

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, 24 April 1985

**THE PRESIDENT** (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 11.30 a.m., and read prayers.

## SUPPLY BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 23 April.

**HON. C. J. BELL** (Lower West) [11.32 a.m.]: This Bill allows me to raise several issues which are of concern to me. A number of problems confront my electorate. I want the Government to take note of a couple of the major problems in the hope that consideration will be given to them in the preparation of the next Budget.

The first matter I wish to raise relates to the Pinjarra Road which runs from Mandurah to Pinjarra. A small article appeared in the *Mandurah-Murray Telegraph* on Wednesday 3 April. It shows a picture of several damaged vehicles and the headline states, "More Pinjarra Road Victims". The article states—

A NORTH Pinjarra man was fatally injured when he was involved in a head-on collision on Pinjarra Road, North Yunderup, on Thursday morning.

Gary Michael Wood, 23, of North Pinjarra died when his car collided with another vehicle driven by Thorold Renfred Peppingill, 55, of Mandurah.

Mr Peppingill is in Royal Perth Hospital in a serious condition.

Later on Thursday morning, two women were lucky to escape with minor injuries when their cars collided on Pinjarra Road.

The impact of the collision caused one vehicle to veer across the road into the path of an oncoming truck carrying horses.

The truck overturned, but both driver and horses escaped without injury.

Since the summer, there have been three fatal accidents and several accidents involving multiple fatalities on that road. The road is rapidly gaining a reputation for being a horror stretch. Perhaps it is gaining a reputation similar to that of the Kalgoorlie-Kambalda road some years ago.

It is a major traffic route for vehicles servicing the Alcoa of Australia Ltd. alumina refineries at Pinjarra and Wagerup and for the workers in those plants. Most of those workers reside in the Mandurah district and travel along that road in

numbers at particular times of the day. The situation is becoming unacceptable to the local community. Three young people were killed on that road earlier in the year and another has been killed since. Another person was killed last week.

When speaking to the Budget, I said the road required substantial servicing. I know that the Minister had a look at it and has some sympathy for the problem. However, I bring this matter, once again, to the attention of the Minister and Government members. The road is causing a great loss of life and many injuries to people travelling it. I hope the Government will find it possible to allocate a substantial sum of money to this road to allow for its upgrading ultimately to a four-lane highway because, until that is done, the road will continue to be very dangerous and there will be further bereavement in the homes of Pinjarra and Mandurah. Because of the importance of the two alumina refineries, traffic along that road is not likely to decrease; in fact, it is likely to increase. It will be a step forward for this Government if it does something to improve the condition of that road.

The next matter about which I wish to speak is education in the Lower West Province. Two schools in that area are desperately in need of attention. Their needs have been pushed backwards and forwards for many years. It has been agreed that something needs to be done but nothing has been done for so long it is no longer funny. The situation is grave.

Unfortunately, in one area, personalities have become involved to the detriment of the children. I hope that can be put aside and the real needs of Waroona Primary School considered. The school is old and dilapidated. It is on the main highway. There has been continual talk for at least six years about shifting it. The previous Government set aside a block of land which had to be rezoned to allow for the resiting of the school.

It was done by the local authority at the request of the previous Government. This year, when the situation came up again, the member for Murray-Wellington (John Bradshaw) raised the issue with the Minister for Education who said that the major cause for the delay appeared to be the problem of arriving at a fair value for the land. He accused the local authority of inflating the value of the land which had previously been rural, but which was being subdivided for educational purposes and he found that unacceptable.

I do not have the exact figures applicable to that land but I can assure members that land in that area is very desirable and it is at a premium. Land is being sold for hobby farms at a higher price

than the current owners have requested. I understand that the Government is intending to resume that land in order to decrease its value.

The land is situated alongside sporting facilities and a new indoor recreational centre and on the other side of those facilities is the high school. No better site is available and the Government is playing around and arguing over peanuts. If it were buying a site for a school in the metropolitan area it would pay 10 times as much for the land.

The proposed site stands adjacent to the town's recreational area and it will decrease the cost to the Education Department or the Building Management Authority to provide sporting facilities for the children of the school.

The land is worth more than the fair market value. Personalities should be taken out of the situation in order that those concerned can get on and do something to improve that school.

The existing school is detrimental to the children of Waroona who have no particular political axe to grind. All they want to do is to become educated so that they can take their place in our community when they become older. The way the situation has been handled is somewhat of a scandal and it grieves me to see the future of these children being played with.

Another matter I wish to raise concerns the Pinjarra High School, the site of which is unsatisfactory. The school buildings are inadequate and need substantial upgrading. The school stands adjacent to the South Western Highway and because of the traffic noise, which is accentuated by vehicles stopping at a crosswalk immediately outside the school, at certain times of the day it is almost impossible for teachers to conduct their classes properly.

Hon. Lyla Elliott would know something about this matter because I am aware that she spent some time at Waroona and has a fair knowledge of the Pinjarra High School.

The rapid industrialisation of the Pinjarra area has resulted in heavy traffic traversing the highway to service Worsley and this has caused an intolerable situation at that school.

I recently wrote to the Minister for Transport and asked him to consider, as early as possible, a proposal to erect a bypass road at Pinjarra. This would alleviate the noise problem at the school.

I also requested the Minister for Education to proceed forthwith to upgrade the facilities at the school. As a result of the condition of the school there is no reason that there should be any delay in upgrading the facilities. The school is situated on a very small block and the facilities should be made

acceptable and not left to languish in a state which, I believe, is below the level to which Western Australians have become accustomed.

The third school which I wish to mention is the Boddington school which is an old timber building with high ceilings and wooden verandahs and which has been built on a sloping block. The school has run out of space and it is trying to conduct its manual arts class in a small room which has in it 16 workbenches, a couple of lathes, and oxy and arc-welding equipment. The opinion of the teachers is that it is quite farcical to conduct manual arts classes in that type of situation.

A small ex-washroom is used by teachers in an attempt to teach home economics to the students. Currently the teachers are working towards obtaining the use of a storeroom in order to expand the home economics area by getting the children to close in the undercroft of the school in order that it can be used for a storage area.

The Boddington school was upgraded five years ago, but so little has been done to the other schools I have mentioned that it represents a scandalous situation. I do not intend to carry those points further, but I ask the Ministers concerned and Government members to take note of my concerns in order that something is done to improve the lot of the children in those schools for the forthcoming year.

I turn now to an area which I consider to be my industry. Members might call me egotistical, but as I was a dairy industry leader in WA from 1972-83, and because I was born on a dairy farm and have been on a dairy farm all my life, I have some knowledge of the concerns which are confronting the industry today.

I own a dairy farm and my son wants to inherit it. He currently operates it and does it well; yet I see the situation arising where the dairy industry in Western Australia will be in extreme jeopardy.

I want to make a couple of points so that members are not in any doubt as to what the real situation is in the dairy industry of Western Australia. On the front page of yesterday's *Daily News* there was an article about the effect on the community of the proposed increase in the price of petrol. The article reads as follows—

Delivery costs will affect the milk industry, according to Geoff Sansom, the chief executive of the Peters Group.

A two cent increase in milk would be needed to cover the increased fuel costs, as well as the rising cost of imported milk cartons.

There needs to be a guarantee of a price rise of 2c a litre to cover the recent increase in the price of petrol, a rise of 2c a litre to cover the proposed national dairy industry levy, and a further increase of at least 3c a litre to assist the producers in the industry to maintain their viability.

It grieves me to say that, for the first time in the 22 years I have run my farm, last year it ran at a tax loss. I know what comment Tom Stephens will make, but I have no intention of running my farm at a loss.

According to a farm management consultant, I happen to have one of the best farms in the south-west. My management has always been considered top-class. We had an operating surplus, but after taking into account depreciation and other factors, we finished up with a net loss. The fact that one of the best farms in the south-west operated at a loss indicates just how perilous the situation for this industry is, even without the imposition of additional charges.

The Federal proposals would have such a gross impact on Western Australia that it needs to be understood by every member of the Government, every member of the Opposition, and by every Federal member of Parliament. I raise that issue because it has been of great concern to me. I have had what might be called a running confrontation with the Federal member for Brand, Mrs Fatin. As she is on the Federal rural Caucus committee, it is important that she understands what is going on and what the impact of the Federal proposals would be. She is the only Labor member in Federal Parliament who has dairy farmers in her electorate. I plead with Government members to speak to the lady to try to get her to understand just how important this is for her electorate and for Western Australia as a whole.

Hon. Tom Stephens: She is not the only Western Australian Labor member.

Hon. C. J. BELL: She is the only Western Australian Labor member who has part of the dairy industry in her electorate. She was interviewed in an article in the *Coastal District Times* and that article was circulated to all south-west newspapers. It appeared in the *Coastal District Times* of Thursday, 4 April, and was headed, "Fatin: Dairy plan to boost profits". It reads—

BRAND MHR Wendy Fatin says the Federal Government's new dairy industry plan will improve efficiency and profitability.

The dairy industry needed restructuring and if the new arrangements were not implemented the industry would continue to suffer, she said.

Mrs Fatin came under fire last week for not defending the farmers in her electorate, who believed they would be forced out of business by the new policies.

She said that lifting complex and intense regulation would allow the industry to move towards a more market-orientated approach.

"The Government is aware that moves to completely and immediately remove all Federal support to the dairy industry would cause unnecessary hardship as well as social and economic disruption," said Mrs Fatin.

"Bearing that in mind the Government has decided to introduce a new market support mechanism that sets support in the first year of current levels then adjust support in subsequent years as production levels change."

She refuted the attack against her last week by Lower West Province MLC Colin Bell. Mrs Fatin said that Mr Bell was ill-informed about the new arrangements.

She criticised him for suggesting that she was not supporting farmers in her electorate.

"If Mr Bell had kept in touch with the people who have been negotiating for the WA industry, he would have known that I have been in regular contact with Agriculture Minister Dave Evans and WA Primary Industry Association chairman Mr Partridge," said Mrs Fatin.

"I initiated contact with Mr Partridge earlier in the year and have kept him fully informed of developments since then.

"I attended the dairy section seminar and conference in Bunbury on March 5 and flew to Canberra the next day to represent the WA industry's point of view at a meeting with Federal Minister John Kerin.

"I have also had a special meeting with Mr Partridge and Finance Minister Peter Walsh at which the WA position was examined in great detail," said Mrs Fatin.

She had circulated an explanatory paper about the new arrangements as soon as they were announced. These details had been ignored by Mr Bell and others who seemed unconcerned about the overall interests of the dairy industry, she said.

The new market support mechanisms would be financed by a levy on milk production of about 1.5 cents a litre in the first year and current levies on butter and cheese that would eventually be phased out.

The levies on butter and cheese would be substantially lower than at present and progressively reduced.

"Levies on other products—skim and wholemilk powder and casein—will be abolished because with the introduction of the all milk levy, they won't be required to maintain farmers' returns," said Mrs Fatin.

"The Government's decision will benefit the efficient farmer and manufacturer through improved profitability.

"The consumer and the nation's economy will benefit through lower prices.

"As well the Government's package of action, which includes assistance to manufacturers, will minimise the adverse effect on communities of the inevitable change which is facing the industry."

The market-orientated Federal arrangements did not interfere with the existing State regulations on the production and distribution of fluid milk for human consumption, said Mrs Fatin.

That is the biggest heap of hogwash the industry has ever heard.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Before you go on, could I just remind you that the Federal member for Kalgoorlie also has at least one dairy farm in his electorate.

Hon. C. J. BELL: I think that is fairly inconsequential. Mrs Fatin has in excess of 300 dairy farmers in her electorate. The New South Wales irrigators association and a committee from the University of New South Wales recently concluded that the average farm had an employment generation factor of 5:1. It was estimated that an average of 1.5 to 1.8 labour units are employed on a farm, three labour units in the local region, and two in the capital city. That is the impact of agriculture on the economy—a 5:1 ratio.

We will effectively dismantle the Western Australian dairy industry with this levy. The minimum levy is 1.5c and the maximum is 2c. The maximum levy has had to be applied to do anything significant for the Victorian producers. Thus the levy cannot be anything less than 2c. The consumers in Western Australia have no option but to pay another 2c because Western Australian dairy farmers are going into a deficit situation. There will be a net cash loss on the actual operation level.

I refer to a Bureau of Agricultural Economics paper presented at the National Agricultural Outlook Conference. In table 3 which details the

components of investment returns by industry in 1984-85, Onko Kingma, an assistant director of the bureau, estimated that the rate of return to capital and management for dairy farms would be \$13 438. That is not really a good situation. The actual farm cash operating surplus for dairy industries in the next year is estimated to be \$18 775. When we consider that the opening rate of equity in the farm is \$465 357 and that 1.8 labour units are employed on an average farm, \$18 775 does not go far even in satisfying payment for labour let alone giving some return for the equity in the industry.

That is the projection for the forthcoming year. Why should that be? It could be said that if the situation is that bad we should get out of the industry. Perhaps we should look at just one of the comments made by Mr Kerin in Ottawa recently. In an article in the 21 March 1985 edition of the *Countryman*, under the headline, "Kerin says EEC is a 'predator'", the following is recorded—

Canada and Australia had common interests in working together to prevent the European Economic Community corrupting markets for farm products and then blackmailing itself in to those markets, the Australian Minister for Primary Industry, John Kerin, said here.

I will not read the rest of the article, but I will table the paper. It is quite clear that the Federal Minister for Primary Industry says one thing overseas, but another back here. Here he says that the Government should impose the same ridiculous prices that the European Economic Community, as the "predator", imposes on the Australian dairy industry.

To ensure that I am not just speaking totally parochially, I will read from the *Western Farmer* of 21 March, page 5, as follows—

ADIC chairman John Bennet was stinging in his condemnation of what is believed to be Mr Kerin's plan, describing some of the cost figures quoted by the minister as "a figment of Mr Kerin's imagination, a fairy tale".

And to underline the potential for a bitter clash between Mr Kerin and the state governments and industry alliance, NSW Agriculture Minister Jack Hallam told Mr Kerin on Tuesday that the NSW Government would refuse to collect the farmer levies needed under the Kerin plan.

Of course Mr Hallam is a Labor Minister in the New South Wales Government. That gives some support to how unbelievable is this proposal of Mrs Fatin. She says it is good and desirable.

I also quote Mr Partridge, the president of the dairy section of the PIA, who succeeded me in that position. He said—

The Australian Dairy Industry Conference called it a "cheap con-trick" to pull down the States' market milk pricing structure.

The Primary Industry Association Dairy Section President, Mr David Partridge, accused the Government of trading the dairy industry off for New Zealand cars and steel.

Let me assure members that if that plan is implemented—and Mr Kerin is adamant it will be—Western Australian consumers will not have a constant supply of fresh milk. Under the proposals there is no way that fresh milk will be constantly available in Western Australia.

The plan calls for a 2c rise. A penalty is structured into that system whereby if the price of liquid milk is pushed up to compensate, the price of manufactured milk goes down to pull the industry's income down to a commensurate level. What he says is, "We have got you, you are not going to get away with it; we will absolutely tear down the industry in Australia, particularly in the smaller States; we will destroy you".

In Mrs Fatin's electorate some 1 800 jobs are potentially on the line, and she supports the destruction of those jobs. She supports the destruction of the supply of fresh milk to Western Australian consumers. It disgusts me that a member purporting to represent her electorate can do that.

I am extremely pleased to see Mr Burke and Mr Evans coming out in support of the position of Western Australians. I shall read from the *Coastal Districts Times* of 18 April. This is a Press release from me in which I quote a couple of facts. Under the headline "Premier's support pleases Bell" the article reads

PREMIER Brian Burke's announcement that he will stand up to the Federal Government on the dairy issue has left Lower West Province MLC Colin Bell in a jubilant mood.

"It clearly and absolutely vindicates my stand from the start," he said.

"Brian Burke has said that the new plan will place financial pressures on the dairy farmers and Agriculture Minister David Evans has called for the release of information on the social and economic impact of the proposed changes.

"These should be publicised," he said, applauding the State Premier's support for the industry.

"When even the Premier opposes the proposed new marketing plans it leaves Wendy Fatin, Member for Brand, in a position of isolation," he said.

I will not quote any more of that article, but I will table it also.

I will now read a letter which has been published in the paper so that I can put forward opinions from some others in the community. This is a letter to the *Coastal Districts Times* under the headline "Advice for Mrs Fatin", which states—

IN recent weeks you have printed articles from politicians about the Federal Agriculture Minister John Kerin's most recent plan for the dairy industry.

One was from MLC Colin Bell attacking the arrangements and the other from MHR Mrs Wendy Fatin defending them.

I have also read in *The West Australian* a statement by the State Agriculture Minister Dave Evans on the same issue.

I suggest that Mrs Fatin should also read Mr Evans' statement.

Mr Bell, a Liberal MP, and Mr Evans a Labor MP say the new arrangements will "destroy" and "devastate" the dairy industry in Western Australia, a view shared by those within the industry.

On the other hand, Mrs Fatin, who is a member of the Labor Caucus rural committee which endorsed the new arrangements, says they will be of "benefit".

