are expected within the next few weeks. We are not surprised that building societies have decided to put up their interest rates. We are more surprised that those interest rates did not go up four weeks ago, because never have I seen Commonwealth Bank interest rates or any other bank interest rate increase without building society interest rates rising accordingly. Nor have I ever seen a statement by a bank that it is considering altering interest rates without a comment being made by the building societies. Until today there has been no comment from building societies about interest rates.

The proposal provides for the Government to assist borrowers by depositing taxpayers' funds with the societies at preferred rates of interest. The Treasury will deposit taxpayers' funds with building societies at artificially lower interest rates to a lower level than the rates that would be provided to normal depositors—that is, the Government will spend taxpayers' money which is raised right across this State to benefit 40 000 homeowners with existing mortgages. This proposal will enable building societies to reduce the cost of money lent by the societies to homebuyers by three-quarters of a percentage point, and the assistance will be given to all existing homeowners who are occupying their homes.

It will be made available not to new home buyers but only to those who have existing home loans. It will not be available to Western Australians who have worked hard and paid off their mortgages. It will be available only to those people who have existing home loan mortgages.

**Hon. D. J. Wordsworth**: What is the total amount of outstanding loans?

**Hon. NEIL OLIVER**: I am not aware of it.

**Hon. D. K. Dans**: When was this scheme announced?

**Hon. NEIL OLIVER**: It was announced this afternoon. It was announced at a Press conference at which the Premier presided. With him were members of the building societies. The President of the Permanent Building Societies of Western Australia, Mr Ray Turner, was on his right. On his left was the President of the Perth Building Society, Mr Brian Mickel. Another member of the building societies present was Mr Bert Dolan, who is the General Manager of the Home Building Society. I also saw Mr Robert Brown who, I understand, is the Assistant General Manager of the First Federal Building Society, and Mr Jack Richards from Statewide Building Society.

**Hon. N. F. Moore**: You would think the Premier would have told the Cabinet about it.

**Hon. NEIL OLIVER**: It is interesting that nobody else had been told about it. Neither the Master Builders Association nor the Housing Industry of Australia nor the Real Estate Institute was consulted. In view of the fact that the cost of this proposal may amount to \$75 million initially and could amount to \$100 million, surely those bodies should have been consulted. This decision was made by our Premier, Mr Burke, without even some mem-



bers of the Cabinet knowing. Mr Burke is this week on another spending spree of buying votes. That is all this measure is; it is a straight-out political stunt. It will strike at the very heart of those people who aspire to buying a home. It will strike at the very heart of those people who want to take the first step up the ladder to buying a home. It will strike at the very heart of those people in Homeswest homes who would like to make the choice of taking that first step up the ladder. It is a measure which will strike at the very Labor voters those on the Government side of the House say they represent. Represent? They do not represent anybody in the welfare area. Those who do well under this Government are those who are not income tested. The Government is proposing a subsidy scheme for people without any income test for the purpose of buying votes.

Those people in Homeswest houses wanting to buy their own homes will not get this subsidised interest rate. They will have to pay the market rate which will be at least three-quarters of a per cent higher. Therefore, they will have to have a higher weekly wage to comply with eligibility requirements for a loan and a higher deposit. That has been brought about by this Labor Government which is supposed to be looking after the welfare of the people of this State. This will not be the end of the matter; it is only a temporary move. Interest rates under this Government will continue to rise. In fact, the President of the Permanent Building Society when questioned this afternoon said that interest rates would continue to rise. There is hope that after the June quarter leading into October 1986 there will be a decline in interest rates.

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: It is one of the reasons that this vote buying spree is on, just in case there are a few mortgagee sales and this Government will get bad publicity before the next election. It has nothing to do with helping home buyers.

I will take this a step further and say that it will really hit those people who are in need. I would like to hear Hon. Lyla Elliott's com-

ments on this matter. We know that in Australia today some 350 000 Australian families are living in rented accommodation, not owned by the Government, and that their rental repayments represent 50 per cent of their net income. I defy any member of the Labor Party on the opposite side of the House to tell me how a person can live on the 50 per cent of his net income which remains after paying rent. What is left?

Under the scheme introduced today, the people in Western Australia who are currently paying off an existing mortgage on their residence will no longer consider changing house. Apart from teachers or policemen who need to transfer their place of residence because of their employment, the people occupying homes with an existing mortgage will not move to another home. They will not upgrade or downgrade to another property because if they do so the interest rate on their mortgage will be increased by 0.75 per cent or even more. Therefore, they will stay in their present home. What will be the effect on the real estate market in Perth? It will stagnate.

