

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 14 October 1980

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

### *Abolition: Petition*

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [4.31 p.m.]: I have a petition, containing in all eight signatures. The petition deals with the question of the sanctity of human life being one of the fundamentals of a Christian society. Similar petitions have been presented previously. I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly, and it has been signed by the Clerk.

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

(See petition No. 26.)

## INFLATION

### *Political Advertisements: Urgency Motion*

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): I wish to advise that I have received the following letter—

Dear Mr Speaker,

In accordance with Standing Order 48 I advise that I intend to move under Standing Order 47—

“That the House do now adjourn” for the purpose of discussing the effects of inflation on the living standards of Western Australians since December 1975, as highlighted by recent political advertising and the urgency of maintaining accurate and honest advertising in relation to inflation and its effects.

Yours sincerely,

Ron Davies, M.L.A.

## LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

My initial reaction to the letter was to deny permission for the debate to proceed. Indeed, I believe that if there were not to be a Federal election at the end of this week no such motion would be proposed, and the matter seems to me to be one of little relevance to this Legislative Assembly *per se*. However, from past experience it is obvious to me that in the event of my declining to allow the debate to proceed, a motion would be moved to dissent from my ruling. That becomes a very disorderly way in which to deal

with this sort of thing; and I believe it is quite unfortunate that we do not have a more appropriate mechanism to deal with urgency motions.

Mr Tonkin: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Active consideration is being given by the Standing Orders Committee to finding a way around this problem. Ever since I have been a member of this House there has been contention about the lack of facility for introducing urgency motions.

Mr Tonkin: I wrote to you about this matter about two years ago.

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge that the member for Morley wrote to me about two years ago about this, and I want him to know that the Standing Orders Committee of which he was a member gave some consideration to the matter, and the present Standing Orders Committee is currently giving it active consideration in an endeavour to make a recommendation to the House to overcome the problem.

The present Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, expressed his dissatisfaction with the way in which matters of urgency had to be dealt with in this House. In particular he was concerned about the requirement for the motion to be withdrawn after a heated debate. It does not look good to have no vote taken on such a matter. That is my personal view, and I am sure it is shared by many members.

However, I believe it is in the interests of this House for me to allow the debate to proceed, subject to conditions which have applied in previous cases. I therefore propose that the debate go ahead on the basis that there be three speakers from each side of the House, that there be no right of reply by the mover, and that at the conclusion of the debate the mover be required to seek the withdrawal of the motion.

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park—Leader of the Opposition) [4.38 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, thank you for your accurate reading of the situation. I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: I require seven members to support the motion.

Seven members having risen in their places,

Mr DAVIES: I am sure Government members will welcome this opportunity to correct some of the mistakes which have appeared in recent political advertisements. We all understand that sometimes a little licence is taken with the truth and that some of the advertising is not quite on target; but I believe in this situation the Liberal

Party has decided there will be no holds barred in regard to retaining office, and that it can tell as many untruths to the community as it may like. As the Liberal Party probably will not be challenged because the resources and the time are not available to allow such a challenge, this is the occasion when we must try to do something about the matter.

With due respect to you, Mr Speaker, I disagree with at least one point you made; that is, that the matter does not have direct relevance to this Chamber and the people of Western Australia. Of course it does. We are the people who represent the whole of the State, and we are the ones who should be concerned if a wrong is being wrought in respect of advertising which will affect the public and their future for the next three years. We want to look at the matter of inflation and the matter of maintaining accuracy and honesty in respect of advertising. We must all vote. It is compulsory for people to vote on Saturday; and we must endeavour to put the record straight before then. Let us consider what the record might be.

It was only during the weekend that I gave careful consideration to this matter. Unfortunately, I do not see television very often. It is only on rare occasions that I see it. Perhaps because it was a holiday yesterday, and I was in my car more than I might normally be, I heard a lot of radio advertising, and a lot of talk about lamb chops being 80c each. I am not quite certain whether that was going to happen in 12 months, three years, five years, or whenever. No time period was given. However, the scare tactics used in the dishonest advertising of the Liberal Party indicate that a lamb chop will increase in price to 80c, a bottle of milk to 85c, a loaf of bread to \$1.15, and a dozen eggs to \$2.25.

Let us learn what the prices are today. I am quoting from the report of the Australian Bureau of Statistics issued at noon on 11 August 1980. At that time a 600 ml bottle of milk cost, on an average basis, 28.5c; a dozen eggs of the 55 gram weight, \$1.26; a 680 gram loaf of bread, 64c; and a kilogram of lamb chops, \$4.24. If one assumes there are eight lamb chops to the kilogram that means that a lamb chop now costs about 53c.

When one considers the projected inflation rate—and I want members to remember that it has been admitted by Canberra that the inflation rate will be between 10 and 11 per cent during the coming year, irrespective of what Government is in office; and there is very little that an incoming Labor Government could do to control that inflation rate within the budgetary restrictions for the next 12 months—one finds that the increase

for a bottle of milk would be around 5c; a loaf of bread would increase by around 13c; a loin chop would increase in price by around 10c; and a dozen eggs would increase by around 25c.

That is bad enough; but that is calculated on an inflation rate of about 12 per cent only. I have added a little to the projected inflation rate of 10 to 11 per cent and given those prices at an inflation rate of 12 per cent. Despite what this Government says, it has not been able to contain the inflation rate in line with its predictions during the whole of the period it has been in office since 1975.