Surely she must be joking. Or is she desperately trying to defend herself for allowing her Federal colleagues to impose the "kiss of death" on West Australian dairy farmers?

Mr Bell and Mr Evans see the new arrangements for what they are—an attempt to prop up Victorian over-production, a blatant raid on an already efficient dairy sector in Western Australia to pay for mistakes and bungling in the East.

Mr Bell deserves commendation for his stand on behalf of West Australian dairy farmers.

Mrs Fatin should talk to dairy farmers in Western Australia and find out at what cost in dollars and at what cost in jobs will the new arrangements bring so-called "benefits".

A discussion with Mr Evans may help convince her to review her position and represent local interests, not those of an Eastern States-dominated caucus committee.

That letter was written by Marie Dilley who does not belong to the Liberal Party. I think the two members behind me might have some knowledge of Mrs Dilley.

Mrs Fatin reiterated her support; I quote again from the *Mandurah Telegraph*—

BRAND MHR Wendy Fatin has responded to comments made by Lower West Province MLC, Colin Bell, that she was not supporting farmers in the Brand electorate.

"If Mr Bell had kept in touch with the people who have been negotiating for the Western Australian industry, he would know that I have been in regular contact with the State Minister Dave Evans and the chairman of the Primary Industry Association, Mr Partridge," Mrs Fatin said.

She then claimed to have been to the dairy section seminar and conference. That is an untruth. She went to the seminar on the first day, but she was absent from the conference on the second day when vital decisions were made.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: She still attended the seminar.

Hon. C. J. BELL: She attended the seminar but no decisions were made at the seminar. It was an information-gathering place. The decisions were actually made on the second day during the conference, which is the normal way any industry runs its affairs.

Another quote from the *Daily News* of Wednesday 27 March, page 36, under the headline "Federal Milk Plan 'Devious'" reads as follows—

WA dairy farmers will refuse to pay for a Federal Government plan to cut back Australian milk production.

Producers' spokesman Mr David Partridge said South-West farmers would turn over milk tankers if the proposal started an interstate sales war.

Mr Partridge described a plan by the Primary Industry Minister, Mr Kerin to restructure the industry and phase out Government support as "devious and potentially dangerous."

The plan, aimed at stabilising milk production and marketing, would force a reduction in milk returns from 30 cents a litre for fresh milk to 16 cents a litre—and at that price WA dairy farmers could not survive.

"If it happens, the public could not expect any fresh milk," Mr Partridge said.

"Under the Federal plan, WA producers will immediately lose an average of \$6 000 per farm.

"The formula will encourage, and even force, interstate trade.

"There will be a great incentive for Victoria to dump surplus milk on the WA market."

The Minister for Agriculture, Mr Evans, said he would meet WA dairy industry representatives next week for talks on the plan.

The scheme would effectively force WA producers to subsidise uneconomic exports.

This was unjust when WA did not export dairy products.

Mr Kerin said the plan would benefit the efficient farmer and manufacturer through improved profitability.

How can one take money from a person and tell him he will increase his profits? It is farcical. The fact that Mr Kerin is a former BAE economist comes through. He has no idea. I think he said if the farmers became more efficient they would do all the right things. If he wants I will offer him a farm to lease for two years. He can farm it himself and show how good he is. He is not as good as the vast majority of producers in the south-west. I would like him to put his money where his mouth is, because I know he cannot do it.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: The farmers think he is good.

Hon. C. J. BELL: I would like to see where he got that support. Approximately 8 000 farmers demonstrated in front of Parliament House that they were not pleased with Mr Kerin.

Hon. Mark Nevill: How many dairy farmers did the previous Victorian Government settle in Gippsland?

Hon. C. J. BELL: Under an incentive scheme, the previous Victorian Government settled a number of farmers in Gippsland, but I did not agree with that scheme. Indeed, the Labor Government in Victoria has done much to the detriment of the dairy industry as a whole. The Victorian Government phased out contracts and said that would improve the position of the dairy industry, but it added about 3c a litre to the farm price of milk. In other words, the Victorian Government told the dairy farmers in Victoria that, instead of being worth 13c a litre, milk was worth 16c a litre. Based on that, farmers produced more milk, because they thought it was worth 16c a litre when in fact it was worth only 13c a litre. The position would have been overcome had the ADIC's proposals been adopted.

The Minister for Agriculture supports this stand and I hope he will not waver. I hope also that the Premier will not waver in this respect. I hope that members opposite will not waver and that they will insist on telling their Federal colleagues that the Federal Government's proposal is dangerous and stupid, and will be detrimental to the industry in Western Australia. Let there be no mistake about that.

Just in case members think that the Victorian situation is desirable, I shall quote from *The West Australian* of 15 March. Two articles appeared in the Press recently which referred to the fact that dairy farmers would blockade the border if the Government attempted to bring milk across it. The article reads as follows—

Victorian milk-industry leaders yesterday accused the Federal Government and the Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Kerin, of a doublecross on moves for a national milk-marketing plan.

They said that, despite agreement on strategy last month between industry representatives and governments in all States, they believed that the Federal Cabinet was ready to adopt another scheme which would pit farmer against farmer and destroy the dairy industry.

The Australian Dairy Industry Conference chairman, Mr John Bennett, joined other farming leaders including the United Dairy Farmers of Victoria chief, Mr Bill Pyle, in warning that the Federal Government was ready to opt for the uncirculated Kerin plan next Wednesday.

Mr Bennett said leaked details of the new proposal showed that the Government was considering a scheme which would, in effect, peg local prices for milk and milk products to an artificially deflated export price.

A few aspects need to be understood. We must understand what has happened. Firstly, the action of the Victorian Labor Government when it first came into office of phasing out contracts and artificially inflating manufacturing milk prices caused increased production and oversupply. The Victorian Government misled the farmers in that State as to the real worth of the milk they were producing.

Secondly, Governments in Europe and America have been supporting their dairy industries to such an extent that they are now in a position of gross oversupply and they are dumping on world markets. Cheese is imported into Australia in large quantities—we frequently have some in our dining room—and is sold at a price which is not

“subsidised” but which is subject to export restitution.

On the best information available, it appears that, for example, for cheese which is sold here for a little over \$2 a kilogram, the farmers are paid the equivalent of \$5.60 a kilogram. The farmers are paid and the processors have the cheese on hand. The processors are told, “This is the price at which you must sell the cheese on the European Economic Community market. However, if you want to go outside the community and sell it at whatever price you like, that is fine. When you have done that, tell us the price at which you sold it, and we will make up the difference”. This is not called a “subsidy”; it is called “export restitution”. It is a very devious device and it has been very detrimental to the dairy industry in Australia.

The international market for dairy produce comprises only four per cent of dairy production. Therefore, if we increase supply for export by 50 per cent throughout the world, problems arise. Effectively EEC countries have done that. We cannot accuse the Americans of doing that at this stage, because in recent years they have kept their excess stocks as surplus and they have not broken the international agreement; that is, the GATT minimum. However, the Europeans have done that recently and, as a result, the prices of international dairy products have reached an all time low in real terms.

It should be borne in mind that, of the total production of dairy products by EEC countries, only two per cent is exported, compared to a figure of 27 per cent in Australia and 80 per cent in New Zealand. We have the situation in which that two per cent of EEC production goes on to the export market. Those countries do not care how much they get for their products, but the two major dairy product exporting nations—New Zealand and Australia—are hit very badly.

Many people think that the dairy industry is only a small industry. Indeed, it is not a very big industry in Western Australia, but it is Australia's fifth largest agricultural industry. Approximately 18 000 farmers are employed directly in the dairy industry and in excess of 200 000 people rely for employment on the dairy industry in its various forms, including retail distribution, manufacturing, transport, etc.

Therefore, Sir, you will understand clearly that it is extremely important that Government members in this State contact their Federal counterparts and ensure that they understand the impact this proposal will have on Western Australia. If they do not do so, the inevitable consequence will be substantial unemployment in the south-west

regions and the lack of a continuous supply of fresh milk. That will be the consequence of the Federal Government's dairy industry proposal.

I urge members to obtain the facts from the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture, because in recent weeks they have supported the Western Australian dairy industry and I applaud them for that. It has taken a while for that to occur, but the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture have adopted that excellent position and I applaud them for it.

I hope members will contact their Federal counterparts and ensure that they understand the impact this proposal will have on the farming community and the consumers. The result of the proposal will be fewer farmers, fewer jobs, a reduced quantity of milk at a far higher price than exists currently, and a generally detrimental effect on our State.

With those few comments, I support the Bill.

**HON. TOM McNEIL** (Upper West) [12.19 p.m.]: I refer firstly to the amount of funding made available to sport and culture through the Instant Lotteries. It is time the Government closely examined the position, because the Instant Lotteries were initiated in an attempt to bolster funding to culture and sports. However, a ridiculous situation has developed. The Government saw that it had a tiger by the tail and, within seven months of establishing the Instant Lotteries, it put a ceiling on the figure allocated to sport and culture to bring it back to what it considered to be reasonable proportions. However, the Government is still selling this lottery under the guise that the proceeds from it are going to culture and sport.

The Instant Lottery was first introduced in December 1982, and it had raised \$32 million by June 1983. That money was raised by holding on an average each month nine Instant Lotteries and four Lottos. The amount generated for sport and culture was \$6.4 million.

Everyone connected with sport and culture at the time thought that this would be the bonanza they had been looking for. These bodies had been crying out about the shortage of funds for some time and they thought that finally funding would become available to enable them to make the necessary advancements in their respective fields.

However, over the next 16 months following June 1983, under the first system, sport and culture could have expected to receive \$18 million. That money would have been derived from 115 Instant Lotteries and 123 Lottos. This is where the nigger is found in the woodpile, because all of a sudden the Minister in another place decided, with

the Government, that this money had to be brought under some control.

Apart from deciding to place a ceiling on the distribution of funds to sport and culture, it was decided also to increase the number of Lottos held. The Government introduced the mid-week Lotto on 18 October 1983. All of a sudden, Lotto took over from the Instant Lottery. The Instant Lottery has not had more sales than Lotto since September 1983. The galloping funds coming in are looked upon by the Government as funds for its own benefit. Since the ceiling of \$6 million for funds going towards sport and culture, the rest of the money has gone to the Government's Consolidated Revenue.

It is interesting to note that according to the Act, 14 days' notice had to be given if the Lotteries Commission desired to conduct another lottery. Right to the day in another place, that is the action the Government took. In 14 days Instant Lottery was a thing of the past in terms of being the number one exponent of drawing in the Australian dollars being spent on standard lotteries, Instant Lottery and Lotto.

In answer to a question I asked I was informed that the net profit from standard lotteries was \$75 000; the net profit from Instant Lottery was \$136 000; and the net profit from Lottos was \$147 000. It is evident just on those figures that in June 1982, prior to the introduction of Instant Lottery, nine standard lotteries produced \$767 000 while Lotto was able to produce \$590 000.

The Government then saw the advantage of increasing the advertising component of Lotto, and in 1984 that advertising jumped out of all proportion. Of some \$155 000 a month spent on advertising, 70 per cent goes on Lotto. Poor old Instant Lottery gets 18 per cent and standard lotteries get 12 per cent. I can see the Government's theory behind this move. If it continued to advertise Instant Lottery, the money coming in for sport and culture would rise and those bodies would say to the Government, "You are grossing \$108 million a year, yet you are giving us a miserly \$6 million". The Government would be justified in saying that it would have another look at it. However, in its wisdom it decided to put 70 per cent of its advertising into Lotto because money derived from that source would go straight into its pockets. As I said, only 18 per cent of advertising moneys goes on Instant Lottery, and standard lotteries comes along as tail-end-Charlie receiving just 12 per cent.



On 19 March I asked question 642 of the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Arts. I asked—

What was the total amount of funds derived from Sports Instant Lotteries and directed towards arts and culture from—

- (a) inception to February 1983;
- (b) March 1983 to February 1984; and
- (c) March 1984 to February 1985?

I was told that from March 1983 to February 1984 the amount received was \$4.7 million. The amount for the 10-month period from March 1984 to January 1985 was only \$2.5 million.

The people involved in sport and culture were interested to see what was happening with their funding, which had been set at a maximum of \$6 million in March 1984. The Government handed over \$200 000 of a gross of \$35.92 million. The total net reimbursement was \$9.667 million. Of that amount, for the last 12 months sport and culture got just \$200 000. The Government did that in justification of the ceiling placed on the amount to go to sport and culture. I will not hammer that point any more but I ask that the Minister take note of the concern of people involved in both areas. It is just not enough to expect to be able to hand over a miserly \$6 million for 12 months and expect everyone involved to sit back and say what a great job is being done for sport and culture. It is a farce. The Government should wake up to the fact that it is diminishing the funding going to sport and culture. For goodness sake, it should change the name of the lottery and perhaps call it the "Government Benevolent Fund", because the money is not going to the areas for which the lottery was instituted.

The final subject I want to deal with in supporting this Bill is of great concern to me. Besides Hon. Eric Charlton, I am perhaps the only person who can claim some disadvantage in the system of pairs we have here. Prior to the 1983 election I was opposed by a member of a political party which saw great mileage in demeaning the amount of time I spent in the House according to the attendance record and the number of divisions in which I failed to take part.

I realise that all is fair in love and war as it is in the political scene. We have to be able to cop these things. However, I do not believe it is just for the Opposition and the Government to have a sweet-heart arrangement where they can say, "If Joe Bloggs won't be in tonight and won't vote on that Bill, neither will Fanny Adams".

The political party in question produced facts and figures to show that its member had been

marked off the register on various occasions for a multitude of reasons. We all understand that members of Parliament have commitments to meet in their electorates. However, in balancing the votes between the two sides of the House, the injustice done is to a person like Tom McNeil.

In the lead up to the 1983 elections that party was able to show that on one particular night 11 divisions had taken place and I had not taken part in any of them. The political party opposing me thought it could gain mileage from this and decided it would point out the percentage of votes I had missed in the House. As I say, we have to cop this sort of thing. People throw mud, and if they throw enough some will stick. I do not claim that my record was anything sensational, but neither do I say that it was fair of that political party to adopt that attitude.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Do you mean the Liberal Party?

Hon. TOM McNEIL: I do not think it is fair for a political party to use a system of pairs like we have to its own benefit when it suits it and then decide to use that same system to accuse a political opponent simply because it believes by doing so it could pick up a seat.

One member from the other place has been particularly vociferous. I will not name him, but I found it interesting that during the run-up to my election he was most critical of what I was doing and where I was. I thought I would have a good look to see what this person had been doing. I repeat that I do not intend to name him, but if one wants to check *Hansard* one can find out for oneself. I discovered that the members of the Opposition in another place—and I do not include the National Party members—missed divisions through pairs or through absence on 1 256 occasions. The number of divisions taken in that House was 218. The person who decided to lower the boom on me claimed he was so outstanding in his own contribution and his own efforts in being able to attend Parliament that his record and the records of other people from my end of the electorate were quite good, so I thought I would look at that matter.

Since the Liberal Government lost office the House has sat on 93 occasions. During that time the person who has the worst record of missing divisions and who aimed the guns at me has missed 84 divisions and in respect of 58 of those divisions he has been marked present. So in other words, while he was present, for whatever reasons, he did not vote.

The point I am trying to make is that one cannot knock somebody because he is not able to get a

pair, and then utilise the pairing system to show how perfect is one's attendance in Parliament. I am prepared to argue that system with anyone who is interested in doing so. The only two members in this House who may be affected are Hon. Eric Charlton, the new member for Central Province, and myself. Of course, I do not come up for election next year and I am hoping that my comments today will seep into the people who are behind the political aspirations of other candidates or who believe it is good mileage to try to knock the guy who is already elected. I think I have made the point. *Hansard* is proof of what is happening in the other place. I point out that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

*Sitting suspended from 12.33 to 2.17 p.m.*

**HON. G. E. MASTERS** (West—Leader of the Opposition) [2.17 p.m.]: I raise a matter which I think is important to put before Parliament, and in referring to that matter which deals with a report in last week's *Sunday Times* I want to draw attention to a concern that the Opposition has expressed over a number of months—in fact, over the past two years—at the Government's introduction of various pieces of legislation dealing with gambling, gaming, and the like.

I draw the attention of the House to the number of Bills that have been brought forward by the Minister in regard to these matters. This should be placed on record so that we know exactly what is happening.

Hon. Mark Nevill: All supported by you?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Sure, but with some reservations. I am not saying that I have opposed them, although some of my colleagues have done so. I have not. I do not make any excuses for that at all. I point out that the Legislative Council is very careful with the legislation it deals with.

We are not obstructive or destructive. We are very careful and very understanding of the Government's position: that is the Legislative Council's role.

In 1983 we dealt with the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax Amendment Bill, the Racing Restriction Amendment Bill, the Liquor Amendment Bill (No. 2), the Lotteries (Control) Amendment Bill (No. 2), the Lotteries (Control) Amendment Bill, and the Acts Amendment (Trade Promotion Lotteries) Bill.

In 1984 we dealt with the Totalisator Duty Amendment Bill, the Soccer Football Pools Bill, the Acts Amendment (Soccer Football Pools) Bill, the Acts Amendment (Bingo) Bill, the Lotteries (Control) Amendment Bill and the Casino Control Bill.