A Government member: All you are worried about is the real estate market.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The Government cannot understand that its policy is a two-edged sword. It has not been thought through.

A further point is that it is putting on the line the jobs of 80 000 employees of the biggest single industry in this State—the housing industry. I want to know who will buy a new home and take the first step of entering into a building contract if the interest rate will be higher than it is on their present home and the repayments exceed the charges for rental accommodation in a Homeswest home. Therefore, the scheme is basically ill-conceived and badly targeted; it will give no relief to those people on fixed incomes. The only thing that will come from this is total disaster at the expense of the people who really need homes in this State. It is simply for the benefit of Brian Burke to enable him to buy votes.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

109 and 141. *Postponed.*

### TAXES AND CHARGES: DEATH DUTIES

#### *Deceased Persons: Probate Applications*

142. Hon. I. G. MEDCALF, to the Attorney General:

In view of the fact that there is no liability for death duties in WA, why is it still necessary to file sworn particulars of the assets and liabilities of deceased persons in applications for probate?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

There are two reasons—

- (i) To place on record details of the deceased estate which can then be made available, on application and payment of a fee, to interested parties, such as next-of-kin or beneficiaries; and
- (ii) in cases of intestacy, to enable the registrar to make necessary decisions regarding security—for instance, to protect the interests of children under the age of 18 years.

### ROAD

#### *Lord Street, Bassendean: Widening*

143. Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Are there any plans to widen Lord Street, Bassendean between Morley Drive and Walter Road?
- (2) If so—
  - (a) when is it planned that the work will be carried out; and
  - (b) what is the size of the area involved?
- (3) Will resumption of private property be necessary?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (3) The metropolitan region scheme defines Lord Street as an important regional road and the section between

Morley Drive and Walter Road is under the control of the Bassendean Town Council.

As far as I am aware, the council has no plans to carry out any construction work in the near future. Planning issues would be resolved by the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the council.

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

#### *Seaman Inquiry: Financial Assistance*

144. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Was any limit set as to the total amount of funds that could be made available by the Seaman Inquiry Liaison Committee to assist persons or organisations to lodge submissions?
- (2) If so, what was this limit?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes. Application for grants far outstripped the actual level of funding provided.
- (2) Total grants paid amounted to \$466 626.

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS: LAND RIGHTS

#### *Seaman Inquiry: Submissions*

145. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) Are all of the submissions made to the Seaman Inquiry still available for public perusal, in their original form?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If so, where are they located?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) All submissions which had previously been made available to the public during the course of the Aboriginal land inquiry can still be viewed at the office of the Aboriginal Affairs Planning Authority.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) As above.

146 and 147. *Postponed.*

## HORTICULTURE: GRAPES

*Seminar: Swan Valley*

148. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is a two day seminar into the production, promotion and marketing of Western Australian table grapes planned to be held in the Swan Valley?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), who will organise this seminar and is it intended that any members of the Cabinet will attend?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1), have invitations been issued, and if so, will local members also be invited?
- (4) If "Yes" to (1), what date/s have been set aside, if at all, for the seminar?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Department of Agriculture and Rural and Allied Industries Council; yes.
- (3) Yes; yes.
- (4) 25 and 26 September at Mulberry Farm, Caversham.

149. *Postponed.*

## HORTICULTURE

*Grapes: Cuttings*

150. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many vine cuttings were supplied, by varieties, from the Swan Research Station during the current season to grape growers?
- (2) How many cuttings are planned for release, by varieties, from the Swan Research Station next season?
- (3) Will cuttings be available from any other Government source?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Rootstocks
  - Ramsey—4 400
  - 34 EM—3 000
  - Schwarzmann—2 500
  - Wine Grapes
  - Chardonnay—11 400
  - Merlot—2 200
  - Pinot Noir—1 975
  - Cabernet Franc—1 950

Verdot—25

Sauvignon Blanc—2 140

Cabernet Sauvignon—1 900

Verdelho—2 000

Rhine Riesling—2 200

Traminer—600

Shiraz—10

Grenache—110

Chenin Blanc—25

Gamay—280

Tita Cao—60

Souzao—50

Tourigal—650

Table Grapes

Ruby Seedless—350

Flame Seedless—Mainly distributed as buds estimated 6 500

Cardinal—685

Italia—775

Sultana—270

Ribier—80

Queen—620

Red Prince—160

Black Muscat—6

Gordo Muscat—400

Waltham Cross—100

Emperor—380

Santa Paula—20

Perlette—90

Hunisa—10

Madeleine—100

Chassalas—120

- (2) Release determined by demand and availability of new material.
- (3) Other Department of Agriculture research stations, depending on demand.