Let us see what has happened to the prices of those essential commodities since 1975—the milk, the bread, the lamb chop, and the eggs. A bottle of milk has increased from 19c to 28.5c—an increase of 8.5c or 50 per cent. A loaf of bread has increased from 42c to 64c, an increase of 22c or 52.4 per cent. The price of a dozen eggs has increased from 99c to \$1.26, an increase of 22c or 27.3 per cent. One loin chop has increased from 10.8c—I could hardly believe this myself—to 53c, an increase of 42c or 390.7 per cent. That is the increase in the price of a lamb chop under the present Liberal-Country Party coalition Government. An increase of 390.7 per cent! Those are the facts. Those figures were not my recollection of the situation, and they were not taken from newspaper advertisements. As I said, they are the figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics in Canberra. Looking at those figures, the price for a kilogram of loin chops in 1975 was 86.5c, and this year it is \$4.24 per kilogram. That is an increase of 390.7 per cent in five years.

Yet the Liberal Party has the gall to use these scare tactics in its advertising, saying that prices will zoom under Labor. It claims that prices will be uncontrollable. However, prices have already gone out of control because of the policies adopted by this Government.

The Liberal Party talks about this 20 per cent increase, and one asks, "Where do they get it from? Where is the authentication of the figure?" There are no answers to those questions, because that statement was thought up in the advertising rooms of the Liberal Party. There is no justification for the figure. That figure has been mentioned on a number of occasions. The Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, mentioned it one occasion.

We did some research about a 20 per cent increase, and we found the only time there had been a 20 per cent increase in the Consumer Price Index was in 1951, under the Menzies Liberal Government of that day. That was the only time

in the post-war period that there has been an increase of 20 per cent, and yet the Liberal Party is saying this occurred in the Whitlam era, and it will occur again. That is nothing but lies.

The public have to be alerted to what is going on in this direction. Even the advertising in the paper is incorrect. "Could your family afford Labor's 20 per cent inflation?" We do not know where that figure comes from, but it is used continually. The advertisements say, "The buying power of the dollar would be cut in half with 20 per cent inflation." Those people are not even good mathematicians.

Mr B. T. Burke: They are good liars.

Mr DAVIES: If there is a 20 per cent increase over the three-year-period, \$1 will be worth \$1.20. If there is a 20 per cent increase per year, after the first year \$1 will be worth \$1.20; the second year it will rise to \$1.44; and in the next year it will be \$1.75; so the inflation rate will more than cut in half the existing \$1, if there is a regular inflation rate of 20 per cent.

Somebody should complain to the Trade Practices Tribunal about this advertising. Then the Liberal Party would be fined thousands of dollars for unfair and untrue advertising. There is not the slightest doubt that the Liberal Party, having seen government galloping away from it, has decided that there will be no holds barred, and it does not matter what kind of scare tactics may be used. It believes it is entitled to do that. It believes it does not matter how many lies are told, to make certain that it retains the reins of government.

We know the Liberal Party wants to retain the reins of government because it has a happy knack of looking after its special friends. That is another story, and it is another matter we should discuss as a matter of urgency in this House. However, that is not the matter we are discussing now.

Every member of the Government, and every member of the Liberal Party, should be ashamed to be associated with a party that advertises deliberate untruths and deliberate lies, as does this Government. The suggestion that a lamb chop would cost 80c is something that makes everyone concerned. I suppose the general idea is that the people are continually eating lamb chops, every day of the week. At the current price of \$4.24 a kilogram or 53c each, very few people are able to eat lamb chops at present. They have risen to 53c each from 10c five years ago—an increase of 390.7 per cent! Indeed, very few people are able to eat sausages or braising steak.

I will give some figures in relation to that. I was very upset, as members will realise, at what

happened during the last election. I kept a copy of one issue of *The West Australian* newspaper at the time of the 1975 election. I put it away on my study shelves, and I brought it out yesterday when I was annoyed about the lies being told in the advertisements. I took out that newspaper to compare the prices then with those at the present time.

I wish to refer to an advertisement which appeared in *The West Australian* of 11 December 1975. Most people will have regularly seen full page advertisements by Charlie Carter Pty. Ltd. which appear on a weekly basis in this newspaper. Charlie Carter Pty. Ltd. has been placing such advertisements in the newspaper for a good many years.

I compared the advertisement which appeared in a December 1975 issue of *The West Australian* with an advertisement which appeared in an October 1980 issue of the same paper. I did not compare prices of fancy goods, such as biscuits and the like, because the position would have been much worse than in fact it appears. However, I compared the prices of staple items, like with like and advertisement with advertisement. I compared equal weights advertised by this company in 1975 and 1980. On some occasions, of course, it was necessary to convert the weights into metrics.

The comparisons were as follows—

	1975	1980
Braising or casserole steak—per kilo	66c	\$2.68
Sausages—per kilo	61c	\$1.65
No. 15 frozen chicken (That would have been one of the smallest increases)	\$2.15	\$2.99
Bacon rashers—per kilo	\$2.68	\$4.25
Cheese	\$1.45	\$2.29
Margarine	78c	\$1.79
Peters ice cream—2 litre tub	68c	\$1.19
Instant coffee—150 grams	79c	\$2.47
Tea	35c	63c
Cans of Coke and Fanta	16c	.25c
Laundry detergent—per kilo	73c	\$1.81

That is the kind of inflation record to which the public has been subjected by this Government.