In 1985 we have dealt with the Liquor Amendment Bill, the Casino (Burswood Island) Agreement Bill, the Acts Amendment and Validation (Casino Control) Bill, the Acts Amendment (Betting Control) Bill, and the Acts Amendment (Lotteries) Bill, which dealt with beer ticket machines.

The most recent Bills we have dealt with are the Race Meetings (Two-up Gaming) Bill, the Gaming and Betting (Contracts and Securities) Bill and the Acts Amendment (Gaming and related provisions) Bill.

I certainly have not opposed any of these Bills at all, and in almost every case, neither have my colleagues. I think members will find, though, that we have expressed concern over the level of gambling and gaming in the community, and the Government's introduction of something like 20 or 21 Bills relating to gambling in the last two years is bound to have a serious effect on some sections of the community. People simply cannot afford to gamble to any great extent.

Hon. D. K. Dans: How many of those Bills directly involve gambling? You are a very dishonest person. They are mostly to tidy up existing Legislation.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I can go through them one by one. If the Minister would wait for me to finish my comments, I would say to him that we recognise there is a need to tidy up legislation in many cases. But some of the legislation has the effect of encouraging more gambling in the community, and that is the problem we have. With some reluctance I supported some of the Government Bills, and I somewhat enthusiastically supported others. The Minister would well know that I expressed no opposition to the casino Bill or to the establishment of a casino on the chosen site. My only objection was to the manner in which it was dealt with. Nevertheless, there are a number of pieces of legislation which do encourage more and more people to risk part of their dollar on gambling. This is not good for some sections of the community—those who can least afford it, those on low incomes.

I know that the Minister has been under a great deal of pressure to change some of the Acts. We dealt with an Act the other day which went back probably hundreds of years, and quite properly that needed to be changed.

I read in the paper only a few days ago of the great delight that is being expressed about the new legislation by bookies because it is going to mean a few bob to them. I am not criticising that legislation, the point I am making is that it seems there is more and more encouragement for people to risk

on gambling part of their dollar that may be better spent in looking after their families.

In expressing these concerns we also state that though the Government is showing a great deal of care there is a chance of certain elements becoming involved that would be much better kept out of this State, and I am talking of course of gangsterism and people with not very reputable backgrounds being involved in some of these gambling projects. The Minister quite properly said that as far as the casino and most other changes were concerned, there seemed to be adequate protection. One of those pieces of legislation dealt with beer ticket machines. I, like everyone, thought that that legislation passed through Parliament on the understanding—

Hon. D. K. Dans: What you thought was correct, and when you sit down I will tell you how correct you were.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I am delighted that the Minister is joining with me in debating the Supply Bill. In the meantime, my understanding and the understanding of this House, was that the beer ticket machines would be of support to charitable organisations and sporting bodies, and I have no doubt that will be the case. But we do say that in all of these things care needs to be taken. I am not out on a witch-hunt today, and I do not speak in this debate simply because of the article on the front page of the *Sunday Times*. Whether or not that headline was exactly right I do not know. The point is that the public read that paper and saw from the front page banner headlines that a row in the handling of the beer ticket machines was likely to occur. There was a suggestion of the involvement of a person well-known and well-reported in Western Australia. I am talking of a person named Abe Saffron; I have never met the man, of course. The paper states this—

The W.A. Hotels Association will urge members to accept beer-ticket machines from Sydney businessman, Mr Abe Saffron—named in Parliament as Mr Sin.

That is where the public become concerned.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am glad you said that about the New South Wales Parliament. They only say it inside the Parliament. You know they have never said it outside the Parliament.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I can understand the sensitivity of the Minister who has been responsible for all these things, and of course he will react in that way. I can tell Mr Dans that I am a bit reluctant about mentioning the gentleman's name inside Parliament, never mind outside.

The legislation is just one of those 20 pieces of legislation about which we and other people in the

community have expressed some doubts. A lot of it was justified to clear up untidy legislation. But it does seem that the Government is going further down the track of freeing the market and having people spend their dollar.

What really worried me was a document put out by the Western Australian Hotels Association. I was deeply concerned when this document came into my possession. I have spoken to the association, and it has assured me that its intentions were honourable, and I take that as its true objective. Nevertheless a document which is responsible for upsetting and disturbing people is being bandied around publicly in the community and it should be brought to the attention of members of Parliament. The Hotels Association put out a questionnaire asking for information from people who are likely to supply these beer ticket machines. It really wanted to cop part of the action. This is where the statement is made, and I think it is necessary, Mr President, for it to be on the record.

The Western Australian Hotels Association, on 19 March 1985, sent out a document headed "Lotteries in Hotels and Taverns 'Break Open Ticket Vending Machines'." It started off by saying—

In this respect it would be appreciated if you could respond to the following enquiries:

1. Is it proposed that you will establish a State-wide service? YES/NO
2. If the answer to question number one is "NO" could you indicate the areas of the State in which you would prefer to operate.

Question 3 on page 2 reads as follows—

3. Can you guarantee a seven day a week, 365 day per year service to our members in terms of supplies and maintenance of your vending machines? YES/NO
4. If there are limitations as to your service capacity would you please indicate your preferences below:—

And then we get to the parts which I think are misleading and quite dangerous, Mr President—

5. If the Association accepts your tender as a W.A.H.A. endorsed licensed ticket supplier what sort of overriding commission or royalty on ticket sales would be offered to the Association.

That means, of course, "What sort of cop do we get?"

The questionnaire continues:—

6. Any other inducements that would cause the Association to recommend you or your company to its members as a reliable supplier of tickets.

Lastly it asks—

7. In the event that the W.A.H.A. obtains a licence as a vending machine and ticket supplier would you or your company wish to tender for the role of supplier and manager of the Association's licence. If such a proposal is of interest to you would you please indicate the terms and conditions under which you would wish to operate.

That was not a very prudent document to put out publicly; whether it was sent only to the association's members or not it would become public knowledge one way or another. Reference is made to inducements being offered to these people who are to be recommended by the Western Australian Hotels Association. I have spoken to the association and I understand its motives; but they have been misinterpreted. There is a great danger in this sort of document that there will be encouragement and offers to people who are, if you like, not desirable types to have operating in this State. There is an open invitation to those people to bid and become involved. No request is made for references, nor is there any suggestion that an investigation will be carried out into their background.

I know there are many people whom you, Mr President, and I know personally who may be involved in giving quotations on these sorts of machines. Good luck to them! The headline in the *Sunday Times* suggests there are other people less desirable who may become involved and control the scene. Those sorts of people are liable to use any means to gain complete control. I am sure that is not the intention of the Minister or the association. Nevertheless, the implication is there and I must draw it to the attention of the House because something must be done. There must at least be a move if possible—and I am not sure how it can be done—to keep certain elements out of the market.

I read with interest the Minister's statement, and I am not having a shot at Mr Dans because I, too, supported that legislation. We are perhaps seeing that the Government has gone down the line too fast. The newspaper report said—

The Minister for Racing and Gaming, Mr Dans, said yesterday he would have his officers look into the whole situation and if there was reason for concern, "as quick as a flash" he would have the matter referred to the police for investigation.

That is good, but I wonder how far the Minister has gone; I wonder whether there is a need for this investigation and whether certain elements can be prevented from becoming involved and, more importantly, from taking control of the supply of these machines in the community. We need people with a good business background whose credentials stand up to scrutiny.

We are talking about a gambling game. Incentives will be offered not only to the Hotels Association, but also to the management of hotels and licensed premises, and perhaps to sporting and charitable bodies. The sort of people who offer these incentives usually bring forward other incentives which are a little more painful if need be. I am not suggesting that that necessarily will happen in charitable organisations or sporting bodies, but some groups will use any means to take control in this area.

I say to the Government and to the Minister that I hope the Government will take every precaution to make sure this sort of people are kept out of the community. I welcomed the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Hotels Association and to get its assurance about its motives. One aspect on which it could not give me an assurance was that it would keep out the undesirable elements we do not want. I leave the matter to the Minister, and I hope he will reply and assure the House. The community is very worried, and with very good reason.

I want to refer to one other matter; that is, the Government's Westrek scheme. This was held up by the Premier and the Government as a new scheme to get young people into the work force and allow them to gain experience for little return. My understanding is that young people will be paid—150 of them initially commencing in June this year; I do not know how far preparations have gone—for taking on community work, and they will be given food, board, and transport. They will receive \$1 a day and be under the control of certain employer groups.

This idea might work, and I am not criticising the Government for any efforts it makes to get young people into the work force to gain experience and give them pride and get them out of the unemployed queues. The fact that the Government criticised a proposition I put forward because it would cut the rates of pay for young people seems hypocritical when one looks at this scheme about which I am criticising the Government for being hypocritical; I am not criticising the scheme. I understand the Government will allocate \$650 000 for these 150 young people for the first six months.

There seems to be a little lopsidedness in the project. Assuming the Government persuades 150 young people to take on the job at \$1 a day with a paying-off figure of \$750 if they complete six months. I draw attention to another situation which could develop. You, Mr President, will be particularly interested in this. An advertisement was placed in *The West Australian* in the professional column on Saturday, 30 March. It was headed "Westrek Scheme". Bearing in mind that \$650 000 has been allocated for six months, the Government has advertised through the Public Service Board 15 positions for persons to administer that scheme. It is seeking an executive officer for 12 months; a field training officer for 12 months; a clerk typist for 12 months; and 12 positions for group leaders for nine months. According to my calculations, the cost of those positions will be \$252 000 for a year.

The Government has allocated \$650 000 for six months, so it seems the administration costs of this scheme will take a great percentage of the money allocated for training young people and getting them into the workplace. Much of the money will go on executive officers, group leaders, and the like. I wonder who is going to gain most from it. Admittedly there are 15 nice new jobs for a group of people, but the young people will get the rest of the money at the rate of \$1 a day with a finishing figure of \$750.

The system is lopsided, and I wonder whether the Government has tried to find a better way of administering this scheme with people who perhaps are cheaper or come from local government and who can organise the project. If this scheme progresses I can see that the number of people holding the professional positions—the executive officer, the field training officer, and the like—will escalate, and in the end a small group of youngsters will work for \$1 a day while any number of executive officers administer the scheme.

I draw that to the Minister's attention because it needs to be looked at. In the past, probably in our time as well as that of this Government, schemes have been set up with an allocation of funds meant to help people who are disadvantaged or who do not have jobs. The administration becomes so top-heavy that there is little money left to do the job it was intended for. It seems to me this Westrek scheme could develop into that sort of situation. I ask the Minister to see whether something can be done to reduce the overheads in this type of scheme.

I support the Bill.

**HON. D. K. DANS** (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.40 p.m.]: It is not

normal for the Leader of the House to enter a debate on the Supply Bill. However, I cannot allow what the Leader of the Opposition said to go unchallenged. Either wittingly or unwittingly, he attempted to give the impression that this Government had introduced over 20 Bills related to gambling. The majority of those Bills were machinery Bills tidying up outstanding anomalies in certain Acts. One of those Bills which, incidentally, did not pass the Assembly, was the trade promotions Bill. That simply dealt with an anomaly in the Police Act relating to trade promotions lotteries being carried out on licensed premises. Supermarkets, shops and other retail outlets have been dispensing those sorts of tickets for years and because the Police Act contained that anomaly it was felt that the amending Bill should be introduced. The Police Department and the Crown Law Department sought to change that anomaly.

There are a number of Bills in that category. Let me deal quickly with the Bills that related to gambling. The first Bill was the casino Bill from which all other legislation flowed. This Government made an election promise to legalise in this State things that were being done illegally. We introduced a new form of Lotto, six from 36 pools—I think it is now six from 38—because this was the only State in Australia without the facility to allow people to bet on the British soccer matches.

On my motion we allowed two-up to be played after picnic race meetings. While that may seem a gigantic step forward, I ask members to consider the number of clubs in this State that hold only one meeting a year. We also liberalised the laws relating to bingo.

In case Mr Masters has forgotten, the Anzac Bill that was asserted to today allows bookmakers on the course tomorrow to start taking bets at 12 o'clock instead of one o'clock. The on-course totalisator and the off-course totalisator are permitted to start at 12 o'clock in any case. I know Mr Masters supported most, or all, of those Bills and I am grateful to him.

I now turn to the article that appeared in the *Sunday Times*. That paper is renowned for its banner headlines. It mentioned a man by name. I may be wrong but I did not see that same story appear in what I refer to as the responsible Press; and with good reason. The man who was named in the article was Mr Abe Saffron. For as long as I can remember, living in New South Wales and here, Mr Abe Saffron has been in the headlines for various activities. To my knowledge nothing has been proven against him to this date. It is a matter of public record that the *Sunday Times*

forgot to mention that Mr Abe Saffron either holds the licence or is in partnership with people who hold the licences for four hotels in this State, the Raffles Hotel, the High Wycombe Hotel, the Cloverdale Hotel and the Warwick Hotel. If I were being political, I would say that three of those licences were issued in the days of the Liberal-Country Party Government. That Government did not see fit to challenge Mr Saffron. It is not my task in this Chamber to either defend or condemn Mr Saffron, but simply to tell the House that that statement attributed to me in the *Sunday Times* is substantially correct.

Mr Masters said that people reading that article could have some cause for alarm. The amazing thing about it is that not one person from my large constituency has contacted me and not one person has contacted my office. Indeed, the comments or complaints made about the casino have been minimal. I confess I thought they would have been much greater.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I think they were a little greater than you concede.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Whatever Mr Gayfer may say, he should now listen to me carefully: I did not receive one complaint as the member for the South Metropolitan Province. The complaints I received as Minister were minimal.

Mr Masters raised matters relating to the Acts Amendment (Lotteries) Act 1985 which related to beer tickets and beer ticket machines. I make it clear from the outset that there is no likelihood of only two ticket suppliers being licensed by the State Taxation Department.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I was talking about the recommendations.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I know: I am putting the member's mind at rest. I will come to the recommendations in a moment. The Commissioner of State Taxation is anticipating he will receive approximately 10 applications from persons to be licensed as ticket suppliers, not two. Applications have not been considered at this stage. However, licensing—I am using the term "licensing"—deliberately—is expected to be finalised in the next few weeks.

New section 109 of the Stamp Act provides that the Commissioner of State Taxation in considering an application from a person to be licensed as a ticket supplier, shall have regard to the financial circumstances of the applicant and such other circumstances as he considers relevant. That is a pretty big hurdle to jump. The commissioner may also cancel a licence if he has reason to believe that a licensed supplier has contravened the pro-

visions relating to the supply of tickets or the payment of duty.

Where the commissioner either refuses to grant a licence or cancels a licence, he must give reasons for the refusal or cancellation. That is pretty powerful stuff. If the person aggrieved by such a decision wishes, he may appeal to the Local Court within 42 days after the reasons are given. In other words, the commissioner has to give the reasons and then, if the person aggrieved feels that is not sufficient, he can appeal within 42 days.

I want to now refer directly to the newspaper report that the Western Australian Hotels Association has made a decision to endorse two companies to supply beer ticket facilities to its members. Firstly, it should be noted that the legislation clearly provides that permits to sell continuing lotteries are to be obtained from the Western Australian Lotteries Commission by a charitable organisation or a club which wishes to sell break-open tickets, and not by hoteliers. Where the tickets are to be sold by vending machine, endorsements of the licensee's approval will be required on the application. The benefit to the hotelier will be from the increased trade over the bar and the charitable organisation or club will benefit from the profits. The Western Australian Hotels Association made a commercial decision to endorse supplies of ticket facilities and tickets. I would say that that was an inducement and, if I may, I will resort to some slang and say, "What's new, pussycat?". Mr Masters has been in the commercial world and he knows that inducements are given by way of discounts and by way of a number of other benefits. The intimation is, "If you want my business, what are you prepared to give me by way of a discount or other devices by way of a straight-out cash rebate?"

I do not think they were doing anything wrong, but I believe that they did not have cognisance of the whole Act. A recommendation by the Western Australian Hotels Association to its members to support a particular company will not affect the rate of return to charitable organisations or clubs—it cannot.

Hon. G. E. Masters: I did not say it would.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am putting it on record because people reading the newspaper article could have read two different things into it and Hon. Gordon Masters knows that very well. The legislation has all the requirements built into it to prevent any underhand dealings, including refusing people certain licences.

Some concern has been expressed—I do not know if Mr Masters has expressed the concern—that one of the recommended companies

has as one of its directors a Mr Abe Saffron. I am advised by the State Taxation Department that a licence will be refused on any grounds which might place the revenue in jeopardy. Whether a refusal to licence could be sustained on grounds not related to the financial status of an applicant requires further consideration.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is the point.

Hon. D. K. DANS: That is what we are looking at.

Mr Saffron has held interests in companies holding hotel licences in this State for many years. During this time the premises owned by his companies have been conducted satisfactorily. When I made the statement to the Press I said that I had put the matter in the hands of my officers and they did a good job.

The extension of one of Mr Saffron's business interests into the break-open ticket field is an obvious one in view of his hotel interest. However, I am concerned by the implication, and we will have the situation closely monitored by the officers of the Department of Racing and Gaming and the State Taxation Department. Should the need arise, amending legislation to increase the number of inspectors or to provide for tighter licensing controls can be introduced into the Parliament.