## HORTICULTURE

*Grapes: Rooted Vines*

151. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many rooted vines were supplied, by varieties, from the Swan Research Station during the current season to grape growers?
- (2) How many rooted vines are planned to be supplied, by varieties, from the Swan Research Station next season to grape growers?
- (3) Will rooted vines be available from any other Government source to grape growers?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Ramsey—6 000  
34 EM—12 000  
Schwarzmann—11 000
- (2) Estimated availability:  
Ramsey—5 000  
34 EM—10 000  
Schwarzmann—10 000
- (3) Not to my knowledge.

### CRIME

#### *Car Thefts: North Metropolitan Province*

152. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What are the reported car thefts for the following police stations for the last three years—
  - (a) Scarborough;
  - (b) Innaloo;
  - (c) Wanneroo;
  - (d) Warwick; and
  - (e) Nollamara?
- (2) What is the number of solved car theft cases for the same period?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The information is not readily available and would take considerable time to compile.

153. *Postponed.*

### CRIME

#### *Neighbourhood Watch Scheme: Establishment*

154. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What police or other personal resources are there involved in the establishment of the neighbourhood watch programmes in WA?
- (2) What funds have been expended to neighbourhood watch schemes in each year since the pilot programme was established?
- (3) Of the funds expended what amounts have come from corporate sponsors?
- (4) What are the names and what are the contributions from each of these sponsors?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) One police officer is involved full time. Other personnel are involved as part of normal duties.
- (2) (a) Departmental expenditure—  
1982-83—\$10 207  
1983-84—\$10 379  
1984-85—\$11 152  
(b) Private sponsorship—  
1982-83—\$5 000  
1983-84—\$30 000  
1984-85—Nil.
- (3) \$35 000.
- (4) The Royal Automobile Club of WA (Inc), \$35 000.

### CRIME

#### *Neighbourhood Watch Scheme: Establishment*

155. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) How many neighbourhood watch programmes have been established in WA?
- (2) On what date was each scheme established?
- (3) How many people are there in each of the programmes?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) 6.
- (2) 27 October 1982—Bunbury  
1 March 1984—Geraldton  
12 November 1984—East Fremantle  
14 February 1985—Kalgoorlie  
30 April 1985—Albany  
11 September 1985—Gosnells
- (3) Not known, however the estimated population as at 30 June 1984 for each of the respective local government area was—  
Bunbury—23 940 persons  
Geraldton (including Greenough Shire)—24 790 persons  
East Fremantle—6 220 persons  
Kalgoorlie (including Boulder)—22 200 persons  
Albany (town and shire)—22 420 persons  
Gosnells—59 150 persons

156 to 159. *Postponed.*

## HOUSING

*Rental: Driveway Extension*

160. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Housing:

I refer to my letter to him of 21 August 1985 regarding the extension of a tenant's driveway in order to achieve greater security, and ask whether a decision has been made on the matter?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I apologise for not replying earlier to the member on this matter. However, following receipt of the letter I requested an investigation of the matter which revealed that there are technical problems associated with the acute slope of the land, with attendant financial implications. Those problems indicated that on the face of it the requested improvement could not be effected.

However, having regard to the problems the tenant is experiencing I requested further investigation and report to ascertain whether an alternative solution to the problem could be achieved. I will advise the member as soon as this prospect has been investigated.

## SPORT AND RECREATION

*South West Games: Allocation*

161. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Sport and Recreation:

- (1) Was an amount of \$250 000 allocated for the South West Games?
- (2) Has this amount been exceeded and, if so, by what amount?
- (3) What is the reason for the excess?
- (4) Is there to be a similar allocation for similar purposes in other regions of the State?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) No.
- (3) and (4) Not applicable.

## CRIME: BREAKING AND ENTERING

*Schools: South Central Metropolitan Province*

162. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What schools in the South Central Metropolitan Province have been broken and entered in 1984-1985?
- (2) What value is put on—
  - (a) damage to property caused by such actions; and
  - (b) goods or equipment stolen or damaged?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) This information is currently being obtained and will be available by Friday.