Since December 1975 prices in Western Australia have increased by 58.6 per cent. That is the highest level of increase of all the States of the Commonwealth. It is nearly 3 per cent higher than the national average increase, which is 55.7 per cent for the same period.

If members look at the prices I have quoted, they will see most of them are in excess of the CPI. This is the type of situation about which people are worried.

As I said in the House recently, we do not need figures to prove things are getting tougher and

tougher. We do not need three reports from three welfare agencies to indicate more and more people are seeking assistance. All we need to do to obtain that information is to talk to people. Housewives, men in the pubs and at sporting events, people in the supermarkets, mothers—anyone can tell members that the dollar today is going nowhere when compared with the situation a few years ago.

This Government has the effrontery to say that, under a Labor Government, the price of food will increase excessively. It is an attempt to frighten people.

What has the Labor Party said? It has spoken about a capital gains tax, death duties, and resources, rental and wealth taxes. All those matters have been referred to. However, these matters are to be considered by a proposed Royal Commission on wealth. An undertaking has been given that taxes of that nature will not be introduced prior to the 1983 election.

Several members interjected.

Mr DAVIES: We know most members of the House are in a privileged position. All members, especially Ministers, receive a salary far in excess of that received by the average working man. We can afford to do all we can to protect the little extra we have; but the fact remains we are here to try to help the people and to raise the standard of living.

Mr Hassell: You don't help people by destroying enterprise!

Mr DAVIES: We are hearing now a succession of innuendoes, half truths, and untruths, by way of interjection. Such remarks cannot be substantiated in any way. Members opposite are trying to suggest the Labor Party is concerned with destroying enterprise. Let us look at what is proposed in the policy—

Mr Hassell: Let us look at what Mr Hayden did when he was a member of the Whitlam Ministry. He brought on a recession by indicating a capital gains tax would be introduced.

Mr DAVIES: Let me remind the Minister for Police and Traffic that only one Hayden Budget was brought down and that was not altered in any way by the incoming Fraser Government.

Mr Hassell: Hayden indicated a capital gains tax and look what it did to the economy!

Mr B. T. Burke: You dumbbell!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DAVIES: Finally I want to remind the House that there is a record of comments made by Mr Viner when talking to a group in Melbourne, at which stage he advocated the

introduction of a resources tax. All these matters—resources and rental taxes, death duties, a wealth tax, and capital gains tax—will be looked at. I ask members: what could be fairer?

Mr Hassell: The five new taxes!

Mr DAVIES: The Minister for Police and Traffic is frightened that the little bit extra he has will be taken away from him to help less fortunate members of the community.

We are concerned about the untruths contained in the current advertising on behalf of the Liberal Party. That is the reason we must bring this motion before the House today, so the people can be alerted to the situation.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balcatta) [4.58 p.m.]: You said, Sir, when introducing the matter we are debating at the present time that you thought it had little relevance to this State House and, in some ways, that is true. However, I draw the attention of members to the fact that one of the greatest deceivers of all time represents the Government in this House. There is no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I submit that type of language is unacceptable. It will lead only to tempers being frayed and scenes which are not in keeping with the traditions of this House. I ask the member for Balcatta to desist from using that type of language.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Thank you, Sir. Let us see where the Premier stands with respect to his public statements and let us see now whether he wants to deny that he is on record as saying that, under the previous Labor Government, there had been a great decline in the number of exploratory wells drilled for oil. Now, does the Premier still maintain that is true?

Sir Charles Court: That is correct.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier claimed also that, under the Fraser Government there had been a rapid increase in the number of exploratory oil wells drilled.

Sir Charles Court: Very much so.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I will tell the Premier the official figures and then we will see whether he maintains the truth of what he says.

From 1973 to 1975 inclusive, 146 exploratory wells were drilled at a cost of \$263 million, at 1974-75 prices.

Sir Charles Court: The flow-on from the previous Administration.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The flow-on! The Premier did not mention a flow-on when he made these remarks; he said that fewer wells were drilled.

Now let us examine the figures under the Fraser Government from 1976 to 1978, inclusive. There were 94 exploration holes drilled. There were fewer wells drilled under the Fraser Government than were drilled previously under the Labor Government. The Premier wants us to acknowledge the threat of what he is saying.

Sir Charles Court: You have your facts completely wrong, and you are distorting the figures in a reprehensible way.

Mr B. T. BURKE: A total of 52 more holes were drilled under the Labor Government than were drilled during the first three years under the Fraser Government.

Sir Charles Court: You do your case no credit; you are distorting the facts.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Shame on the Premier that he cannot, like a man, face the mistakes he has made when they are pointed out to him. I will repeat the proposition: The Premier said that fewer wells were drilled under the Labor Government than were drilled under the Liberal Party Government led by Fraser. That is what he said, and now he wants to say—when I put forward figures which demonstrate that 52 more wells were drilled under the Labor Government than were drilled during the first three years of the Fraser Government—that it was a flow-on.

Sir Charles Court: The drilling rigs left this country under the Whitlam Government, and they returned under the Fraser Government.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Well, if all the drills have returned they are drilling fewer holes.