Hon. G. E. Masters: That is exactly what I am asking.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for raising this matter and I point out that while a number of Bills that have been introduced into Parliament might have sounded like gambling Bills—some obviously were—others were just to tidy up Acts. The Government has already introduced what it thought was watertight legislation and it was passed with the assistance of members in this House. If the Government finds that there are any problems with the legislation—I am not suggesting that there will be—it will bring back the legislation to this House for amendment.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You must admit that the document produced by the Hotels Association could be misunderstood and it was unfortunately worded.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not think the association has as many commercial brains as many other companies and rather than operate by word of mouth it put the information into a document; but members must agree that inducements and rebates are part of daily life.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You coupled that with some unsuccessful applicants.

Hon. D. K. DANS: That is right and it was a dangerous document. I am thankful that the matter has been ventilated in this House.

HON. NEIL OLIVER (West) [2.55 p.m.]: This Supply Bill approves Government expenditure to 30 June 1986 and is normally introduced at this time of the year pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill during the Budget session later in the year. However, the Bill gives members one of only three opportunities in each year to draw to the attention of the Government problems being experienced in their electorates.

Before speaking to the specific problem in my electorate, which involves the Swan Valley grape and wine producers, I wish to compare the growth of expenditure this year by the Burke Government to that of previous Governments and, in particular, I refer to the Court Government and the subsequent O'Connor Government.

This Supply Bill grants Government expenditure to 30 June 1986 of \$1 710 million. In the financial year ending 30 June 1982 the Court Government's Supply Bill was for the amount of \$1 020 million. The O'Connor Government increased its Supply Bill to the year ending 30 June 1983 to \$1 130 million, an increase of \$110 million on the previous year.

With the change of Government to the Australian Labor Party and the introduction of the Burke Ministry the Supply Bill to 30 June 1984—remember the Burke Government had been in office for only four months and had not had the opportunity to get into top gear—was \$1 240 million which was an increase of \$110 million on the previous Liberal Government's Supply Bill. For the financial year ending 30 June 1984 we saw a further increase of \$160 million on the previous Supply Bill, which made a total for that year of \$1 400 million. This year we see an increase of \$310 million, which in 1974 was the total amount of the Supply Bill introduced by the Court Government.

Members will be aware that during the period from 1974 until now Australia had the highest level of inflation ever experienced. The Liberal Government presided also over the greatest growth rate that this State has experienced since it was founded.

Premier Burke has joined the last of the big spenders. If he continues in office for another year he will have increased expenditure in four years to the same extent that was achieved by the Liberal Government in nine years. He will receive the treatment he deserves in the same way as Prime Minister Hawke will receive the treatment he deserves, and they will go down on record as the last

of the big spenders because the taxpayers will not accept an increase in expenditure to this extent. The Premier and the Prime Minister have been very extravagant and have given little thought to Budget management and have obtained little or no results from the increase in expenditure.

Hon. Tom Stephens: We are the ones that balance the Budget.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: I now turn to matters which are of concern to my electorate. During the electoral campaign the ALP convened a meeting at the Swan athletic club concerning the marginal seat of Mundaring. The meeting was held on 7 January 1982.

Hon. Tom Stephens: A safe Labor seat.

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: The election was to be held about four weeks from that date and to use an expression that often flows from the Labor Party, the meeting was "politically motivated".

At this meeting, the promises included: The supply and installation of a distillation plant; the provision of market expertise to expand both local and overseas markets; market research into the expansion of those markets; and, finally, upgraded technical support, including new grape varieties from the Department of Agriculture that would set the grape industry on a more profitable course.

I turn to some questions recorded in *Hansard*, that were asked by me in respect of these promises. Question 336 on page 1878 of *Hansard* of Wednesday, 14 September 1983 was asked of the Minister representing the Minister for Economic Development and Technology and Deputy Premier, Mal Bryce. It read—

In respect to the new distillation still plant to be used by the grape growers in the Swan Valley—

- (1) When and at what location will the still be installed?
- (2) What organisation will be responsible for its operation?
- (3) How is it proposed that the product be marketed?
- (4) Will the plant and/or its associated equipment have any alternative production other than spirits for fortified wines and brandy?
- (5) When will the still be operated?

The responsible Minister in this House replied for Mr Bryce—

- (1) to (5) The Government is conducting confidential negotiations concerning the creation of the proposed distillery. None of the member's five questions can be

answered with clarity at this stage. He will be fully apprised of the details as soon as they are able to be released.

The next question I asked was question 419 on Tuesday, 20 September 1983, some six days later. I addressed this question to the Leader of the House representing the Premier, in view of the fact that the Premier was at that meeting. I asked—

- (1) Did the Premier at a meeting convened by the Labor candidate for Mundaring on Friday, 7 January 1982, promise grape growers that a distillery would be installed in the Swan Valley as soon as they (Labor) took office?
- (2) If "Yes", why has this promise been broken?

The Leader of the House, representing Premier Burke, replied—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) On 20 July 1983, Cabinet approved financial assistance for the establishment of the distillery. The member will be aware from replies to his question 336 of Wednesday, 14 September and question 416 of Tuesday, 20 September that negotiations are currently being conducted.

On the same day I asked question 416, recorded on page 2138 of *Hansard* of Tuesday 20 September. This question again was directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Economic Development and Technology, the latter Minister being also the Deputy Premier, Mr Mal Bryce. The question read—

In view of the reply to my question 336 of Wednesday, 14 September, wherein I was advised the Government is conducting confidential negotiations concerning a proposed distillery in the Swan Valley—

I interpolate that at this stage the negotiations are confidential; six days earlier they merely could not be announced. To continue—

- (1) Was an advertisement placed in *The Midland Reporter* of September on page 5, authorised by M. Beahan, 82 Beaufort Street, Perth, which stated that \$400 000 has been approved to build a distillery?
- (2) Is the Government in any way associated with the provision of those funds?
- (3) If so, how was this amount agreed upon, and from what source will it be appropriated?



The Minister replied—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) This amount represents the estimated cost of establishing a distillery in the Swan Valley. As indicated in the reply to the member's question 336, detailed financial information regarding the establishment of the distillery will remain confidential during current negotiations.

To substantiate further the need for a distillery, I refer to a question that the Deputy Premier, Mal Bryce, answered in another place on 23 August 1983. The current member for Mundaring asked a question to which the Deputy Premier replied—

Distillery facilities have not been available in the Swan Valley since late 1980. As a result of the lack of facilities the grape growers have not been prepared to rebuild or replant their vineyards. A modern distillery will provide a market for grapes which cannot be sold as table or wine grapes. The reintroduction of a grape distillery will give the grape growers renewed confidence in their future, and make them independent of Eastern States distillation facilities. It will provide also a local source to fortify spirit for the Western Australian wine industry. There are encouraging signs for a revival of the production of fortified wine, and I understand that the people involved in this industry in the Swan Valley have been elated by the Government's decisions . . .

Incidentally, the Deputy Premier was quite right. There was a revival in the production of fortified wine.

When the Burke Government took office in February, the President of the Swan Valley Grape Growers Association, Mr John Beros, had available a used, but recently acquired, still. It had been recently installed, was modern and was available on an offer basis of \$65 000. Grape growers in the Swan Valley, including the president of their association, were champing at the bit to proceed and take up the Burke promise. The House has already heard of the indecision and bungling of that Government from the moment it was elected, and this is no exception.

Nowhere in the world in a large or even a secondary grape producing area such as the Swan Valley is there no distillation plant. In the Swan Valley originally, there were four distillation plants. Some were old and not suitable for use in the continuous distillation operation. The most recent continuous distillation plant installed in this country is a modern plant supplied and installed at

Beenleigh in Queensland for the amount of \$145 000. The viability of a distillery has been a point of contention, but not to the Labor Party.

The 1981 inquiry into the feasibility of the re-establishment of a distillery in Western Australia concluded that it was not commercially feasible to establish a distillation industry here. This inquiry was conducted by Chadwick Martin Consultants Pty. Ltd. for the Western Australian Department of Industrial Development and Commerce and the Swan Valley Grape Growers Association. Neither I publicly, nor the President, nor members of that association would accept the proposals that were outlined in that document.

The conclusion reached was based on the prediction that the demand for fortified wines and, consequently, grape spirit would follow the previous declining trends. However, there has been greater demand for fortified wines. Sales in Western Australia have increased by one million litres. That is an increase of 25 per cent in a three-year period since the inquiry.

This does not take into account the disastrous fortified spirit tax. The predictions of the feasibility study were proved to be inaccurate, and the reverse occurred.

I have two tables which I seek leave of the House to have incorporated into *Hansard*. One is table 4 by the Australian Bureau of Statistics which indicates the predicted sales and the actual sales. The other is table 8 which is headed "Western Australian Fortified Wine Market—Relative Shares". The table compares Western Australian winemakers to the Eastern States winemakers. The source is the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Leave granted.

*The following material was incorporated by leave of the House—*

TABLE 4. Fortified Wine Stocks (Australia)

Year	Stock (000 litres)	Predicted Sales	Actual Sales
1975/76	138 026	—	51 758
1976/77	143 203	—	50 210
1977/78	129 495	—	44 293
1978/79	132 838	—	47 935
1979/80	134 440	—	45 587
1980/81	133 856	41 019	45 868
1981/82	135 254	35 224	45 189
1982/83	134 132	29 653	43 027
1983/84	116 596	25 086	42 587

Source: ABS and A.W.B.P.A. Statistics and Projections

TABLE 8. Western Australian Fortified Wine Market—Relative Shares

Year	WA Winemakers Total (000 litres)	Eastern States Total (000 litres)
1975/76	1 060	4 257
1976/77	942	3 699
1977/78	812	3 158
1978/79	863	3 513

1979/80	610	3 559
1980/81	687	3 680
1981/82	651	3 066
1982/83	530	3 217
1983/84	332	4 023

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics

Hon. NEIL OLIVER: All that has been achieved by the Burke Government has been a series of broken promises. Action on the distillation plant has been nil.

I wish to quote from an article appearing in the *West Advertiser* on 2 April entitled, "Grape growers endorse government aid", which reads as follows—

THE Grape Growers Association of WA has endorsed a State Government plan to bolster the ailing grape industry.

The plan will involve research, promotion, finance for restructuring properties, cool storage facilities and inspection services.

The Government's aid package was supported by growers who last week attended a meeting called by the president of the association, Mr John Beros.

Mr Beros said the meeting also discussed the export problems facing grape growers.

The Premier, Mr Burke, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, made specific promises at that meeting regarding exports to the extent that he was prepared to send people overseas. We now have the results of that promise 27 months later. I proceed to quote further from that document—

Increasing exports, especially to Asia, was the only way to end the depressed state of the industry, he said.

This year the downward trend has been disastrous compared to the previous year. The figures are not yet known but the effect is overwhelming on the downward trend. The receipts of export table grapes through the Swan Settlers Co-op Association Ltd. is indicative that the situation is bad.

This week I went into the chiller unit and I saw grapes which had been picked and specifically packed for export and which were moulding because there were no shippers to take them. The only place that these grapes will finish up is in the oven for dried fruit. The dried fruit industry in the Sunraysia district alone last year had a surplus of 90 million tonnes of dried fruit. Mr Beros went on to say—

WA ought to be able to sell 40 per cent of its table grapes to the lucrative Asian market—but at present the market was oversupplied with grapes from the Eastern States.

Mr Beros said that WA growers would have to concentrate on premium quality grapes.

At present the market is over supplied with grapes from the Eastern States. Mr Beros further stated—

A new variety, MU7-58, would be released to growers by the Department of Agriculture this year.

He did not know whether MU7-58 would be accepted by Asian buyers but he said: "We are at the stage where we have to take a punt".

Take a punt! We have market research, technical research, promises of people to visit Asia and open up new markets and planting new vines this year—and they take a punt on it! So much for research and the promises of this Government!

Mr Burke was very strongly supported by Mr Tonkin in the *Western Mail* when he very quickly jumped in to say he was—

—pledging that a Labor Government would provide financial assistance to establish a distillery.

Mr Tonkin said the Opposition had been impressed by a submission on the distillery presented by the Grape Growers Association of WA.

Could I draw attention of the Chamber to what actually happens in other States. The Department of Agriculture in Victoria produces a magazine entitled, "Buyers' guide to Australian table grapes", which is distributed throughout Asia and to the Australian public, with financial assistance from the Commonwealth Department of Trade. It also produces a quarterly newsletter known as, "Table Grape News".

I asked a question in this House recently to do with the promotion conducted in Singapore last year entitled, "Food and Hotel Asia". I asked whether this Government had made any contribution to that exhibition in the World Trade Centre. The answer was "No". From Victoria a major promotion was conducted and in addition they reported back to the grape growers and visitors who came from Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Brunei, and Taiwan and they reported how many visitors they had, and what their preferences were for the various varieties of grapes. So much for the research of this Government and its promises to grape growers! Research into the field of grape juice has been carried out in Victoria—which is politically delicate because the grapes in Victoria are grown in the area where oranges are produced;

that is, the Murray Valley. We know Australians currently prefer to drink what is called pure orange juice, but there is also much research being undertaken into the manufacture and the marketing of pure grape juice. The research also covers the production of grape juice extracts and utilisation of the various other types of fruit that can be added to grape juice.

I now turn to not only the broken promises but also the actions of this Government in what it calls supporting an industry which it clearly stated needed support. I spoke in the adjournment debate on Thursday, 18 August 1983, reported in *Hansard* at page 1186. I said—

I would like to refer to a matter concerning my constituents who are in the grape growing and wine production industry. My constituents are concerned about the likelihood of an imposition of a wine tax at Federal level. I would like to say that this matter is of increasing concern to the wine industry. I recall making representations on behalf of the industry to the Federal Government in 1977. The tax had been removed prior to this, but rumours were abroad that it was to be reimposed.

Acting on my initiative the Federal Government did not introduce the wine tax at that time in 1977.

I went on to talk about its effect on primary industry and many members in this House will understand the problems of primary industry and the concern of grape growers and wine producers who are not in isolation but are part of the agricultural industry which has made this country so great; and this country is still agro-economically based.

I went on to say—

If such a wine tax were imposed now, it would be at a very bad time for the industry—a time when it is suffering from the dumping of surplus poor quality wine from other States. The effect would be especially disastrous in the Swan Valley.

I then said—

The proposed imposition of this tax comes at one of the momentous times in the history of the wine industry in Western Australia. I was prompted to raise this matter because of an article which appeared in *The West Australian* this morning. For the first time in the history of the Western Australian wine industry a company in this State has won the most coveted and prestigious award; that is, the Jimmy Watson memorial trophy. That

award was presented to the Cape Mentelle vineyards.

I went on to say—

I extend my congratulations to the Cape Mentelle vineyards on winning this coveted and prestigious award. I hope the Leader of the House uses his best endeavours to ensure the Premier of Western Australia brings this matter to the attention of the Federal Government, because the imposition of this iniquitous tax would have a disastrous effect on a primary producing industry; that is, the wine industry.

I repeat, I hope he uses his best endeavours.

I now turn to one of the most interesting reports in *Hansard*. It is eulogising by two members of Parliament—namely, the member for Mundaring and the Western Australia—who made the promises. This is dated Wednesday, 24 August 1983, about a week later. It appears on pages 1562 and 1563 of *Hansard*. Mr Troy had this to ask of the Premier—

I draw his attention to the fact that despite the widespread speculation that a wine tax would be imposed in the Federal Budget, no such tax was imposed. I ask—

- (1) Is it a fact that the State Government made representations to the Commonwealth on this matter prior to the Budget?
- (2) In light of the Commonwealth's decision not to impose such a tax, how does he regard current prospects for the wine industry in this State?

There was a series of interjections, and the Premier said this—

I did so because I thought the imposition of such a tax would inhibit the strong development taking place in the industry in this State.

I repeat what he said, "the strong development taking place in the industry in this State".

The Premier went on to say—

The wine industry in Western Australia has been undergoing a period of considerable growth. New facilities and wine-making techniques have been installed in the Swan Valley in recent years and I think it is agreed that there has been a dramatic improvement in the quality of wines from the valley.

Grape growers in the Swan Valley will get another boost from the Government's decision to back the establishment of a distil-

lery, something which the Opposition when in Government rejected out of hand.

He goes on—

Members will be aware that last week two Western Australian wines won major trophies at the Melbourne show, most notably the Jimmy Watson Trophy for dry red wines, Australia's most prestigious wine award.

He then continues—

This will give Western Australian wines a huge marketing boost in the Eastern States.

Incidentally, this has never come to fruition. He goes on to say—

The Minister for Economic Development and Technology has instructed his officers that contact should be made with the industry to ascertain how the Government can help industry to take advantage of the outstanding marketing boost the awards have given the State. For all the reasons, the industry's prospects are obviously bright, and the continued tax-free status of wine will help advance those prospects.