163 and 164. *Postponed.*

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

*Dispute: Resolution*

124. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Has the industrial dispute at the Port of Bunbury been resolved?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

The latest report I received this afternoon was that arrangements had been made for one of the ore carriers to leave, but that the substantive issue had not yet been resolved.

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

*Dispute: Shipping*

125. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I ask a further question with respect to the industrial dispute at the Port of Bunbury. What is the position of the ships standing offshore at Bunbury? Are they now allowed to enter the port?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I do not have any information other than that I have conveyed to the honourable member. I make it clear that, as the member is probably aware, the Federal commission is still

involved in a meeting with the various parties in Bunbury. I received my last report before the commission resumed this afternoon. I have no further information.

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

### *Dispute: Conference*

126. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I also ask a question with respect to the industrial dispute at the Port of Bunbury.

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a representative of the Waterside Workers Federation arrived at the hearing and proposed a conference in Sydney between the WWF, the MWU, the port authority, the AWU, the Seamen's Union, and a representative of the Western Australian Government?
- (2) If he is aware of that proposal which is being pressed at the moment, will he say whether the Western Australian Government will agree to attend such a meeting?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) I am aware that the Waterside Workers Federation has had a continuing interest in this matter. Its interest was expressed some weeks ago on the basis that mooring and unmooring in ports other than Fremantle and Bunbury was work which the WWF was handling. I am also aware that today a proposition was put for a meeting. I have indicated to the representative of the Government who has a watching brief in this matter that the Government would maintain the position that it has maintained all along of doing everything that it can consistent with the interests of the Bunbury Port Authority and the community generally to see this dispute resolved. While we have no firm proposal for a meeting, we have no firm position on such a hypothetical proposal. I understand that the director of the Office of Industrial Relations is prepared to make a representation to me in favour of the

Government's participation in such a meeting if there is a concrete agreement from all of the parties that they believe is in their interests. I make it clear that I have not given final consideration to the matter. I would want to talk with the port authority and the other participants, particularly the unions involved. I make it quite clear that the Bunbury Port Authority has the carriage of the dispute. The Government will continue to give it all the support that it deserves.

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

### *Dispute: Conference*

127. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) With respect to the same subject I ask whether the Minister, after receiving from his industrial adviser now present at the hearing advice to attend a conference in Sydney with those representatives I have already mentioned, will also insist that the Industrial Relations Commission attend that conference.

- (2) If not, why not?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) First, I do not have an industrial adviser attending the Bunbury conference. As I indicated to the honourable member, the Office of Industrial Relations, which is the adviser to me on matters of industrial relations, has an officer attending with a watching brief. Secondly, I am astounded that Hon. Gordon Masters should suggest that I insist on the Industrial Relations Commission doing anything. The difference between my Government and his is that I believe in the separation of powers. I will not insist on the Industrial Relations Commission of Western Australia doing anything. I do not understand that it would have a role in attending the meeting at this stage. However, if the commission thought it had such a role I would certainly have no objection to its attending. In fact, it would be a matter for it to decide. What I made clear is that I have not given final consideration to whether this meeting is appropriate. I am awaiting more information about the

views expressed by the various participants in the dispute and, in particular, the views of the Bunbury Port Authority, before I express the position that I would adopt.

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

### *Dispute: Conference*

128. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I ask another question of the Minister with respect to the industrial dispute at the Port of Bunbury. After the Industrial Relations Commission has given orders and made decisions, all of which have been ignored, would the Minister agree with a reported statement that a meeting such as that proposed in Sydney without the Industrial Relations Commission being present would completely and totally undermine the authority of the commission and that the presence and participation of the Western Australian Government at the Sydney conference would add to and reinforce that view?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I have made it clear to the honourable member that I have not made a final decision about it. It was a hypothetical proposal put to me and I would want more information before making a decision. Secondly, I make it clear that I have no power to nor interest in nor right to direct the Industrial Relations Commission to do anything. The commission has a role because matters have been referred to it. It seems to me that purely mischievous purposes are directing Mr Masters' mind at this time. There is no doubt that if there is a proposal which all the parties regard as a sensible one, the Government will do everything in its power to see such a proposal implemented. That is as far as I can go at this stage. We are dealing with a hypothesis: That is, that there might be a meeting. I wish to get some better information and the views of the participants, particularly those of the Bunbury Port Authority which is charged with responsibility in this case, and to which the Government is giving every support, before making a decision.