Sir Charles Court: The wells are being drilled at a much greater cost, which never would have occurred if the Whitlam Government had remained in office.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier is a terrible man; he is a shocking man. He has said that fewer wells had been drilled during the term of the Labor Government than during the term of the Liberal Government. The truth is that 52 more wells were drilled during the three years of the Whitlam Government than during the first three years of the Fraser Government. Now the Premier claims that was a result of a flow-on from the previous Liberal Government.

Sir Charles Court: The rigs left this country during the term of the Whitlam Government, and returned during the term of the Fraser Government.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I submit to those members who are attempting to assist the member for Balcatta that he does not need any

assistance in the delivery of his speech. I also ask the House to come to order.

Mr B. T. BURKE: That is the sort of thing to which the Opposition has every right to object legitimately.

Before I came to this place I was a journalist for seven years and during that time I had the pleasure of reporting more than one Federal election and several State elections. In those experiences I never witnessed a campaign based more clearly on lies than is the campaign of the present Federal Government.

Mr Grayden: What rubbish!

An Opposition member: It is spot on.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Minister for Cultural Affairs would not understand they were lies because for years he has been using them.

The SPEAKER: Order! That type of expression is totally unacceptable. I ask the member for Balcatta to withdraw.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I am quite happy to withdraw, but let me repeat that the sort of campaign that is now being waged by this Liberal Government in its desperate effort to maintain hold of its power is the worst I have experienced either as a journalist or as a member of Parliament.

Several members interjected.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let us more closely discuss all the things which have been done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. The member for Morley has made two or three interjections since I asked the member for Balcatta to withdraw and in those interjections he has implied that I am preventing the truth from being spoken in this Parliament.

I say to the member for Morley it is not my intention to prevent the truth from being spoken in Parliament. Quite the contrary, I believe the truth should be spoken in Parliament. But I do not want to hear unparliamentary language and I do not want to observe unparliamentary behaviour. I ask the member to pay some heed to the job I am trying to do, and afford me a certain amount of respect, because I believe the office I hold requires that I receive respect.

Mr B. T. BURKE: What about the incident we had in the Press a few days ago of the Liberal Government incorporating in its advertising a picture of the Governor General? Have we seen the Premier dissociate himself from that sort of advertising?

Sir Charles Court: It was not my advertising.

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** It is the advertising of the Premier's Federal counterparts.

**Sir Charles Court:** Before you go any further, could you put the record straight and give us the number of holes drilled during the term of the Whitlam Government.

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** Before we go any further, I will repeat the number of holes drilled during the term of the Whitlam Government, and I will relate them to a number of years. I will take them in order, and the Premier will have plenty of time to answer.

But, let us continue because the Premier seems to be dodging the issue of the Liberal Party using a picture of the Governor General in its advertising.

**Sir Charles Court:** Give us the number of holes drilled.

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** Is the Premier satisfied that the political party to which he belongs will take a picture from a Liberal file and use it, without the permission of the Governor General, to advance its political argument?

Several members interjected.

**Sir Charles Court:** Since when have you supported the Governor General? The Prime Minister has stated the position quite clearly.

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** That is like the posthumous pardon granted to Timothy Evans; withdraw the execution and leave the body dead. That is the sort of advertising which the Liberal Party is pushing down the throats of the people. What members on the other side are happy with that performance of the Federal Liberal Party? What members opposite are happy with a party which will take an unauthorised picture of the Governor General and incorporate it into political propaganda in order to maintain political power? Is that acceptable? If we in the Labor Party had done that sort of thing to the Governor General we would have been pilloried by the Government. We would have had it rammed down our throats that we should not incorporate a photograph of the Queen's representative.

**Mr Blaikie:** You would not be photographed with the Queen's representative; why not be honest for a change?

**Mr Pearce:** She gave him a medal!

**Sir Charles Court:** What about the drilling of the holes?

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** Just let us see whether we are able to extract from the Premier some sort of denial that members of the Liberal Party are using that sort of advertising. Is the Premier prepared to face up to the fact that it was his

political party which took an unauthorised picture of the Governor General and proceeded to use it for political propaganda in order to maintain political power? Will the Premier comment on that, or deny that it is an inappropriate thing to do?

**Sir Charles Court:** Has not the Prime Minister already expressed the view of the members of his party and his Government? He came out quite frankly about it. Surely you will not flog a dead horse with things like that?

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** The Premier has said we are flogging a dead horse. He hates to flog a dead horse when the dead horse is a mistake he has made.

**Sir Charles Court:** I hope you are not putting yourself up as a great moralist because you, of all the members in this place, would be the last person to be considered a moralist.

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order!

Several members interjected.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order! I want to say to the Premier he makes my job very difficult to do by using that type of language. It leads only to a reaction from others. I submit this place will degenerate if this type of language continues in the House.

I am sorry to have to make that statement to the Premier, but I believe I cannot be coming down on the members who sit on my left and not do the same thing to members on my right.

I have just this minute sent a note to a member on the Government side who said something by way of interjection which, in my view, was just about as bad as the remarks coming from the other side. I did not take up the remark quickly enough to speak to him in the course of debate, but I want it to be known I sent him a note strongly deploring the language he used.

I appeal to members from both sides to moderate their language.

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** Is it not strange that when one sets out to speak some home truths the Minister for Police and Traffic makes sure to absent himself from the Chamber, or, by design, seats himself in another seat so that he does not have to answer what has been said.