The Premier and the member for Mundaring had not read the Federal Budget, because contained in the Federal Budget was one of the most disastrous taxes ever introduced into the wine industry, and that was a tax on fortified spirit. Fortified spirit was selling at that time at \$2.40 per litre of alcohol, and the new tax was \$2.50

The tables I have had incorporated in *Hansard* by leave of the House will bear witness to what then occurred. It was so disastrous that Mr Kerin, the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, disassociated himself from the Hawke Ministry's stand and said the decision had been made while he had been absent, and he had not been consulted.

The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr Hawke, came to the Swan Valley and gave an undertaking to have the matter examined; but that did not happen either. The tax was a disaster because to collect it cost more than the revenue. I am not aware of any previous Government doing this, but the tax was returned to the taxpayers who had paid it.

As a sideline, I would like to say that as a result of the failure to honour those promises, although it has had some effect from people moving into the Swan Valley with horses and to follow other rural pursuits, the cost of pesticides to a medium-sized vineyard has increased from \$500 a year to \$6 000 a year in the past two years. That is due to the fact that the vines are not being cleared correctly, and there is a tremendous growth of mediterranean

fruit fly. When I raised this matter with the principal of the Roseworthy College—he would be well known to you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. Robert Hetherington), being a South Australian—he said that it was the first time he had been aware that grapes could be struck by fruit fly. Then he went on to say that with the prevalence of mediterranean fruit fly in Western Australia this must obviously occur because the fruit was left on the vine.

What motivated me to speak today on this subject was a question by the member for Mundaring and the answer given by the Minister for Agriculture in the Assembly on Thursday, 28 March 1985, which was as follows—

- (1) Is the Minister aware that a resolution from a Liberal Party-originated public meeting held in the Swan Valley on Monday, 18 March 1985, was rejected outright at a meeting of the Grape Growers' Association held on Monday of this week?

His statement that it was totally rejected, I leave to the consciences of the member for Mundaring and those present at the meeting. To continue—

- (2) What is the current situation with the distillery?
- (3) Would the Minister outline what dangers the Government sees with such blatantly politically motivated moves occurring in an industry which, while undergoing considerable difficulties, has faced its difficulties by putting forward a well-considered and positive package that maximises the cost benefits of the assistance offered?

The Minister for Agriculture replied—

- (1) to (3) It is my understanding that this Monday's meeting of the Grape Growers' Association members gave extremely strong support to their committee to continue pursuing the 18-point aid package as a first priority.

It is understood that the future consideration of a distillery is not rejected, but is recognised as being desirable, subject to economic circumstances warranting pursuance.

This resolution clearly rejects the motion of the Liberal Party-organised meeting held in the previous week to request the Government to provide a distillery, regardless of cost.

It is very clear that political motive, regardless of cost, dominates the actions of

the member for West Province and his colleagues.

The industry is now well aware just what tactics the Opposition will use.

They, and the Mundaring electorate, will be so much wiser as a result of this clumsy action.

Since I have represented the Swan Valley, I have called several meetings there. On one occasion, I called a meeting in order to defeat legislation introduced into the Parliament by the Court Government. That legislation was defeated in this House without even a division being called.

I called a public meeting and 150 people attended. I said, "I cannot promise you that you will get what you want, but I shall fight for you". I challenge the member for Mundaring, the Premier, or any other Labor member to say, "I disagree with the Labor Government and I shall fight for you in the Parliament".

It is indicated in the question which I quoted that the public meeting referred to was motivated by the Liberal Party. I am a member of the Liberal Party and I support the establishment of a distillation plant. The President of the Grape Growers' Association appreciates my stand, but unfortunately he is now under the rule of the member for Mundaring. Indeed, some members of the executive of the association were not even aware of this 18-point plan until it was distributed by mail on the day following the meeting. Some of the members of the executive had never heard of it, but they received it by mail from the member for Mundaring, not the association.

That meeting was representative of all the grape growers and wine producers in Western Australia. It was attended by over 150 people. I took one of the leading roles. The chairman was Mr Clem Mulcahy, the respected principal of a school in Midland and Chairman of the Tourist Council of the Swan Valley. He was respected by all those who attended the meeting and he conducted a very impartial meeting. He deputised for the shire president who was unable to be present due to another major commitment.

The other people who sat at the top table were the President of the Grape Growers' Association, Mr John Beros; the President of the Wine Growers Association, Mr John Barrett-Lennard; the Chairman of Directors of Swan Settlers Co-op Association Ltd., Mr Joe Rakich, who belongs to a family which has been in the Swan Valley for over 100 years; and the Swan Shire planner, Eric Lumsden.

Apart from Mr Beros, who expressed some doubts, the majority of those people spoke in

favour of the establishment of a distillation plant in the Swan Valley.

The reason I am speaking on this subject this afternoon is the question I quoted earlier. That question motivated me to get to my feet and speak on this issue. It is a disgrace to group all of those people as having attended a "Liberal Party-originated public meeting". The question also indicated that it was "blatantly politically motivated" regardless of cost. Those statements have motivated me to speak in this debate.

Last Monday the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow Cabinet visited the Swan Valley at my invitation and that of my colleague, Hon. Gordon Masters. Those members met collectively with the Swan Shire Council in its Chambers and then dispersed in pairs and travelled throughout the valley looking at the position. Later in the day they met with many of the leading people in the area.

On that basis I put a proposal to the Leader of the Opposition which he is anxious to examine. The proposal is—

That consideration be given to—

- (1) providing a one-off \$200 000 grant to establish a continuous distillation plant and ancillary equipment in the Swan Valley;

Members should recall that the Government has just guaranteed a \$1.7 million loan to the Manjimup Canning Co-operative Co. Ltd. which will not now be proceeded with, because it does not even have the support of primary producers; that is, the potato growers. To continue—

- (2) providing a guarantee for any loan associated with a pasteurisation and bottling plant—

Incidentally, the Manjimup cannery is looking at such a plant at the moment at a cost of \$90 000. To continue—

—together with the facilities to provide grape juice, to extend flexibility in growing and marketing grapes, grape juice, and wine production in the Swan Valley.

Currently we are awaiting the results of a national grape inquiry. Due to the impact of exported wines on the wine industry in this State and the subsidies granted wines from the European Economic Community, the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly initiated the setting up of a wine inquiry.

The motion moved by the Opposition in the Assembly was amended by the Government so that the inquiry which was set up was one into the grape growing industry rather than into the wine

industry. Therefore, in Western Australia at present two inquiries are being conducted into the grape growing industry. One comprises a committee of four chaired by Mr McKay, the former head of the Department of Primary Industry, and I understand it will report soon on the position of the grape industry throughout Australia.

I will outline to members the benefits of a distillation plant. Firstly, construction of a distillery will allow distillation of salvage and surplus grapes which are unsuitable or surplus for table use or winemaking. Normally, approximately 1 200 tonnes of grapes but this year over 2 000 tonnes have been left on vines or dumped, and approximately 90 000 litres of tank bottoms would be used in the production of suitable grape spirit and brandy spirit—Portuguese type—for Swan Valley fortifieds. This would return grape growers to the original profitable avenue and would also allow for greater flexibility when the season produces low yields. With this year's vintage, even though a larger quantity of surplus material is available, the quality of grapes is inferior—due to the hot weather—and is more adaptable to distillation.

Secondly, availability of a distillery would increase use of salvage and surplus grapes and would therefore prevent inferior quality grapes being dumped and sold at local markets. This would increase prices and therefore increase the quality in the industry and export opportunities.

Thirdly, fruit fly would be controlled because vineyards would be cleared of rotting and wasted grapes. I have already mentioned that the cost of insecticides in some vineyards has increased from \$500 in 1983 to \$6 000 in 1985.

Fourthly, further employment would be created and new ancillary industries developed, including grape juice and brandy spirit production. A weighbridge facility also is essential in the Swan Valley.

Fifthly, it would prevent the process of grapes and wine from being dumped.

Sixthly, grape growers would be encouraged to continue new plantings and it would generally boost morale.

These are many of the things the Premier has already said. The distillation plant could run in conjunction with a pasteurisation and bottling plant for grape juice and apple juice. The fruit juice market has increased considerably and production of grape juice could take place intermittently at off-season times.

The wine and grape growing industries provide a substantial contribution to the Australian econ-

omy. The two industries provide substantial employment and stimulation for tourism and export markets. Presently these industries need assistance. Greater flexibility amongst other factors is necessary for stimulation to the industries and the provision of a distillery would be a step in this direction.

In conclusion I challenge the Government to hold a referendum in the Swan Valley. I can tell it now that the overwhelming number of grape growers—between 80 and 90 per cent of them—would give their priority to the installation of a distillery plant.

**HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central)** [3.43 p.m.]: This Supply Bill involves the mind-boggling figure of \$1.710 billion. Hon. Neil Oliver made some comparisons between the Supply Bill of this Government and those of previous Governments. I can well remember when I first came here the 1959 Parliament dealt with a Supply Bill for \$80 million. That differs greatly from the present Bill for a huge \$1.710 billion—it is 20 times as big.

The Bill also seeks the issue of \$1.550 billion from Consolidated Revenue. As I recall, back in 1959 it was around the \$68 million mark. The \$80 million in this Bill to go to the credit of the General Loan Fund compares with \$12 million in 1959.

I therefore believe these mind-boggling figures of billions of dollars should take pride of place in this debate and I am worried a little that these figures have more or less been unmentioned except by the previous speaker. It is rather strange that we have had many speakers so far but very few have mentioned these huge figures.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.00 p.m.*

**Hon. H. W. GAYFER:** We were told that the amount of supply requested was based on the cost of maintaining essential works and services and that no provision has been made to satisfy the introduction of any new programmes which may be brought in with the 1985-86 Budget. One would think that with an amount of that magnitude one would have no trouble at all in being able to lop off a few dollars here and there and thereby balance the Budget. Certainly the Government is very proud of the fact that it seems it will achieve a balanced Budget for 1985, and I suppose the Government is to be commended for it.

On the other hand, the Minister who introduced the Bill said that much of this income and the means of balancing the Budget has been based on current trends and more buoyant revenue collections. It is due mainly, of course, to the increased

Westrail revenue which was brought about as a result of an excellent wheat harvest.

In the next paragraph the Minister said "Taxation receipts are also running slightly ahead of the Budget estimate, a reflection of increased economic activity in this State".

Last night I listened to, I think, five speakers on this Supply Bill, every one of whom was a country member. Not one of them talked about increased economic activity in regard to the prosperity of his own enterprise and the enterprises those members represent; namely, the farming community. The State Government is to be lauded for balancing its Budget. As a member of Parliament, I am really very surprised, yet grateful, that the Government has been able to do this; but that does not mean to say that there are many people out in "them thar hills," as Mr Stretch said last night, who can balance their budgets.

While we are taking from one sector in order to help another sector balance its books, I do not know whether we are doing any good for the total prosperity of the State. It is rather like the Minister's comments on introducing the Supply Bill. On page 5 of his introductory notes the Minister said—

Turning to the outlook for 1985-86 honourable members would be aware of the crucial importance of Commonwealth-State financial relations.

This State has a Supply Bill for \$1.710 billion yet worries about the impact of Commonwealth taxes and Commonwealth handouts in regard to WA. The Government looks ahead of itself but it fails to look behind itself and to see those people who cannot balance their own budgets. The Minister for Budget Management mentioned in his second reading speech that the history of the tax sharing arrangement was that despite promises of a guaranteed share of Commonwealth taxing revenues the Commonwealth has in the past imposed unilateral decisions which have restricted the growth of funding to the States to a level beyond the corresponding growth of the Commonwealth's own expenditure. Those are sad words indeed. It is very sad to think that we in WA who are so dependent on finance because of the size of our State, must rely on the Government's cap-in-hand attitude in crawling to the Commonwealth Government, and that is what we are doing at all times. We are literally crawling on our stomachs to Canberra looking for handouts for this State, handouts which should be axiomatic within a levelling process, and not handouts which are filched or taken away from us resulting in our having to

plead to get them back so that we can use them. The drastic measures that were taken at the time of war when all our taxing rights were handed over to the Commonwealth, and the more drastic move that the Commonwealth Government made by never handing them back, were crippling for WA.

Hon. Garry Kelly: You cannot be serious.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am serious, and I am quite convinced of another thing. What is wrong with Australia is that the Nullarbor Plain should be larger so that—as the people in the east believe we are, anyway—we can be totally divorced in every aspect from people in the Eastern States.

The wealth of this State—this third of Australia—is being bled for the welfare of the Eastern States and other dependent States such as Tasmania. The 85 per cent of population who live below that line between Brisbane and Adelaide could not give a damn about Western Australia; they do not know it exists. The 85 per cent of politicians in that area are not interested one iota in the welfare of this third of Australia. The 14 politicians who live within sight of the Sydney Town Hall would not even think about Western Australia once a year. How in the name of goodness could any Premier, Mr Burke or any other, go over there and expect to get a sympathetic hearing?

They could not even build Canberra away from the sound of the Bow bells in Sydney and Melbourne. King O'Malley should have built it at Ayers Rock. That would have been a sensible exercise. If he had put Lake Burley Griffin there something would have been accomplished.

We are looking at a Budget of \$1 700 million. The Minister said in his speech that we cannot possibly exist without more, yet we have no way of getting it without resorting to other taxes which he says are harder to find as the years go on. That is true; I have referred to the chimney tax which applied in other times in England. It would not surprise me if that is the next tax to be introduced in this State.

We must exist. We have got to the stage where our wealth, the size of our industry, the fact that we produced the largest wheat crop last year and the largest amount of iron ore is exported from this State indicate what a great State Western Australia is. We should be doing a "Bjelke-Petersen" and telling the Commonwealth Government to go to hell.

We should be telling it we can stand on our own feet and we do not need the imbalance of trade across our borders which favours the Eastern States. We can set ourselves up here so that they

have to pay for the privilege of coming to Western Australia.

I know I am talking secession and that it is against the Commonwealth Constitution, but things have reached the stage where it is an absolute rot. It will not be long before we have to go to the Commonwealth to find out whether we can transport anything out of this State, whether by rail or otherwise. I would not be surprised if we suddenly had to hand over control of transport. The Commonwealth already controls the road system; the next step will be toll systems on some of the roads.

The whole thing is mind-boggling. We are fast losing our grip and control on this glorious State; it has been sliding slowly out of our hands, particularly in the last few years. It is a terrible thing to say, but I am tied up in businesses where I see more and more control being imposed from Melbourne. I can see the other States looking at each other and ganging up on Western Australia. Mr Wordsworth does not believe me.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: I liked the way you pronounced "Western Australia".

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is correct; it is the western third of Australia.

The Government has introduced this Bill and says willy-nilly it is doing a good job and that it expects to balance the Budget this year. It has been helped in that respect by farmers paying out more money for freight. The Government says it would like to do more but it needs more money from Federal taxes. It then goes on to say it will have to raise more money here later in the year but it does not know where it will rip it off. It intends to do so, however, and to continue to balance the Budget.

This has been going on for a fair time—in my memory from the \$80-million Supply Bill in 1959, until now when we are dealing with a Bill involving an amount 20 times that size. The previous speaker referred to Supply Bills from 1977 to this year. The money machine that is needed to keep this State going is beyond the control of Western Australia. We are becoming a glorious shire council, nothing else, dependent on the handout of the Commonwealth and the actions of people who are supposedly meant to represent us. Yet when they get to the Commonwealth sphere in Canberra they forget the State from whence they came. Those are shocking words to say, and no doubt Mr Moore does not believe me.

Hon. N. F. Moore: I agree with you entirely—100 per cent.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: It is very true in relation to the supplications I have made to Federal

politicians to do something. The member would find out if he wrote himself that it is almost an effort on their part to write back to anybody in Western Australia. It is difficult to get one's point of view put over.

Western Australia is a lot bigger now than it was in 1959 when the population was about 600 000. We are now clocking up 1.4 million people, maybe more; I do not know. It is 2½ times the number of people we had in 1959, just 25 years ago. Are we going to allow ourselves to continue to go cap-in-hand to the Federal authorities and come back and say, "We did all right this time; we expected worse", as Premier Burke said; "You will have to take a tax cut; we agreed with that. It is part of preserving the total economy of the country"?

Why the hell can we not make the decisions ourselves? We are big enough; we are as big as India. We have enough people—1.4 million of them. Our products are good enough. There is nothing to stop us going it alone. I honestly believe that in the future we will have to look at this question as politicians. We will have to take a long, hard look at the possibility and the feasibility of this State's breaking away and going it alone.

I was never a secessionist until the last few years, but it is getting so that the odds are stacked against us. I firmly believe we should have an inquiry of some sort to see where this State should go. Look at Queensland! We all know in our hearts that the strength of its Premier—whether one likes him or not—lies in his determination to get things done for Queensland.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Unemployment is higher there than anywhere else.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The Minister should go to Queensland and find out what the people there think. I was there last weekend on the eve of the strike, and I heard what they had to say. I will not go into that now, but it is about time we had somebody with an equal amount of guts to get up as a Western Australian and put the same points of view. That is what I am driving at. It does not mean to say that I approve of everything Mr Bjelke-Petersen does, but I believe it is about time we had a statesman in control here.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: That is what we have.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The member should know that if we had a statesman he would not come back from Canberra saying, "We did the best we could; we have had to take a cut in the money we get from taxes; I can understand what it is all about". That is what the Premier said—I am right, Mr Pandal?