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

### *Dispute: Conference*

129. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

On the same matter, I ask the Minister whether my understanding of his previous answer is correct; namely, that he would not attend a conference in Sydney or anywhere else unless the Bunbury Port Authority agreed that such a conference was necessary.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I cannot put my answer any more clearly than I did. I have made it clear—

Hon. G. E. Masters: Say "Yes" or "No".

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The honourable member can read *Hansard*.

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

### *Alcoa of Australia Ltd*

130. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I regret that the Minister failed to answer "Yes" or "No" to the previous question. Perhaps he can do better this time.

Is the Minister aware that Alcoa of Australia Ltd has advised it will only ship through the port of Bunbury if the Australian Workers Union carries out its work at the port?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

That statement has not been made to me. I can only say to the honourable member if he sincerely wishes to see a resolution to this dispute—I take it he sees some political advantage in its continuation—

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: —we will get the port working much faster if we do not have a constant barrage of who said what and to whom as this conference proceeds.

The important thing is that the parties should feel at liberty to hold discussions before the Federal commission in a spirit of frankness and confidentiality, which is the only way in which these matters can be resolved. I do not believe one can find

any credibility in an Opposition which wants to debate each move as it proceeds during the course of the day.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

*WA Chip and Pulp Co Pty Ltd*

131. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I note that the Minister seems not to know nor to care for the previous statement I made.

I ask the Minister whether he has been made aware of the fact that the WA Chip and Pulp Co Pty Ltd say that every ship which is not loaded with woodchips for Japan would cost 66 jobs per year.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

That is not a statistic which has been drawn to my attention.

Hon. P. G. Pental: Get out of that portfolio!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

*Dispute: Commission Orders*

132. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

I ask if the Minister could answer "Yes" or "No"; that would save a lot of time.

I ask the Minister whether he will now publicly give full support to the Federal and State industrial commissions' orders relating to the Bunbury Port Authority dispute?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I have always given the fullest support to the Industrial Relations Commission and to the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and I will continue to do so. The difference between Hon. Gordon Masters and me is that my party and I fully support the system and want to see it work. We do not want to deregulate it or dismantle it on the basis that the sort of chaos which would follow would not be of benefit to the people of Western Australia or Australia.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: My record of concern for industrial relations and the Government's record for ensuring that industrial relations are conducted in an even-handed and fair way are shown to be the best way of proceeding. That is clearly demonstrated by the record, as I said yesterday.

#### PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

*Dispute: Commission Orders*

133. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

May I ask again, because I think the Minister probably did not understand my question: Will he support the Federal and State industrial commissions' orders and directions relating to the dispute at the Bunbury Port Authority? Will he support publicly the orders and the directions given by the commissions?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I cannot say it more clearly. Of course we support—

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I feel like issuing all my answers in quadruplicate so that the member can read them one after the other.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I have told the member quite clearly that we support the commission.

Hon. P. G. Pental: But not its orders.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: If we support the commission we support the processes which have occurred; and the Government and I have made that position absolutely clear.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is fine.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING: What has been said and done—

Hon. P. G. Pental: Take the rest of the day off.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: What has been said and done during the course of this question time is not directed, as Hon.



Gordon Masters would know, at challenging the commission. What he wants to do is to keep this dispute running; he does not want to see a resolution. The Government is not going to be put in the position of heating up this dispute; we are seeking its resolution. We are doing all in our power to do that and to support the Bunbury Port Authority in the interests of the people of Bunbury.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! When I call for order it means members must stop interjecting, otherwise there will be no further questions without notice.

## PORTS AND HARBOURS: BUNBURY

### *Dispute: Support for AWU*

134. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Will the Minister now publicly give full support to the Australian Workers Union in its stand and in its actions in the Bunbury Port Authority dispute? "Yes" or "No"; that is all I need.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

First of all I really do not understand the question because I have already made it clear that the Australian Workers Union has the coverage in this matter, and as the member would know if he bothered to listen yesterday, the problem is that the workers concerned on the Bunbury wharf must have been reading the Liberal Party industrial relations platform and decided to take advantage of the suggestion that Hon. Gordon Masters was making in that document that workers should be free to choose their own union. That is exactly what 14 out of 15 of the workers at Bunbury did.

I made it quite clear in all the discussions I have had that the Australian Workers Union has the coverage and the Australian Workers Union should continue to be the only union recognised by the Bunbury Port Authority; and that was the substance of the discussions that Hon. Julian Grill and I had in Bunbury. It was a most harmonious discussion.

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Despite the smears and outrageous references of members opposite, and of Mr Pental, that pedlar of untruths

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Peddling Pental, the pedlar of untrue assertions!