**Sir Charles Court:** What is the point you are trying to make?

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** That the behaviour and the language being used at this time is completely in

keeping with that of the Minister for Police and Traffic.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! Might I prevail on the member for Balcatta to proceed with his speech and leave alone the matters to which he is referring?

Mr B. T. BURKE: I was simply saying that the behaviour of the Minister for Police and Traffic is in the same tenor as is the entire Liberal campaign.

Mr Sodeman: You hypocrite!

Mr B. T. BURKE: I ask the member opposite not to call me a hypocrite; he is a mean, minute little man.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. That was a classic example of one unsavory statement drawing, probably, a little worse statement by way of reaction from the other side. I will leave it at that.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let us get down to some of the facts of the situation, and let us hear the Premier explain how he can in honesty defend the sort of advertising which has been carried on. Let us hear the Premier explain to the House—accountant and mathematical genius that he is—how he can say that under a Labor Party Government there will be an inflation rate of 20 per cent.

Sir Charles Court: I am going on the 1972-1975 record.

Mr Davies: Go back to 1951, under Menzies.

Mr B. T. BURKE: So the Premier is able to say that by referring to a period as long as eight years ago, under a different leader with a different set of policies, an inflation rate which never occurred then will occur now. Of course, he is not able to prove that. If any member opposite argues differently, then why did the Liberal Government adopt the Hayden Budget?

Sir Charles Court: How could we do anything else? It was a December election.

Mr Pearce: The inflation rate was never 20 per cent. That is a lie.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Premier is able to say by reference to a period eight years in the past, under a different leadership with different policies—

Mr Hassell: It is the same policy under the same Treasurer.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Under the same Treasurer, but not under the same policies by any stretch of the imagination. The Minister for Police and Traffic has never found ignorance a handicap.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. That is another example of the type of language which is unacceptable to me. I say to the member for Balcatta that if he continues to use that sort of language I will have to take some sort of strong action.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I respectfully remind you, Mr Speaker, that the things I have said have simply been rejoinders to other things which have been said. As far as I am concerned, if the Premier wants to lead the way with the sorts of statements he is making on this occasion I cannot be blamed for answering them.

But, let us look in detail at the 20 per cent inflation proposition. Let us ask the Premier what calculation his party has used to come up with that sort of figure.

Sir Charles Court: The answer is very simple—by referring to the record of the Whitlam Government from 1972 to 1975. Also, the President of the ALP during the Whitlam era will be a Minister if, unfortunately, a Labor Government is elected. Another very senior member of the Whitlam Labor Government—and its Treasurer, Mr Hayden—is hoping to be the Prime Minister. You do not have to do any calculations because the policies are the same.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The policies vary widely from those advanced previously, but even if they were not the argument put forward by the Premier would not stand up. His reference to Mr Hayden is similar to blaming Helmut Schmidt for things Adolph Hitler did.

Let us hear the empirical facts on how the Premier makes this argument because if they are not explained they will remain a dishonest attempt to frighten people from supporting the Labor Party.

Sir Charles Court: We do not have to make any attempt; the people will make their own judgment.

Mr B. T. BURKE: If you do not need to make any attempt, why the advertising campaign?

Sir Charles Court: The people are being warned, as they should be, of what happened under Whitlam, and the sort of thing which can happen again because Hayden will not be there for very long if he is elected.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Here is another typical example of the Premier saying, by way of interjection, that Mr Hayden will not be there for very long if he does happen to win next Saturday. That is the sort of thing we mean. How can the Premier justify that statement? This campaign is wracked with dishonesty on the part of the

Liberal Party, and by comparison, the campaign of the Australian Labor Party has been absolutely without blemish.

Mr Hassell: It has been a classic of its kind.

Mr B. T. BURKE: There has not been one statement on which suspicion could be cast, and I will list the promises. There is the promise with respect to petrol prices, the promise with respect to family allowances, the promise with respect to \$700 million of avoided taxes—

Mr Hassell: That is totally consistent—

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let us hear what the Minister for Police and Traffic has to say. He has been very vocal.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order, and I point out also that there is far too much casual conversation. The member for Balcatta.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let us hear what the Minister for Police and Traffic has to say about the \$700 million of avoided tax each year.

Mr Hassell: Oh yes, this is a great new interest and Mr Hayden had a brilliant record from 1972 to 1975 of doing nothing. What about the great scheme drawn to your Treasurer's attention about which he did absolutely nothing while he was there and had the power to do something? The business about tax avoidance has been taken up by the Federal Government, as you well know.

Mr B. T. BURKE: No-one can deny that I gave the Minister a chance to state his position fully. Then why did he not tell us of his attitude towards tax avoidance?

Mr Hassell: What attitude towards tax avoidance?

Mr B. T. BURKE: That is it—ignorance is bliss. The Minister for Police and Traffic is so concerned about the financial situation of this country that he does not have an attitude towards tax avoidance.

Mr Grayden: Twister!

Mr B. T. BURKE: In fact, the political party of the Minister for Police and Traffic actively promotes—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr B. T. BURKE: —and not only actively promotes, but also, in a funny sort of way, seems to heap praise upon people who are able to avoid tax and develop these schemes.