Hon. P. G. Pendal: You are right Mr Gayfer.

Several members interjected.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: If I can get a word in edgeways, I would like to leave that thought with the members in this Chamber. The time is fast approaching when we will have to look collectively at this problem—the problem of a lack of funds for our huge enterprises, and the fact that we are virtually a remote village 2 500 miles away from the centre of activity. That is the great problem that we will have until we can collectively face up to it. People have gone away on a constitutional discussion or whatever it is—a war committee. It will just be a lively *tête-à-tête*. We preserve the planks of Parkes or Deakin, whoever put those planks in; but we skate around the edge, we shake each other's hands, have a good fortnight, and come back again, but this does not recognise the fact that the fundamental problems of Western Australia and Queensland are exactly the same—we are a forgotten entity as far as 85 per cent of the population of Australia is concerned.

I have in my electorate certain problems that started about 1959 and continued through successive Governments. These problems were associated with a limited expenditure of \$80 million in supply then, and are still unresolved when supply is now 20 times that amount.

I refer in the first instance to the new York High School. It was moved to where it is now in the days of my predecessor—Jimmy Mann—in 1959, some two or three years before I came into this House. The buildings that were promised then are still prefabricated dwellings without any air-conditioning, with ceiling fans, in one of the hottest atmospheres in those York hills that can ever be experienced. One has to look at the overall welfare of the children. I have taken this matter up with the member for the district, the Minister for Works, and he has informed me that they are working hard on doing something for York. In the file in front of me I have at least 150 letters from York people. As an example, one reads as follows—

As a parent of children at the York District High School I find the conditions under which the children have to work are intolerable. Our children have put up with these conditions for three years, believing that new classrooms would be built very soon.

We feel we have waited long enough and wish our school to be given priority for funding in 1985-86 budget and new classrooms to be built during 1986.

I would like to impress upon you that I feel very strongly on this issue and anxiously await your reply.

Their sentiments cannot be voiced to me any louder than that. I have received such letters over the last 24 years and have been trying to get something done during that time. In fact, tonight I received a telegram from the secretary of the York P & C which reads as follows—

York parents request higher priority listing for the construction of brick and tile classrooms at York secondary site.

There is very little I can do about it personally. I can stand here and put the case forward in this place and supply the innumerable letters that I have written over the years. I can take some of the blame as well, because we were in Government ourselves during that period. When we were in Government the Opposition members of the day thought the case was as strong as I believe it was then and is now.

If because of budgetary considerations we cannot possibly get some form of relief immediately for the summer and winter conditions that the children are experiencing in those prefabricated installations, why then can we not have air-conditioning installed? With regard to the question of air-conditioning, I asked a question of Hon. Peter Dowding, representing the Minister for Education. I asked him what is the Education Department's policy with regard to the installation of air-conditioners in Government schools. I wanted to know exactly what the overall policy was. Hon. Peter Dowding gave an answer that is not very easy for everybody to understand! I will read it and let the members listen again to the answer he gave, which was as follows—

The policy of the Education Department in respect of the provision of air-conditioning in Government schools has been formulated in terms of data provided by the Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology.

Priorities have been established in accordance with the data provided with respect to the relative strain index, which provides a means of assessing climate in terms of strain imposed on man. A relative index of 0.3 indicates the level of human discomfort at which air-conditioning is desirable.

Schools in areas where the relative strain index exceeds 0.3 for 50 days, or 25 per cent of the school year have highest priority for air-conditioning, whilst a lower priority has been established for those schools in areas

where the strain index exceeds 0.3 for 25 days per year.

The York P & C had a little trouble understanding that. It was a very good ministerial answer from the Minister, I must admit. They could not understand why, 40 miles to the south, the school at Dale is air-conditioned and why, 100 miles to the east, the school at Bencubbin is air-conditioned. Now, everybody is looking for the relative strain to see whether it is comparable with schools around the corner or around the bend or somewhere else.

In answer to another question the Minister said on 19 February 1985—

I am conscious of the stressful situation in many classrooms throughout the State, caused by the current lengthy period of very hot weather. Indeed, arrangements have been made so that parents may keep children at home if the temperature is expected to exceed 40°C.

In other words, "As the children get hotter, to hell with the schooling, we are not going to put in air-conditioning". Up to 150 kids can be sent home every time the temperature reaches 40 degrees. I think they should go home at that point too, because when it reaches 37.8 degrees in Perth our friends, the waterside workers at Fremantle, go home. I think the children and the teachers should go home when the temperature reaches 40 degrees; but I fail to see why we do not have air-conditioning in places where such temperatures are common.

The Minister went on to say that the temporary classrooms concerned are equipped with fans, although during such hot weather their effect cannot be great. I think that was quite an understatement, when I look at all these letters that have been sent to me.

He then said that no permanent buildings are scheduled for York. That is a repetition of the sad story that has been told for 25 years. He said also that due consideration will be given to the needs of that school during preparation of future Budgets.

I have been told that this financial year we will receive supply of \$1.7 billion. That is a huge increase from \$80 million in 1959 when this school was built. We were short of funds then and we are short of funds now. I guess that works are being carried out in the city areas and little is being done in my area.

The Minister went on to say that while it may seem desirable to solve the problem of hot classrooms by providing air-conditioning, it should be remembered that that would be a very costly exer-

cise both in initial and running costs. He said also that the spell of hot weather was most unusual. We have gone over and over the same thing over the years. What the Minister meant to say was that there are no plans for a new school and for permanent, decent, insulated classrooms. The school has the same fans as are used in this Chamber and those kids will have to swelter in that oppressive heat for the rest of time. Why are better answers not given to me when I ask those questions so that parents can at least hope that something will be done to provide decent classrooms in York?

Equally worrying to me, I believe, is the situation of the 170 community kindergartens throughout this State. Mr MacKinnon had much to do with the pre-school centres. Unfortunately, he was not able to carry his initiatives through to fruition. Promises were made by the Government that consideration would be given to the kindergarten system in this State. The Beazley report stated that there should be a much greater community involvement at all levels of education and that that involvement should be encouraged by all Governments.

The tardiness in implementing Labor policy has created a genuine concern for the parents. I believe that the concerns of these parents are: The lack of advisory support staff in education; the financial hardship that these parents have to bridge; the uncertainty about staffing; the continued Education Department policy which allows pre-primary enrolments to affect the classification of local primary schools which in turn puts pressure on parents to transfer their community kindergartens to the pre-primary system; and divided communities deciding the future of their kindergartens.

The concerns of the 170 kindergartens throughout this State are very real. If the Government, prior to the election, promised certain things—it should implement those policies. It should not fob off those people who genuinely believed that relief was around the corner. It should not defer Mr Beazley's recommendation that certain services need to be stabilised and secured. Where a community sees a need the role of kindergartens should be extended to serve the needs of that community. I believe something should be done immediately.

While I am on the subject of schools, I would like to tackle yet another great concern of country people: The subsidy payable to parents who send their children to high school hostels in country areas. In the main I refer to St. Michaels in Merredin and the hostel at Narrogin. I will not repeat the myriad figures that can be obtained by

anybody who cares to search through *Hansard* except to say that the fee imposed on parents who send their children to these hostels has increased from \$700 which was payable in the first term of 1982 to \$1 050 in the first term of 1985. That is a 50 per cent increase over a four-year period and it works out at an average of 12.5 per cent per annum.

The people who use that facility are the very people mentioned by many members who spoke last night on the Supply Bill. Their business enterprises are going down the gurgler at the rate of 13 per cent a year behind costs. There has now been this 12.5 per cent admitted increase in boarding fees at these schools. The difference is about 25 per cent in real money terms. Something has to be done; those kids have to attend school. The law demands that they be educated to a certain age and the law states that, given equal opportunity, they are entitled to the same education as their city cousins. Yet parents cannot drive 200, 300, or 400 kilometres to school every morning and back every night. Children have to attend cheap boarding schools so that they can receive an education which is not provided by the schools in the areas in which their families live. It is high time that an investigation was carried out into this very serious problem.

A suggestion has been made that the staff at these country high school hostels should be paid by the Government. At the moment they are paid by the hostels which, in turn, set the fees to cover that cost. I believe that the staff have as much right to be accepted as a Government responsibility as do the advisers employed by the Government. The advisers are of no real benefit and do not advantage the people living in the country areas.

I believe that the hostels authority is very concerned about this matter. The fact is that kids will have to leave school; there is nothing else they can do. Parents cannot afford to send them to these schools. The people who will suffer are the poor parents living in the agricultural areas of this State and their children. It is a very sad state to see something like this happening today. This situation would not be tolerated in the city.

I do not believe the people in the city would tolerate it, but the parents in the bush are expected to send their children to school and if they do not they can expect a visit from the truant officer—that is what he was called in my day. I do not know what he is called today.

Hon. John Williams: He is called a welfare officer.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: The parent will say, "I have no bloody money and that is that". It is as simple as that and it is a sorry state of affairs that exists in the country at the present time.

Last night we heard members talk about the direct impact of problems on people in the country, but I am referring today to the direct impact of problems on the children in the country. Surely they should not suffer and go back to the conditions that prevailed in the 1930s.

I appeal to the Government to investigate this matter. If it cannot do anything for the farmers let us see whether, with a little bit of careful planning, it can do something for the children which will enable them to have a decent standard of education.

Finally, I must express my deep concern over the proposition to introduce fat-tailed sheep into Western Australia. I do not know if members are familiar with the story, but I note by the smile on the faces of members that for me to jump from the subject of schools to the subject of fat-tailed sheep is somewhat hilarious. I will not explain in detail what fat-tailed sheep are. Briefly, they are a very edible type of sheep which is suitable for Arab markets. The sheep has a big fat, round tail which is a highly desirable part of the sheep's anatomy as far as the Arabs are concerned. Members are aware that the merino sheep are very successful for Western Australian farmers and if the fat-tailed sheep are brought into Western Australia and are allowed to mate with existing merino flocks I forecast that it will not be many years before our fine merino bright white wool which is sought after around the world will become a thing of the past. The fat-tailed sheep has a colour that cannot be taken out of the fibre as far as weaving is concerned.

Australia exports between \$6 million and \$7 million worth of merino wool each year. I understand that as far as merino meat is concerned the Arabs consider it to be at the bottom of the list.

If we introduce the fat-tailed sheep through the importation of embryos there could be a decline in the country's white wool industry because of the colour fibre of those sheep.

Over the years when the price farmers received for their wool was high enough to enable them to employ labour they could cull their flocks very easily. It was done as a normal course of husbandry. A farmer would either drive his sheep on horseback or would walk behind them with his dog and if he saw a sheep with black feet or a black nose it was pulled out of the flock and ear-marked.

Australia's wool market is something which should be treasured and it was almost lost in 1950

when wool became £1 a pound. At the time farmers said they would not pay any more than 50 guineas for a ram. They said, "What is the good of paying more? As long as they have the necessary attachments it does not matter. As long as they mate and we get lambs it will be all right". During that period the classification of wool and flocks deteriorated.

With the accent on grain there has been an equal disregard for the Australian merino flock. It would be a pity if their fleeces were further contaminated with the colour fibre of the fat-tailed lambs should they be introduced into Australia. If this occurs we will have a sorry and sick wool market in the future.

I do not know who is behind the introduction of these fat-tailed sheep but I have received several letters on the subject. I do not know whether the project is being introduced by the Department of Agriculture, but regardless of who is responsible the Government must look at the situation with an eye on the future of the industry.

I make no apologies for having exceeded the time for which a number of members said that I was allowed to speak. I believe there are a number of speakers to follow me and if the House is to sit until midnight tonight I believe we have that responsibility.

I thank the House for its tolerance in listening to my speech and I hope that some of the points I have made will at least be investigated in the interests of the people I represent.

**HON. KAY HALLAHAN** (South-East Metropolitan) [4.48 p.m.]: The reason I take this opportunity to speak to members in the House is the result of the attack by Hon. Colin Bell today on the Federal member for Brand, Wendy Fatin. In his address he did admit that some of the problems that beset the dairy industry can be attributed to the past Liberal Governments, and it is quite clear that the Premier of this State and the Minister for Agriculture have made very significant representations on behalf of that industry.

It would seem to me that if we have industries that are experiencing troubled times their interest would be best served by members who are prepared to discuss across party lines what might be the resolutions to those problems. While we might accept in this House that that section of the speech by Hon. Colin Bell was politically expedient, quite frankly I believe that he is a poor advocate for the industry. He said that he had been at one time a representative and leader of the industry in WA, and indeed I understood him to say that he had the credentials to speak on this matter. It disturbed me that a person with his experience and

alleged concern would slip into a Federal member who represented the constituency about which he was speaking.

After his speech I telephoned Wendy Fatin and it was clear to me that the point he was putting was spurious.

Several members interjected.

**HON. KAY HALLAHAN**: After all Wendy Fatin is representing the interests of her electorate in a very effective way at a national level.

If Hon. Colin Bell would stop attacking his Federal counterpart and get down to personal communication with that person he might find he would achieve more by that than by the use of the methods he now uses in resorting only to criticism of the member in the local Press.

**HON. C. J. BELL**: Do you mean to say that she does not have any ability to communicate with me?

**HON. KAY HALLAHAN**: I would just like to make clear in the record of this House that Wendy Fatin, the member for Brand, is strongly concerned about the constituents in her seat. She represents them in a very effective and thorough way at the Federal level. I reject the comments made by Hon. Colin Bell in this House.

**HON. P. H. WELLS** (North Metropolitan) [4.51 p.m.]: Mr President—

**HON. Peter Dowding**: That's eight minutes, Mr Wells, you promised.

**HON. J. M. Berinson**: This will be the exception that proves the rule.

**HON. D. K. Dans**: I take Mr Gayfer's point. If you have to be here till two or three in the morning, so be it.

**The PRESIDENT**: Order!

**HON. P. H. WELLS**: The interjections that we get are interesting. I rise to support the Bill. I am anxious that funds be provided for a wide range of areas where funds are necessary.

I draw the attention of the House and the Government to a couple of important issues that I think should be seriously considered. The first relates to the Police Force in our State. For each man out on the beat there is probably a back-up staff of five. Therefore, if we say that we are to increase the Police Force by 100, 200, or 300, it does not mean that that number of police will be out front. We need to be extremely conscious of the present system which very often ties down policemen to duties that take them away from the public.

I suggest that the Police Force, or its methods, should be streamlined. I will give an illustration. I do not have exact knowledge with respect to my

statement, but the Government can soon check it out. I have heard that on some evenings one police car does duty south of the river and one north of the river. That patrol car is on call for any of the incidental happenings in its area. Let us suppose that a patrol car apprehends a drunken driver who must be taken to the police lockup. That exercise takes the patrol car off the road for some hours. I suspect that if another incident occurred in its area, the car in the other area would have to leave its area uncovered for some hours to attend to that matter. In other words, if the car south of the river was attending to a matter which necessitated its leaving the southern area unattended, the car north of the river would have to attend to any other incident south of the river, thus leaving its area uncovered. Taking a drunken driver to the lockup necessitates attention to a number of duties and therefore much time.

That is only one example that could be given. I understand that a whole range of such matters need streamlining. The present Commissioner of Police could well be the person to bring forward that streamlining. It appears that he would need to examine computerisation and many other backup facilities to make our Police Force more effective. It is an important area to consider, because we are not getting the best out of our trained people if the system bogs them down in detail.

Another thing to remember is that if a person pleads not guilty to a charge, a policeman can be tied up for two days in connection with the court case and its preparation. I suggest that those in authority look at whether there is some way of streamlining that method.

I draw the Government's attention to one other area. I believe there should be some extension of "Operation Noah" which has been used successfully in other States. It has recently been announced that it will be used by this Government. It consists of a promotional campaign designed to get callers to ring in to give information about drug offences. I support the proposition, which is a good one.

Victoria and New South Wales have had 12-hour phone-ins, in conjunction with the police, and have been able to uncover many people involved in drug offences. That type of exercise, which makes the public more aware, should be extended into other areas of crime. Just as a store could have a sales promotion to promote awareness of its goods to make the public more aware of what it is selling and to make its staff more efficient, we could have promotional awareness campaigns against break-ins in our State. Recent figures for both north and south of the river which have been presented in this Parliament show break-ins occurring in in-

creasing numbers. In New South Wales a small programme called "Crime Stop" encourages people to phone in their suspicions. It had some promotion. With the readiness of the Press to provide the Government with a high profile, there could be special promotional campaigns to make the public more aware of means of communication.

I suggest that in many cases the public do not know what to do. Only today I heard of an incident in which a person had rented out his house. After some months his next door neighbour noticed all the furniture being put in a furniture van. When the owner of the house came back three months later he found that not a stick of furniture was left in his house. The whole lot had been cleaned out. Afterwards the man's next door neighbour said that he thought it seemed a bit funny that the furniture was being put into the van. That sort of suspicion could be raised over the telephone and could be checked out by the police, who could well have apprehended the criminal. Certainly, the next door neighbour would have been a friend for life and the owner would not have lost the furniture.