### *Withdrawal of Remark*

The PRESIDENT: I ask the Minister to withdraw that inference in regard to the honourable member peddling untruths.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I withdraw.

### *Questions without Notice Resumed*

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The fact is that it is totally incorrect and untrue to assert in any circumstances, as Mr Pental did by way of interjections—

Hon. G. E. Masters: You behaved very badly.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: There was no difference of opinion between myself and Hon. Julian Grill. The fact is that the two of us have been friends for many years. We worked together and we continue to work together to seek a resolution to the problems occurring in Bunbury.

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: If it were not for the Leader of the Opposition and for the fact that he has no idea about industrial relations, he would never have suggested to anyone that workers in those circumstances should be free to abandon the union which has coverage over them.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

## UNIONISTS

### *Rights: Protection*

135. Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

Will the Minister give a guarantee on behalf of the Government that he and the Government will protect the legal rights of the moderate unions and unionists against the militant trade unions and the powerful trade unions in Australia in industrial matters?

Hon. G. E. Masters: Why do you have to keep asking Mr Dans what to say?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

That is the sort of question which even Hon. Gordon Masters would know is unanswerable.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Your boss had to get up and save you and protect you, and he did it reasonably well.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Is the Leader of the Opposition going to belt up, or what?

The PRESIDENT: I am not going to tolerate the Leader of the Opposition defying my request to come to order. It is difficult enough to get through questions without notice these days without members becoming accustomed to disregarding the Chair's request for orderliness when Ministers are trying to answer questions. I have told honourable members on numerous occasions that the purpose of a session of question time in Parliament is to seek information and to receive that information. It is not a time to harass each other across the Chamber, and I will not tolerate it. If this behaviour does not cease I give members an absolute assurance that there will not be any more questions without notice. The Minister.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I support the right of unions to operate and organise within the ambit of the law and I will continue to do so. That applies to all unions.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: BUILDING SOCIETIES

### *Interest Rates: Government Assistance*

136. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House:

My question is addressed to the Leader of the House in his capacity as the most senior Cabinet Minister here and also representing the Premier. Is it a fact that a large proportion of taxpayers' funds will be deposited with building societies due to the current interest rate—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind Hon. Neil Oliver that I have given a ruling in the past that it is out of order to ask

a question without notice of a Minister in the capacity in which he is representing a Minister in another place. Perhaps I misunderstood the honourable member, but I gathered that he is asking the Leader of this House a question in his capacity as representing the Premier in another place and, therefore, that question has to be put on notice and cannot be asked without notice. Did I understand the honourable member correctly?

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: No, thank you, Mr President; my question is directed to the Leader of the House. It is as follows—

Is a large amount of taxpayers' funds to be lodged with building societies in the forthcoming two weeks?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

This question should be put on notice and directed to the Treasurer. I do not know the answer.

## HEALTH

### *Noise Abatement Regulations: Business Concern*

137. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

Could the Minister tell me whether he has received correspondence from the Geraldton Chamber of Commerce expressing the concern felt in Geraldton at the need for businesses to comply with the noise abatement regulations by 21 October, by undertaking a noise survey of premises which, in some cases, small businessmen understand will cost them between \$500 and \$1 000 at a time when they have to find money both for local rates and the Government's land tax?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

My attention was drawn to an article which appeared in a newspaper. I do not recall the name of the newspaper, but I think it was the local Geraldton newspaper. In the article there was a fairly full report of a statement made by a gentleman who I think was the president of the local chamber of commerce who made a number of, I thought, very reasonable points, in-

cluding the point that the bulk of the problem was that small business people and others who had had plenty of notice of the requirements of the regulations had not taken the time and trouble to investigate this matter earlier and, indeed, it was only at the last minute, despite having had nearly two years' notice, that they were taking their position seriously. I have already said publicly outside the House that a number of concerns have been expressed to me about the introduction of these regulations. Firstly, there is a misunderstanding about the extent to which all small businesses need to conduct a noise survey in order to comply with the regulations. By and large, it should be possible for those in small businesses who read the discussion paper that I am having widely circulated in the next few days to make a decision about whether a formal noise survey is required, and I believe that in the majority of cases, small businesses will find that a formal noise survey may not be necessary.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Good.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I will make the discussion paper available to members as soon as it is released.

Hon. G. E. Masters: It is a big issue in the country areas.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Members can then show it to the people who approach them and perhaps they can do some work in their own electorates to disseminate the information contained in it.