Mr Hassell: You tell us what the Labor Treasurer did about a current scheme when it was

drawn to his attention in 1973. Tell us what he did about it—come on.

Mr B. T. BURKE: In the same way I could tell the Minister about what the then Treasurer, McMahon, did with his 1972 horror Budget. That would have as much relevance to today as the things the Minister is saying.

Mr Hassell: Total relevance to the point you made.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let us face facts. In the one minute left to me, I will sum up by saying: This campaign is the most dishonest, the most unfounded, and the most despicable campaign that has ever been waged by a political party, and the sudden change in tack that became evident just two weeks ago was the result of a decline in the fortunes of the Fraser Liberal Government. That explains the lies on which the Fraser Government's attempts to retain power are based.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Education) [5.19 p.m.]: May I say this: the members of this House are extraordinarily fortunate. It comes to very few people during the course of their lives to scale mountains. With the tirades we heard from the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Balcatta, we have virtually scaled the Mt. Everest of hypocrisy. They were the ultimate in hypocrisy.

Mr H. D. Evans: You say that—you of all people!

Mr GRAYDEN: I am not merely going to say it, I am going to prove it.

Mr Pearce: This is Edmund Hillary talking.

Mr GRAYDEN: This is a day of significance for the Parliament of Western Australia. It is a day in which we have heard the ultimate in hypocrisy. We have virtually scaled the heights of hypocrisy and, therefore, all members should feel really privileged. At the very outset—

Mr Barnett: We are about to get a lesson from the master.

Mr GRAYDEN: —before I begin to talk in terms of the arguments produced, we should give the members of the Opposition some convincing proof that what they have been saying is sheer hypocrisy; that it falls into the category of the cheapest form of electioneering—untruthful electioneering by desperate men.

Mr Pearce: We are in front in the polls; you are the ones who are behind.

Mr GRAYDEN: We have heard this from individuals who would stop at nothing—least of all the truth.



Mr E. T. Evans: You would know all about that.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Opposition is trying to gain some cheap electoral advantage, and what cheap electoral advantage it is.

Mr B. T. Burke: Can't you do better than this?

Mr GRAYDEN: We have the straightout statement; it is cheap electioneering.

Mr E. T. Evans: Whose statement is that?

Mr GRAYDEN: We have the statement; it is the height of hypocrisy.

Let us go back to one or two articles which appeared in the Press in 1975.

Mr Davies: For goodness sake!

Mr GRAYDEN: This was when the Whitlam Government went out of office. Let us contrast the situation in 1975 when the Whitlam Government went out of office with what is happening now, and then consider the statements we have just heard.

Mr E. T. Evans: Why don't you sing your speech?

Mr GRAYDEN: We have heard the statements of the Leader of the Opposition; a man in a most eminent position in Western Australia.

Mr E. T. Evans: Your speeches would be better if you sang them.

Mr GRAYDEN: We have heard the statements of the member for Balcatta; a so-called shadow Minister for some portfolio—a Labor Party spokesman. It will be interesting to see whether they try to verify what they have said. They will lose any credibility they have left.

Mr B. T. Burke: This is a weak old effort, Bill. You are having trouble.

Mr E. T. Evans: Sing up.

Mr GRAYDEN: Of course, the honourable thing for both members to do would be to resign.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order! Before I call upon the Minister to resume his speech I would point out that I am not prepared to accept volleys of interjections while members are speaking.

Mr GRAYDEN: If a person's credibility is completely destroyed—

Mr B. T. Burke: He will want us to resign next.

Mr Young: He had already said that, but you were too busy talking.

Mr GRAYDEN: —the logical thing to do is to resign.

Several members interjected.

Mr GRAYDEN: I can assure the House those members will have no credibility left at all. The speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition was virtually a tirade, and the speech of the member for Balcatta was delivered with the greatest vehemence we have ever heard from him. Let us look at the facts, and contrast the facts with their speeches.

Mr B. T. Burke: Here is a first for the Minister—we are going to look at the facts.

Mr GRAYDEN: I have here a statement which appeared in *The West Australian* in 1975.

Mr Barnett: That is a good authority.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is dated 22 April 1975 and it is headed, "Inflation could hit 30 per cent—Treasury". For the benefit of the member for Gosnells, I am going to suggest—

Mr Pearce: I was just about to ask you to table it.

Mr GRAYDEN: —that he should ask for it to be tabled.

Mr Pearce: I was just standing up to do so when you said it.

Mr GRAYDEN: The report is from Canberra, and it states—

The Federal Government was warned by the Treasury yesterday that Australia could have an inflation rate of 30 per cent by the middle of next year.

Mr B. T. Burke: What has that to do with 1980? Come on—you are as weak as water, Bill.

Mr GRAYDEN: As a means of avoiding these facts being put before them, Opposition members are now saying, "What has this to do with 1980?"

Mr B. T. Burke: Next you will tell us the Whitlam Government resigned because it did not have credibility.

Mr GRAYDEN: I will read the letter written by the Leader of the Opposition to see what it has to do with 1980. The letter commences as follows—

In accordance with Standing Order 48 I advise that I intend to move under Standing Order 47—

"That the House do now adjourn" for the purpose of discussing the effects of inflation on the living standards of Western Australians since December 1975—

Mr Davies: Yes, that is right.

Mr GRAYDEN: But the Opposition is saying, "What has that to do with the current debate?"