On a broad range of matters, people do not know what to do if they are aware of suspicious circumstances. Promotional awareness campaigns could overcome this problem. Every Easter and at other times we have a campaign for safety on the roads. We educate people with respect to seat belts and the like. Why then can we not do it with respect to crime detection and crime prevention? The Government, without any major increase in cost, could well improve communications between the public and the police. The police would have the ability to act on a number of suspicions; more importantly, the public would know what to do. Such a campaign could be combined with the present Government's extension of the "Neighbourhood Watch" system which originated in America and has units in New Zealand. It was commenced by the Liberal Government in Bunbury and extended by this Government to Geraldton and East Fremantle; Albany is just about to move into the "Neighbourhood Watch" scheme. It is a scheme by which neighbours look after each other and watch the houses of people in their absence. I believe it is a good scheme, but it is not enough. The Government has the opportunity to put together proper promotions. The media would be readily available. The Government has no trouble in organising a campaign for safety on the roads over Easter. For example, it has blitzes on seat belts and speeding. It now has the glorious opportunity, in conjunction with the media, to put together a crime awareness promotion.

The public would be made aware and we would benefit because our city and our homes would be better protected.

We should examine the possibility of police courtesy squads. We should not always book motorists. Certain offences could be handled by courtesy squads which are used by other States. Police with loudspeakers just prompt erring motorists, particularly on the freeways. It could well be that motorists need their attention drawn to certain matters, rather than being charged and fined.

We are fortunate that we have police officers who are dedicated to their work. If we undertake the sort of approaches I have suggested, we need to make certain that the Police Force has the capability to follow up those inquiries. It is no good having a promotion that brings in 300 or 400 phone calls providing information if we have not the resources to follow up that information. For example, in the Eastern States "Operation Noah", 1 200 phone calls were received in 12 hours, leading to 289 arrests. If we had such a deluge of information, we would not have the resources to follow it up.

I believe there is a need for the Government, in conjunction with the police, to sit down and work out some specific areas of benefit to the police and to the community.

The move by the fast food outlet, McDonalds, in making a contribution of something like \$40 000 to sponsor the safe house scheme operating in a number of schools in my electorate should be applauded. I have sought to support its establishment in terms of helping to make it safe for children by providing homes where people are willing to act in the case of a child's being accosted or met by some stranger in the street. The programme consists of educating the children not to respond to strangers, and also providing them with the knowledge that the yellow sticker identifies the homes where they can get help. This is a programme which is worth supporting. It is one of those programmes which identifies the people concerned.

#### [Questions taken.]

I congratulate McDonald's Family Restaurants on its contribution to the safe house scheme. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Sunday Times* of 21 April last under the heading "Big Mac saves safety houses". The article reads, in part, as follows—

A fast food chain has stepped in to prevent the collapse of WA's Safety House scheme for children under threat.

Members would be aware that the letterboxes of houses involved in the safety house scheme are marked with a yellow sticker in order that children may identify them. The people who live in those houses are classified as being suitable to help young people who find themselves in difficulties.

The community should be grateful to McDonalds for the way in which it has come to the aid of the safety house scheme which faced the possibility of collapse.

The Minister has indicated that the Government is considering introducing legislation to control the distribution of junk mail. I am concerned that such legislation will result in Australia Post becoming the sole distributor of junk mail in Western Australia.

I refer members to an article which appeared in *The Age* of 13 April last under the heading "Junk mail" means profit for all, says eager Australia Post" and which was written by Margaret Simons, the consumer affairs reporter. The first paragraph of the article reads as follows—

Australia Post is encouraging "junk mail" by persuading organisations to sell their lists of subscribers to mail advertisers.

A further paragraph reads as follows—

The manager of promotion and marketing for Australia Post, Mr Russell Hick, said Australia Post wanted to encourage direct marketing because it helped to cover the cost of maintaining the postal service.

It is possible that legislation in this area could promote the activities of Australia Post despite the fact that direct marketing of that nature is very costly. An expensive method of handling junk mail would be to place it in an envelope and charge a fee for its distribution. Such a practice would add to the cost of distribution of the goods being sold.

If the Government is considering legislating in that area, it should bear in mind that Australia Post does not pay for the letterbox one places at the front of one's house and people have a right to decide what is put in their letterboxes. It would be bad legislation if it protected a Government monopoly and resulted in Australia Post reaping a profit.

The other issue to which I draw the attention of the House is my belief that the Government should introduce adoption legislation. I do not intend to go into a complete debate on this issue, but I make the point that we do seem to be in an age where legislation has a domino effect—one State establishes a piece of legislation, we watch to see how it works, and then follow suit after that initial

breathing space. I will quote from an article which appeared in *The Age* under the heading "Search for 60 000 adoptees". The article concerns the Victorian legislation, and I quote as follows—

The legislation gives adopted people over 18 access to their birth certificates and any identifying information held by the agency which handled the original adoption.

I believe that if the Government is considering moving in a similar direction it should seriously consider taking the responsibility from the Department of Community Welfare and transferring it to the Attorney General's department. In this instance we are not talking about children being adopted, but about adults wanting information. The registration being talked about comes within the responsibility of the Attorney General's department, so there is some strong reason to support such a transfer to his department. I say this without intending any slur on the Department of Community Welfare, as in this case we are not dealing with children but with the registration of adults.

I turn now to schools and I have two concerns to raise. The first involves the latest high school to open in my area: namely, the Woodvale High School. I visited the school this week and I was pleased to see the great changes which have come about thanks to the money the Government has expended. Mind you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. John Williams), no sign can be seen to tell anyone that it is a high school. What is more, if a builder erects a house in my electorate he is required to place a sign at the front giving his name and his builder's licence number. If we walk around the city and come across a building being erected we always see a notice telling us the name of the architect, the project engineer, the builder, and a whole range of other people involved. For some reason apparently the Government did not want anyone to know that the Woodvale High School was being built. Unlike other Government projects such as, for instance, bicentennial road projects, no sign was placed in front of the Woodvale High School development.

A part of the development of new high schools is that new roads are often required, and these roads are the responsibility of local government. Sometimes the Government moves ahead too quickly with a project and the local council is not able to keep pace and have the roads built in time for the school's opening.

In this case the roads adjacent to the Woodvale High School are certainly in a dangerous condition. I saw children on their bicycles riding on the soft edges of the uncompleted roads and facing

the danger of overturning their bikes and having an accident. Cars leaving the school and travelling on the temporary roads often spin their wheels. If a child were riding past a car which spun its wheels there could well be an accident.

I accept that there is a lot of pressure on local governments to fix up these roads, but unfortunately the Government sometimes moves too far ahead with its project. Discussion needs to take place with the local council concerned and possibly some consideration should be given by the Government to its taking the initiative by providing a temporary advance of moneys to ensure the roads are constructed in time.

I turn now to comment on the Heathridge Primary School, which was designed well before the present Government came to office. Its situation indicates that planners decide on a block of land without always inspecting the site. The school needs a playing area, and although there is free land adjacent to it, it is quite hilly. On a plan the area might look to be suitable for a playing area, but in fact it is not. The population in the area is increasing and the school is bursting at the seams, yet it has only a small recreation area. It needs an oval for the children. A council reserve is adjacent, but again it happens to be a hilly area which the council may take some time to develop. This problem could have been avoided had there been some forward planning and discussions with the council. This might then have assured that proper playing fields were provided for the many children at the school.

My last subject concerns bicycles and the Government's move to have large numbers of cycleways constructed around the metropolitan area. This is a good move, although I do not believe it is necessarily the best and it may not provide people who want to travel to work on their bicycles with the best means of doing so.

In recent times major roads have been built with shoulders so that motorists who are in difficulty can pull over into these shoulders and not affect the main flow of traffic. The Government has made some moves to have these shoulders used by cyclists. This makes sense because it takes cyclists out of the mainstream of traffic.

I am told that the cost of constructing a road with a shoulder is approximately the same as the cost of constructing a road which is curbed on both sides. The Government would therefore do well to encourage local government councils to develop more roads with shoulders along main routes and ensure that they are suitable for cyclists wanting to commute between home and the office. The reason that many people do not ride

their bicycles is that it is rather hazardous to do so on our roads. Most motorists do not have any idea how to handle people on bicycles and in fact create a danger when passing them, at times coming extremely close to the cyclists. By the same token some cyclists need to be educated in riding in traffic.

If there were to be a greater number of shouldered roads constructed rather than curbed roads, we could have more major routes suitable for cyclists to ride to work. The construction of shoulders would encourage cyclists to travel to work on their bikes. This would be preferable to constructing merely recreational cycleways, or cycleways for children going to and from school for instance. The Government should consider encouraging such a move and ensuring that planning for the shoulders is carried out in the early stages.

I support the Bill.

**HON. I. G. PRATT** (Lower West) [5.28 p.m.]: I will speak briefly in this debate to reply to a very unfortunate speech made this afternoon by Hon. Kay Hallahan.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It was an excellent speech—witty, pithy, and to the point.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: The more the Minister makes those sorts of comments the more inclined I would be to spread his comments right throughout my electorate.

Unfortunately, Hon. Kay Hallahan is not in the Chamber, and I understand that all members have commitments which take them from the Chamber at times.

I make it clear at the outset that there is definitely no person in this Parliament, and probably no person in the Federal Parliament or in Western Australia with a greater knowledge of the dairy industry than Hon. Colin Bell. His knowledge comes from a lifetime of involvement in the industry, through his family, through his personal involvement in two States in the ownership of dairy properties, and through his services to the dairy industry at the highest possible level. When he speaks in support of the Western Australian dairy industry he does so with authority.

He has been good enough to give me some of the speech notes he used for his speech earlier today and I shall quote one paragraph of them. Referring to members of the Government his notes say—

I urge members to obtain the facts from the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture, because in recent weeks they have supported the Western Australian dairy industry and I applaud them for that. It has taken a while

for that to occur, but the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture have adopted that excellent position and I applaud them for it.

May he well do so, because the Commonwealth policy on this matter will be disastrous for Western Australia.

I heard members of the Government interject on the honourable member to say that the present Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) is well respected by the farming industry.

Last week I was in Tasmania and the newspapers and television coverage in that State showed how much respect the Tasmanian farmers had for the Federal Minister—they rioted when he was in Tasmania! When he left Tasmania he returned to Victoria and the same thing happened—hardly the sort of recognition a well-loved Minister for Agriculture would receive!

It would appear almost as if Hon. Kay Hallahan was supporting Mrs Fatin because she is a woman; there seems to be very little other reason for a member to stand in a House of the Western Australian Parliament and support a person who supports a policy which will bring disaster to a large and very important industry in this State.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: It is very unfair to attack a person who is not present and is unable to defend herself.

**THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT** (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: That is not my fault. I am a member of this House and I take my right to speak.

Hon. Lyla Elliott: I am not talking about Wendy Fatin defending herself. It was unfair of Mr Bell to attack someone who was not present to defend herself.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I know it is against the Standing Orders to make comments across the floor like that, Mr Deputy President, but I thought it was very important that I pause and allow the honourable member to make her point. I also advise her to listen to the ABC and to hear the sort of comments made by Government members and the Minister in the Federal Parliament concerning members of State Parliament. Then perhaps she would not feel it was so unfair for a State member to stand in this House and defend our State and one of our important industries against the comments of a Federal member of Parliament, because she knows as well as I do that Mrs Fatin cannot be in this House to answer the allegations, nor can Hon. Colin Bell be in the Federal Parliament to make his comments. Hon. Colin Bell makes his comments in this Parliament



and Mrs Fatin makes hers in the Federal Parliament. It is a shame that when the honourable member chose to stand and speak on this subject, being a member, mind you, who, along with Hon. Robert Hetherington, represents a province in which dairy farming is conducted—perhaps they are not aware of its existence, but I am—

Hon. Peter Dowding: You should have told Mr Bell. He said he was the only one who had been—

Hon. I. G. PRATT: He did not say that. The Minister is on one of his nonsense trips again.

Hon. Peter Dowding: He did. You should have listened to him.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Hon. C. J. Bell referred to members of Federal Parliament.

Hon. Tom Stephens: You got that wrong.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You got that wrong too.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): We will get closer to 2.00 a.m. if the interjections do not cease.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: The honourable member referred to members of Federal Parliament—*Hansard* will clear that matter—and the Minister is wrong again; that is something we have come to expect from him. It is a pity that Hon. Kay Hallahan did not line herself up as a representative of the dairy industry along with the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture of this State who have expressed the same view as has Hon. C. J. Bell; or do we see a split in the Labor Party? We are seeing a split in the Eastern States and perhaps it is starting to happen here. Perhaps the honourable member belongs to a faction to which Mrs Fatin belongs; I do not know, but I can see no other reason for her stand.

The ALP tells us all the time that everything it does is rock solid, yet a member has chosen to stand in this House and go directly against the comments of the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture. Her justification is that she has telephoned Mrs Fatin and Mrs Fatin has told her that Mr Bell is wrong. For heaven's sake, the woman does not understand the dairy industry. What else would she say when Hon. Kay Hallahan telephones her?

Hon. P. G. Pental: A big revelation, wasn't it?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I stand with Hon. Colin Bell 100 per cent on this matter. The dairy industry is a very important industry, particularly in our province, and we will do everything we can to support it. If other members in whose electorates dairy farming is conducted are not prepared to support their electors we will not have any qualms about telling the dairy industry about it.

I want to comment on a couple of other matters very briefly. One is the attitude that Hon. Peter Dowding in his role as Minister in this place exhibits when he is asked for information. Due to his handling of matters over recent months, he has become known as the "Minister for Mistakes".

Hon. Peter Dowding: Rubbish!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: We will change that to the "Minister for Secrecy"—

Hon. P. G. Pental: And "Rubbish and Mistakes"!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: —because whenever he is asked a question on a delicate subject he says, "I am afraid it is confidential. I cannot comment on the matter".

Hon. Peter Dowding: I never said that.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: We were elected to this Parliament by the people of this State and we have the right to ask questions and to receive answers to them. I have very vivid memories of the Minister when in Opposition berating Hon. David Wordsworth as Minister for Transport because he did not have on hand some very small detail on a significant subject. Hon. Peter Dowding said, "You are the Minister. It is your responsibility to know. It is your responsibility to tell the Parliament". It is time he took his own advice. It is his responsibility to tell the Parliament. That is why we are here, otherwise a Minister when answering questions would say, "I am not going to tell you", like a spoilt little school kid. It is about time Hon. Peter Dowding faced up to his responsibilities. He is a much-travelled Minister in terms of the portfolios he has held, and really he has probably got to the end of the available portfolios.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I have still about another 15 to go!

Hon. P. G. Pental: The Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet for you!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I want to comment on the question Hon. Ian Medcalf asked of the Attorney General in regard to commissioners for declarations. One of the reasons he gave was that he was too busy to do the job—what a thing for a Minister to say! "I have not got the staff and I have been too busy"; so we let it go for several months. If the Attorney General has not got the staff or the time he should go to the Premier and tell him to give the job to somebody who has the time or the staff and not to make that sort of nonsensical comment, because people come to all of us requiring the services of commissioners for declarations in business. Often a real estate firm does not have a qualified person on its staff and it wants the

services of a CD. Even private hospitals have approached me.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What would they need to sign?

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I have received approaches from hospitals and other organisations. We must say to those people, "I am sorry. You might need a commissioner for declarations within your organisation but until the Minister has time to do his job you will have to wait and find a school teacher or a policeman to do the job for you".

I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

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

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Minister for Budget Management), and passed.

### **BILLS (7): ASSENT**

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

1. Financial Institutions Duty Act (Revival of section 76) Bill.
2. Miscellaneous Regulations (Validation) Bill.
3. Offenders Probation and Parole Amendment Bill.
4. Gaming and Betting (Contracts and Securities) Bill.
5. Acts Amendment (Gaming and related provisions) Bill.
6. Transport Amendment Bill.
7. Acts Amendment (Betting Control) Bill.

### **ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL**

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.41 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until a date to be fixed by the President.

Question put and passed.

### **ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: ORDINARY**

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [5.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### *Rural Sector Hardship: Discussion of Motion*

HON. H. W. GAYFER (Central) [5.43 p.m.]: I rise with a certain amount of indignation over the fact that this House is rising without discussing the business on the Notice Paper. Do I take it from what I have heard in the motion moved by the Leader of the House that the House is prorogued? If it is, does this mean all business on the Notice Paper is dispensed with?

Hon. Tom Stephens: You are wrong.

Hon. D. K. Dans: The House is not prorogued yet.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: Mr President, I need some clarification on this point because I believe we cannot possibly adjourn this House just like that. Some of us have been saddled up for weeks waiting for further discussion on the motion relating to rural industries hardship, yet now it appears the Government is just dispensing with it and letting it go. In the light of what is going on and what has been said, I believe it is wrong in essence to just give it away suddenly and let this business go. I do not think members of the Government realise what is happening outside.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You should be an instructor at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: This is *not* performing art, Mr Dans; it is very real.

I ask members to look at this headline which says, "Bank kicks and another WA farmer bites the dust". Is that not real? I can produce dozens of such cases. Perhaps the 8 000 angry farmers who walked to Parliament House were not sufficient to make the Government realise there is a problem. We are getting up for God knows how long. I will be perfectly frank: When Mr Bell moved his motion I was prepared to move for the deletion of certain words.