I have also called for a report from the Commissioner of Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare. I have asked him to outline the way in which he might deal with the prosecution provisions of those regulations to identify a possible policy towards prosecution in the early stages of the implementation of these regulations. He should recognise that there has been a lot of notice given to people and that there is a need, where people have wilfully defaulted against their obligations, to retain the right to prosecute, notwithstanding that there may be a case for ameliorating the severity

of the penalty provisions during the warming-up period, if we can call it that. I hope that that policy statement will be available well before 1 October.

I have also asked the department to give me a position paper fairly quickly on the extent to which we can help local authorities to train some of their officers in the science of noise surveys, at least superficial surveys, so that we can sort out the majority of businesses which do not need any intensive investigation, and the smaller number of businesses which might. The thought is that perhaps local authorities may be able, through some of their skilled work force, to identify those areas of particular need.

I hope to be in a position to make a more detailed statement about this matter early next week and, as soon as I can do so, I might take the opportunity of making a ministerial statement and then circulating the material to interested members.

#### FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: BUILDING SOCIETIES

##### *Interest Rates: Government Assistance*

138. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is the Leader of the House privy to the fact that up to \$150 million of taxpayers' funds are to be deposited with building societies?
- (2) If not, is that indicative that the deposit of that amount of taxpayers' funds was not referred to Cabinet for its approval?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) With due respect, that is a question which must be directed at the Treasurer. It is a question that I cannot answer. The member asked the same question a minute ago in a different form.

Hon. G. E. Masters: No, he was asking whether you were present at the Cabinet meeting.

Hon D. K. DANS: I am not here to answer questions about what happens in Cabinet. If the honourable member puts his question on notice I assure him he will receive an answer from the responsible Minister.

## HEALTH

*Noise Abatement Regulations: Notice*

139. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

I thank the Minister for his answer to my previous question. I wonder if he would agree also to the comment in the article that the Government appeared to make no effort to bring the regulations to the notice of businessmen in Geraldton, and whether he would agree that it was not until May that only some of them were made aware through the good offices of the Chamber of Commerce that the regulation existed.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I do not accept that proposition. When there is a new law or regulation there is always a problem that someone in the community does not either take it too seriously or read it; and the only way one can make absolutely certain that every single person had read these regulations would be unacceptable in terms of cost. However, I have also made it clear that despite the wide dissemination and the very lengthy period of time that business groups have been exposed to these regulations and the detail of them, there are nevertheless some business people who have not yet come to grips with the regulations. I am therefore keen to see widely disseminated the discussion paper which will be available shortly; and I would thank members opposite if they would join with me and members on this side of the House in disseminating that discussion paper as widely as possible.

## HEALTH

*Noise Abatement Regulations: Information*

140. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

I ask a question supplementary to my previous question. Would the Minister be kind enough to tell me what steps were taken to disseminate this information to businessmen because on my understanding there was great shock in Geraldton in the Chamber of Commerce meeting in May.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I have had the ministerial responsibility for this portfolio for this year alone, and when I took over that portfolio the announcements had already been made and a great deal of the consultation work had been conducted. If the member wants to pursue that in any detail I am quite happy to get an answer to a question on notice for the period for which I have no knowledge.

There have been extensive discussions with a number of peak business organisations. There has been extensive media publicity given to these regulations over a long period of time. As recently as last Thursday week there was a programme on the "National" on ABC television which gave State-wide exposure to those regulations, and there have been previous publicity items about them.

There has been a great deal of publicity and direct contact with business organisations and individual businesses and of course the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Commission, which is an advisory body, has been involved along with representatives from the Confederation of Industry, the union movement, and a number of other experts. There has been a great deal of consultation and dissemination of this information but, as I have said to Hon. Margaret McAleer, I am concerned to get greater exposure and to develop a clear policy which will enable us to deal with the introduction of these necessary but complex regulations.

## TOURISM

*Swan Valley Tourist Council: Funding*

141. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Tourism:

In view of the fact that \$150 million may elude him during a Cabinet meeting, and in view of the fact that the Minister for Budget Management is not present today, would it be possible to ask what funds are envisaged to be provided to the Swan Valley Tourist Council in the Swan Valley policy announced 14 days ago?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

I am starting to get the drift of Hon. Neil Oliver's question. I want to make one thing clear to the member, and that is that if he addresses questions to me in my portfolio responsibilities I will be able to answer them. I want to put one thing to rest. The Minister for Budget Management is not conveniently absent today. He happens to be in the Eastern States on a matter involving one of his portfolio responsibilities.