Mr Davies: Absolutely. You are quoting 1975.

Mr GRAYDEN: Of course I am, because the Leader of the Opposition's letter spoke in terms of December 1975.

Mr B. T. Burke: You are referring to a Press article of April 1975.

Mr GRAYDEN: Goodness gracious—we are splitting straws now. Opposition members are talking in terms of the difference between April and December. The letter continues—

—as highlighted by recent political advertising and the urgency of maintaining accurate and honest advertising in relation to inflation and its effects.

I want to digress and say—

Mr Davies: You have not started—why digress?

Mr GRAYDEN: This is the reason for the relevance to 1975—that is what the debate is all about. So let us return to the article published in *The West Australian* in 1975.

Mr Davies: April 1975?

Mr GRAYDEN: In this article the Treasury is warning the Commonwealth Government and it states—

The Federal Government was warned by the Treasury yesterday that Australia could have an inflation rate of 30 per cent by the middle of next year.

Several members interjected.

Mr GRAYDEN: I hope members are going to listen.

Mr B. T. Burke: You are hoping for a bit much.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Balcatta will have an opportunity to read the article as it is to be tabled.

Mr Davies: I read it in 1975.

Mr GRAYDEN: What sort of person is the Leader of the Opposition? He said he read it in 1975.

Mr Davies: It did not come about—you must be disappointed.

Mr GRAYDEN: It did not come about because there was a change in government.

Mr B. T. Burke: You should be in Footrot Flats.

Mr GRAYDEN: After years of the Whitlam Government we were faced with this situation—a 30 per cent rise in inflation. This was not a warning by some obscure group.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr GRAYDEN: The article continues—

An increase of 3.6 per cent was recorded in the Consumer Price Index for January, February and March—0.2 per cent below the rise for the December quarter but the worst March quarter for 24 years.

That was under the Whitlam Government. To continue—

“The CPI has risen 17.6 per cent in the past 12 months.”

That was the CPI rise under the Whitlam Government. The article then went on to give us Mr Hawke's view, and this is interesting because at the time Mr Hawke was the leader of the ACTU. So Mr Hayden was a Minister in the Whitlam Government and Mr Hawke was President of the ACTU. The only difference now is that Whitlam has disappeared from the scene and we have Wran. I will now read what Mr Hawke said in 1975.

Mr Barnett: Excuse me, in the 10 minutes left to you, do you think you could get to the facts?

Mr GRAYDEN: Do I have a time limit?

Mr B. T. Burke: You were hoping the bell would ring to save you.

Mr GRAYDEN: I was hoping that there was no time limit. I ask members to listen to Mr Hawke's view—

The federal president of the ALP, Mr R. J. Hawke—who is also president of the ACTU—said last night it was not unreasonable to expect an inflation rate of between 20 and 25 per cent by the end of the year.

That is Mr Hawke speaking; that is the new Minister for Industrial Relations should there be a Commonwealth Labor Government. In 1975, after years of the Whitlam regime, Mr Hawke said it was not unreasonable to expect an inflation rate of between 20 and 25 per cent by the end of the year.

Mr Barnett: What is the date of that?

Mr GRAYDEN: I do not intend to keep quoting from that article, but I would like to refer to another little paragraph because I think it should be mentioned. It reads as follows—

It forecasts an increase of about 40 per cent in the Government's collections from income tax in 1975-76.

Let us look at some of the other things that were happening at that time. Another such article is contained in *The West Australian* of 14 February 1975. Under the heading “Economist blames

governments for inflation" the following appears—

Unions were not guilty of causing inflation. It was caused by governments that were too frightened of the political consequences to tackle the problems effectively.

That is what that economist had to say in respect of the Whitlam Government. Another article in 1975 reported the actions of the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Fraser) in the following terms—

A debate on four Bills authorising the Commonwealth to spend \$4413.7 million was turned by the Opposition yesterday into its strongest attack so far on the Government's handling of the economy.

I turn now to the Khemlani affair which, as members will recall, involved the abortive attempt on the part of the Whitlam Government to borrow \$2 000 million from overseas.

Mr Barnett: How much has Fraser borrowed?

Mr GRAYDEN: The article is headed "Loan letter kept 'confidential' " and states as follows—

The Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr Connor, today denied that an intermediary in the Government's abortive attempt to get a \$2000 million loan overseas had a criminal record.

Another article on the same subject is headed "\$18 000m. to repay the \$2000m loan" and states as follows—

Australia would have paid mammoth interest if the Government's \$2000 million overseas loan plan had succeeded.

Mr Speaker, there is no point in my continuing to quote from my file. I believe the articles illustrate the utter hypocrisy of the Opposition's move today. This matter is serious from the point of view of this Parliament and from the point of view of democracy. It would seem to me the Opposition has no credibility left as a consequence of the letter it forwarded to the Speaker.

We know of the situation applying in the various States. For instance, we know that New South Wales has had a Labor Government for some time, and we know the great difference between the job opportunities created in Western Australia and those created in New South Wales. What is happening in respect of education in New South Wales? That State is closing down some schools and amalgamating others. One of the great issues among teachers at the moment is that of redundancy pay for teachers.