I can now say I was going to move that the words "condemns the Government for its failure to address the financial and social plight of rural communities in Western Australia" be deleted so that the motion would read "That this House calls on Governments both State and Federal" to do certain things. That was my solution to get a concerted effort from everybody here to draw attention to this State's problem. It is very much a problem, more so than in other States, but if we had made a concerted effort about 20 March and got no results by the end of the session, we could then have moved to condemn the Government for not acting. In my opinion that would be a compromise in order to get across to the nation that we have a problem; but we are not even being given a chance to do that. We will go out the door and this motion will be dead and buried for ever.

It is wrong that we should be asked to give up our work just to spell a matter as easy as this. There was a way out of the difficulty—a good and clean way—which everybody in this House would have supported. We have been given no opportunity to go to the Federal authorities and put a unanimous decision from this Legislative Council in the terms of the motion about which I have just spoken. In no way did it cast any reflection on this Government.

The crocodile tears in this House are being shed so that people outside can see them. I looked at the number of politicians who crowded around Mr Winston Crane and others on the steps of Parliament House in order to get their photographs taken.

The PRESIDENT: Order! While the member is perfectly free to speak about whether certain items on the Notice Paper are no longer able to be discussed—if that is the situation, and I do not know that it is—Standing Order No. 88 prevents him from discussing the content of any of those items on the Notice Paper. I would ask him to bear that in mind when he resumes his remarks.

Hon. H. W. GAYFER: I am sorry that I talked about the content of certain business on the Notice Paper instead of talking about members standing in front of the cameras, because there was no content in their actions.

I seem to be hamstrung somewhat in launching into what I think would be an excellent discourse at this time of the evening. I can do no more than register my protest at this House adjourning when such an important item is before us and still on our Notice Paper. I sincerely believe it will never be discussed, so I wonder at the futility of doing all the weeks of work and getting a case prepared when it can no longer be heard. I know other members have laboriously brought material in here night after night hoping the chance would come for them to talk about the problems facing people in their electorates and this State.

*Tobacco (Promotion and Sale to Young Persons)  
Bill: Discussion*

HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [5.48 p.m.]: I believe the House should not adjourn without my protest that the Orders of the Day indicate 10 matters have not been dealt with, including one of importance which calls on the Government to debate the Tobacco (Promotion and Sale to Young Persons) Bill. That Bill seeks to

establish a practical, more up-to-date penalty system. The action by the Government in not dealing with that Bill reflects a head-in-the-sand attitude and ignores the fact that people in the community, both smokers and non-smokers—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Move that the House vote against the motion to adjourn!

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I believe the Government by determining that it will not come back—and it is within its power to come back at any time—

Hon. D. K. Dans: You are dodging the issue.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: Tomorrow is Anzac Day and if the Government wants to come back next week—

Hon. D. K. Dans interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Leader of the House will leave control of members to me I am sure we will conclude a little sooner.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am protesting that it is the Government's intention that this be the last session of this Parliament—and that is within the control of the Government—and there is no intention to deal with the Bill which is No. 8 on the Notice Paper. I should register a protest because the community believes this issue could be dealt with. By not dealing with it the Government continues to contribute to the confusion which exists among retailers and the public generally in relation to the present Act which provides a 40-shilling penalty. Most people would accept that if Parliament is not going to act on this matter Parliament does not consider it to be important.

The Government has the initiative in this particular matter and in ignoring that initiative it is neglecting its duty. Furthermore, in terms of the money it is contributing through the "Quit Campaign", it should put together a media programme to educate the public about the facts.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The same Standing Order applies to this member as applied to the previous speaker; that is, under Standing Order No. 88 the content of the subject matter appearing on the Notice Paper cannot be discussed. That is not to say—I do not want the member to misunderstand me—that he is not free to express his concerns about the Bills not being dealt with. I do not know whether members cannot understand that but if they cannot understand it they should tell me and I will endeavour to explain it to them. It seems simple enough to me.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Send him a note.

Hon. P. H. WELLS: I am not referring to the Bill; I am referring to an Act of Parliament. I am pointing out that I believe the "Quit" campaign should have educated people through the media about the facts of the law as it exists today; that is, it is illegal, even though it is a 1960 Act, to sell

tobacco to children. I believe that, if the Government is not going to pass this Bill, it should at least inform people about what the current law is.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## TRANSPORT: ROAD TRAINS

*Speed Limit*

805. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Government received a request from transport operators for a maximum of 100 kilometres per hour to be permitted on all designated road-train routes for all road transport except road-trains themselves?
- (2) If "Yes", when is the Government likely to make a decision on this request?
- (3) If not, why not?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) This matter is under consideration by the Police Department in conjunction with the Main Roads Department and a decision cannot be expected for some months.

806. *Postponed.*

## POLICE: ACCIDENT INQUIRY SECTION

*Victoria Park*

807. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

I refer to his answer to question 517 answered on 21 February 1985, and ask:

- (1) Has the fate of the Accident Inquiry Section of the Victoria Park Police Station (the old Traffic Office) been determined?
- (2) If so, what is to occur in relation to this section?
- (3) How many officers are involved?
- (4) If the office is to be closed or relocated, how will the current area be serviced?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) to (4) Answered by (1).

## CONTRACEPTIVES ACT

*Amendment*

808. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it correct, as reported in the *Daily News* of Tuesday, 2 April 1985, that the Contraceptives Act is to be amended to allow the sale of condoms in shops?
- (2) Upon what is such a decision based?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Professor David Penington, Head of the Commonwealth AIDS Task Force, has advocated the greater use of condoms as a preventive measure against the spread of AIDS. Professor Penington sees this as the most likely public health option available to Governments in the fight against AIDS, in the absence of any breakthrough in finding a medical cure.

It is believed that by relaxing the avenues of availability of condoms, it will assist considerably in the campaign against the spread of AIDS.

It is proposed to make minor amendments to the current Act, as a public health measure, to allow for the exemption of the sale of condoms so as to enable retail outlets, other than registered pharmacies, to sell or distribute condoms. Retailers seeking approval to sell condoms will be required to apply to an advisory committee established under the Act to recommend to the Minister such exemptions.

809 and 810. *Postponed.*

## MR JOHN HORGAN

*Employment: Consultant*

811. Hon. JOHN WILLIAMS, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Is Mr John Horgan employed by the Government as a consultant?
- (2) If so, what remuneration and emoluments are received by Mr Horgan in addition to his fees as a Director of the WA Development Corporation?
- (3) Are any fees payable to Mr Horgan as Chairman of the WA Exim Corporation?
- (4) If Mr Horgan is not employed by the Government as a consultant, on what

basis is he remunerated for expenses and time involved in visiting Korea, the Eastern States, and other visits and activities on behalf of the Government?

- (5) Has Mr Horgan any formal contractual arrangement with the State Government?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) to (5) The information sought by the member will be obtained and he will be advised accordingly.

# DEFENCE: ARMY

## *Manoeuvres: Dandaragan Shire*

812. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Communication and Defence Liaison:

Will the Minister request that following Army manoeuvres in the Dandaragan Shire the Army will remain on site for 48 hours to ensure no outbreak of bush fires occurs as a result of those exercises?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

While it is not the province of State Authorities to direct the Army in relation to manoeuvres on its land, the member's request will be referred to the Army.

# ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD

## *Chairman: Acting*

813. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) When is it anticipated that Mr Dallas Dempster's term as acting chairman of the Rottnest Island Board will expire?  
(2) Why is it not possible to appoint a permanent chairman to the Board?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) Mr Dallas Dempster's term as Acting Chairman of the Rottnest Island Board and the appointment of a permanent chairman will be reviewed when the Acts Amendment and Repeal (Disqualification for Parliament) Act 1984 is proclaimed to come into operation from 1 July 1985.

# APIARY: HONEY

## *Tourism Commission: Sales*

814. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) From which Travel Centres around Australia has the honey purchased from the Great Southern Regional Travel Association been sold?  
(2) Is it correct that the honey has now become cloudy and is, therefore, difficult to sell?  
(3) If not, why is it that the honey has been so difficult to sell?  
(4) What plans do the Tourism Commission have to recoup the costs involved in the purchase of this honey?  
(5) What action does the Minister intend to take to ensure that this type of activity is not repeated by the commission?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Perth.  
(2) No.  
(3) and (4) The commission is developing a comprehensive strategy designed to maximise the benefits which will flow from this venture to be implemented in due course.  
(5) Answered by (3) and (4).

# ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD

## *Member for Rockingham: Resignation*

815. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Tourism:

- (1) When did Mr M. Barnett, MLA resign from the Rottnest Island Board?  
(2) Why did he resign?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The appointment of Mr M. Barnett, MLA, as a member of the Rottnest Island Board was cancelled and revoked under the provisions of the Parks and Reserves Act 1895 by Executive Council on 22 January 1985.  
(2) The appointment was cancelled and revoked in anticipation of the proclamation of the Acts Amendment and Repeal (Disqualification for Parliament) Act 1984 to avoid Mr Barnett prejudicing his position as a member of the Legislature.

816 and 817. *Postponed.*

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT: WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

*Managing Director*

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

Has the Minister ever met Mr David McKinley, the managing director of the Western Australian Development Corporation?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

As I have indicated to the honourable member previously, question time is not an opportunity for him to fish around my ministerial calendar. I do not intend to answer that question, although there is no earthly reason why I should not have met Mr McKinley.

### MINERALS: DIAMONDS

*Dispute: Joint Venturers' Action*

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

Did the Minister become involved in any discussion, either with Mr David McKinley or with any director of the WADC or any other member of the WADC, about the role played by the WADC as an Argyle diamond shareholder in the event the major shareholder participants in the Argyle diamond mine venture proposed legal action against the Transport Workers Union?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Again that fits in exactly with the wall I have indicated I intend to retain around the exercise of my private responsibilities in talking to people and giving them an opportunity to come to me if they wish to raise matters or discuss them in confidence so that the Opposition cannot pillory those people or use the visits—

Hon. Tom Knight: You are answerable to the Parliament.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I accept that—or use the information that a meeting is being held for some purely party political purpose.

If the member has some legitimate reason for wanting to know a policy issue which is raised in relation to this, then I will try to give very careful consideration

to such a question. But I do not intend to allow him to make party political use out of people who want to come to see me for discussions, whoever they may be and whichever issues they may wish to raise with me.

### MINERALS: DIAMONDS

*Dispute: Joint Venturers' Action*

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

Is the Minister aware that the major participants in the Argyle diamond venture met to discuss the use of section 45D of the Trade Practices Act against the Transport Workers Union, but they were unable to pursue that course of action because of the refusal by Mr David McKinley to support such action, giving the reason that the State Government supported the Transport Workers Union's entry into the workplace and opposed the use of section 45D of the Trade Practices Act?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

No, I am not aware of that information.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: You are hiding something.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: It would be a most immature political observer who was not aware that both the State and Federal Governments have taken a certain position in relation to section 45D and its use. One would not have to be Albert Einstein to know that the State Government and the Federal Government have expressed publicly their views about what should properly happen to section 45D. I am not aware of the details of the meeting the honourable member refers to.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

*Postponed: Answers*

691. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General:

In view of the fact we appear now to be in the final day of sitting, would the Attorney General undertake to provide early answers to postponed questions still on the Notice Paper?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

Yes.

# COMMISSIONERS FOR DECLARATIONS

## *Appointments: Moratorium*

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

I would like the Attorney General to inform the House of the nature and the purpose on the moratorium on the appointment of commissioners for declarations.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

There are several reasons. The first is that on taking over the responsibility for the appointment of commissioners for declarations—from the Department of Administrative Services the duties involved in that exercise were combined with the office dealing with the appointment of justices of the peace. The total number of applications involved in that work were excessive for the staff available, or perhaps it would be better to say for the staff which would be justified. I think I previously indicated to Mr Wells that the total staff would be four, but given the relative lack of urgency for appointments, I regard this as an excessive use of resources. Since I indicated that the moratorium was in place, the backlog has been substantially reduced.

The second reason was that this was the first time I had direct responsibility for the appointment for commissioners for declarations, and it occurred to me that the opportunity should be taken to review the policy in respect of the appointment of such commissioners. If my memory serves me correctly, we have something like 16 000 commissioners for declarations. We have something like 40 000 persons or more entitled to perform the duties of commissioners for declarations without being appointed specifically for the purpose. There is a real question as to whether at the current stage there is any justification for additional appointments. The moratorium is intended therefore for the purpose of drawing breath and giving ourselves some time to consider that wider issue.

# MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

## *Consultants*

693. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

Has the Minister engaged any private consultants, and if so, for what purpose?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I believe that not very long ago a question on notice was asked relating to the consultancy arrangements engaged in by the Department of Employment and Administrative Services in relation to some publicity for the Skills West '85 programme. Other than that, none comes to mind. If the member puts the question on notice, I shall provide him with an answer in due course.

# COMMISSIONERS FOR DECLARATIONS

## *Appointments: Moratorium*

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

In relation to the moratorium on commissioners for declarations, does the moratorium purport to request that no further applications be lodged or does it merely relate to the non-processing of applications?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I do not have the copy of my request to members with me. My intention was that members should refrain from lodging applications during the moratorium period.

# COMMISSIONERS FOR DECLARATIONS

## *Appointments: Policy*

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

Is a new policy in relation to commissioners for declarations in contemplation by the Government?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

I do not think I can take this question beyond my former comments. I have said I would like the opportunity, without at the same time having to deal with the flood of applications which normally appear in this area, to consider whether some recommendation should be put to the Government. The Government has no submission on this matter before it. Due to the pressures of the parliament-



tary session. I have not been able to apply myself to the question of whether I ought to put a submission before the Government. The situation then is as tentative as I explained it before; namely, that the time is appropriate to give this matter consideration, but I have not yet had the opportunity to do so.

## COMMISSIONERS FOR DECLARATIONS

### *Powers: Justices of the Peace*

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

I take it from what has been said by the Attorney General that it is not proposed to amalgamate the powers of commissioners for declarations with those of justices of the peace.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

That thought has not occurred to me previously and there is certainly no such proposition in train.

## COMMISSIONERS FOR DECLARATIONS

### *List: Publication*

697. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General:

My question follows on the questions asked by Hon. Ian Medcalf in relation to commissioners for declarations. The Attorney referred to the fact that there are large numbers of appointees and, therefore, the community will suffer no disadvantage as a result of the moratorium. Does the Attorney recognise that, whereas justices of the peace can be identified readily from a list in the telephone directory or from a list published by the department, no such list indicates the whereabouts of commissioners for declarations? Therefore, people who need a commissioner for declarations to witness their signatures are under some disadvantage, because if one is not available nearby, it is difficult to locate one. Thus an ongoing need exists to appoint commissioners for declarations.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Would the Attorney General answer the part of those comments which was a question.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

My hesitation was due to my considering which part that was.

That is a consideration which will be taken into account.

## EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

### *Survey: Lower Central Province*

698. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

In this morning's edition of *The West Australian* an advertisement appeared for market research interviewers to work in the Manjimup, Bridgetown, and Donnybrook areas on an important Government social survey about employment. As that area is the heartland of my electorate, would the Minister give some reason for the survey? I ask also for an undertaking that the results of the survey will be discussed with local members, because it involves all of us.

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

If the decision was made to conduct that survey, it was made in some administrative way. However, if it is a matter within my responsibility, I shall give the request consideration.

## EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

### *Survey: Lower Central Province*

699. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the Minister for Employment and Training:

As a supplementary question to my last question, I would like the Minister to give the matter a bit more consideration, because it is important. It is a matter which involves local members. Would the Minister give an assurance to find out more about this survey and, when his department has the information available for him, would he pass it on to local members?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

I shall give the matter more consideration. If the member puts both questions on notice I shall give him a written reply.

## QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

### *Notice Required*

700. Hon. W. N. STRETCH, to the President:

How much more notice, Sir, does the Minister require than the notice given in this morning's Press?

The PRESIDENT: I do not answer questions.

**LATE QUESTION ON NOTICE**

**GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS:  
PREFERENCE**

*Main Roads Department*

806. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Employment and Training representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does the Main Roads Department have a policy of allowing for preference to local tenderers when awarding tenders for its road building projects?
- (2) If so, what preference applies?
- (3) Does the MRD require its prime contractors to allow for local preference when the prime contractors call for tenders from subcontractors?
- (4) If so, what preference applies?
- (5) Does the Government have a policy on preference to local tenderers which differs from the policy of the MRD?
- (6) If so, what is the Government's policy?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) Tenders for road building projects are required to provide a materials schedule indicating the natural source and value of all materials to be used in the works which are manufactured outside Western Australia.

For the purpose of tender comparisons the value of such materials is increased by 10 per cent. This policy only applies, however, where works are carried out using State funds. The Commonwealth does not allow preference for Commonwealth funded projects.

- (3) and (4) Not specifically, but it is an obligation of the prime tenderer to list all materials which would include those provided by subcontractors.
- (5) and (6) MRD policy accords with the publication "Local Preference—State Government Policy, Western Australia 1980."