With respect to the Swan Valley release the other day I do not know what specific amounts the Tourism Commission has in mind because that particular release given by the Premier covered a range of matters. It was not just a tourist release.

Hon. Neil Oliver: That is for sure.

Hon. D. K. DANS: That is correct. If the member would like to put that question on notice, if there are any specific amounts in respect of assistance from the Tourism Commission into that region, I will obtain an answer and give a detailed reply.

## LIQUOR

### *Wine Information Centre: Details*

142. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Tourism:

I refer to question 119 regarding the Swan Valley tourism document and the wine information centre when the Minister advised me some 14 days ago that he would make me aware of who are the principals and where it is located. Is he now in a position to provide me with that information?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Despite exhaustive searches we have not been able to locate the document, particularly with the description the member gave. I think he had better find out what the full name really is because as soon as it is named I will certainly find it for him. We have spent considerable time searching for it, and no-one seems to have heard of it.

## LIQUOR

### *Wine Information Bureau: Relocation*

143. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Tourism:

I had the same problem, and when I read the document I then searched through Perth and asked various people but there was no such group; but in the document it said that an organisation of that title would be moved from its current premises to the Swan Valley and that was what was quoted. Does the Minister think it may be the Wine Information Bureau which is run at the Wine and Brandy Producers Association at the Showgrounds? They are a likely choice but they do not know about it yet.

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Neither do I.

## HEALTH

### *Noise Abatement Regulations: Enforcement*

144. Hon. MARGARET McALEER, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

If on further reflection and investigation the Minister finds reason to believe that the business people in Geraldton did not have the information prior to May; and if he receives a request from the Chamber of Commerce for a postponement or extension of time for a few months, would he give favourable consideration to an extension of time or an assurance of leniency in enforcing the regulations?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

As I said at the beginning, I have asked the commissioner to prepare a policy on prosecutions on enforcement, and when that is to hand it may answer the member's question. I am hopeful that I will have that by early next week.

## LIQUOR: WINE

### *Cellar Door Trading: Sundays*

145. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Tourism:

Is Sunday cellar door trading in the Swan Valley from vineyards a good promotion for tourism in the valley?

The PRESIDENT: The member is asking for an opinion. I ask the member to ask his question again.

### LIQUOR: WINE

#### *Cellar Door Trading: Sundays*

146. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Tourism:

Have Sunday door cellar sales from vineyards in the Swan Valley resulted in an increase in tourists?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied;

The Tourism Commission, together with other Government departments, collects all kind of statistics, but I am afraid it does not collect the statistic to which the member referred. I have some personal views on matters that have been debated in the past, particularly the Liquor Act, on which Mr Masters and I see eye to eye.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I have not seen your latest Bill.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I did say, "in the past". The short answer is that I do not know.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You and I had a pleasant trip.

Hon. D. K. DANS: We did not visit the vineyards on a Sunday—we would not have known what day it was!

The members' question is hypothetical and the statistic to which he referred would be difficult to obtain. I have always maintained that I agree with demystifying the liquor laws in this State.

### TOURISM

#### *Swan Valley Tourist Council: Meeting*

147. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Tourism:

Will the Minister indicate the date on which he represented the Premier at a meeting of the Swan Valley Tourist Council at which he said some 14 days ago that Mr Eden Clark was in the chair?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

My memory bank concerning that meeting is missing. I would have to check my diary to ascertain the date. It was an evening meeting at which I represented the Premier. I do not recollect Hon. Neil Oliver being in attendance. The meeting was attended by representatives of various community groups and was held some 12 months ago. I could say that it was held on 24 November 1984, which happens to be my birthday and perhaps that answer may satisfy the member. However, I am not prepared to speculate on that date.

### TOURISM

#### *Swan Valley Tourist Council: Consultation*

148. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) In view of the Minister's previous reply will he ensure that the Swan Valley Tourist Council is consulted in future when major documents like the Swan Valley policy document are launched?
- (2) Will the Minister now consult with the Swan Valley Tourist Council, which has not been consulted on the policies in this document?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I cannot give an assurance. The document to which the member referred was not issued by my department and the assurance which the member is seeking will have to come from the Minister responsible for the department which will issue the document.

In the field of tourism the Government has a good relationship with all local and regional groups. Constant communication is maintained on tourism matters. The document mentioned encompasses a range of matters and if one of those concerns tourism I can assure the member that it will be covered by my department.