In contrast, this Government has gone out of its way to create an economic climate which encourages investment. What has been the record of Western Australia over the last 20 years? Some 20 000 jobs have been created directly as a result of resources development.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr H. D. EVANS: Mr Speaker, your tolerance in this House is well known. However, when the Minister strays onto education, unemployment and related matters, surely he is getting a little far from the matter before the House. The subjects to which he is referring have not been raised in the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and I put it to you that he is going to the extreme.

Sir Charles Court: What about oil drilling? Your side referred to that matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe the Minister is within his rights to speak in the way he is speaking. However, I ask the Minister to relate very quickly to the question before the Chair the matter he is now discussing.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr GRAYDEN: I will certainly relate my remarks to the matter before the Chair, Mr Speaker. I mentioned that some 20 000 jobs in resources development were created by this Government. As a consequence, in 20 years our overall work force increased by a total of 300 000, and our population over the same period increased by 500 000, due principally to the policies adopted by this Government and the advanced policies followed by the present Commonwealth Government. Both Governments are going out of their way to create an economic climate which encourages investment which, in turn, creates job opportunities.

Mr H. D. Evans: Did you say our population had increased by 500 000?

Mr GRAYDEN: Yes, over the last 20 years.

Mr O'Connor: That is right.

Mr H. D. Evans: By half a million?

Sir Charles Court: Our population was around 650 000 in 1960 and it is well over one million now.

Mr H. D. Evans: Over what period?

Sir Charles Court: The Minister has already mentioned it is over the last 20 years.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Commonwealth Government is going out of its way to keep inflation down—in contrast with what happened

during the years of the Whitlam Government. During the final months of the Whitlam Administration, some economists were predicting an inflation rate of 30 per cent. However, since the advent of the Fraser Government, inflation has been reduced to around 9 per cent.

Mr B. T. Burke: Nine per cent! Even your own Federal Treasurer admits it is around 10.5 per cent.

Mr GRAYDEN: That is the extraordinary achievement of the Commonwealth Government, aided in such an incredible way by the Government of Western Australia. The present State and Federal Governments mean security for all Australians, and job opportunities for their children.

Mr Pearce: Sit down, and let us hear from the Premier.

Sir Charles Court: I would not waste my time.

Mr GRAYDEN: The Leader of the Opposition alleged that inflation is out of control, but the articles to which I have referred indicate the hypocrisy of his statements.

Mr Davies: They indicate no such thing.

Mr GRAYDEN: These documents are there for all to see. Extracts from them are now in *Hansard*, and they will shortly be laid on the Table of the House. In fact, I ask the member for Gosnells to request that all the documents be tabled—not merely the ones from which I quoted—because they are of such importance.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, I ask that all the documents in the Minister's file be tabled.

The SPEAKER: I ask that the documents be tabled at the conclusion of the Minister's speech.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr GRAYDEN: These documents are of such tremendous consequence that I am happy to table them, Mr Speaker. Members will appreciate that the member for Gosnells had no option but to ask that they all be tabled. In fact, after these documents have been tabled and returned to me, I intend to have them roneoed, together with another selection of documents, and sent to members of the Opposition for their edification.

Mr Skidmore: Don't bother to send them to me, thank you.

Mr Davies: We have them all.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, and far too much casual conversation.

Mr GRAYDEN: It is rather humorous when a so-called responsible Opposition brings about a debate on an issue of this kind. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition sent his letter to the Speaker with frivolous intent, but it could have been done only in that vein. Surely the Leader of the Opposition in all seriousness does not suggest he stands by the contents of his letter, which complains about inflation and the like.

Mr B. T. Burke: How would you have framed the letter?

Mr GRAYDEN: I would be ashamed to be associated with such a letter. However, if by some mistake—and it would only be by mistake—I were the author of such a letter, I would immediately write to the Speaker, withdrawing it and apologising to him.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, the Minister has concluded his remarks, but has not in fact tabled the documents.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to table the documents.

#### *Debate Resumed*

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Deputy Premier) [5.38 p.m.]: At the outset, Mr Speaker, I indicate that I am quite happy to table all my documents; it may save time.

The SPEAKER: The documents which have been tabled will remain on the Table of the House for the balance of this day's sitting, for the benefit of members.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am rather amazed that the Opposition has seen fit to move such a motion. It is obvious the motion is to be used to boost the flagging finish of the election campaign of their Federal colleagues. I can understand their concern. However, it is rather strange that an urgency motion has been moved to debate this matter.

I am also surprised at the elasticity of the minds of members opposite in relation to this and other matters. We frequently see members opposite taking a grain of rumour and making a mountain of absurdity out of it.

The Opposition must also be concerned at the wonderful efforts of the Fraser Government to contain inflation. I intend at a later stage to quote the figures year by year to indicate how well the

Fraser Government has performed, and how poorly the Whitlam Government performed when it was in power. Inflation today has been cut to half the level which applied during the Whitlam era.

Mr Wilson: Is it not going up?

Mr O'CONNOR: It is still at only half the level applying during the Whitlam era, even if it is rising slightly.

Mr Wilson: Isn't it going up?

Mr O'CONNOR: During the Whitlam era, the Treasury forecast the possibility that inflation would reach 30 per cent, but Fraser brought it down.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kalgoorlie! I prevail upon the members who have been interjecting simultaneously to refrain from doing so.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have only to look at the Consumer Price Index at 30 September. In Western Australia the increase was 9.7 per cent—the lowest in Australia. Frankly, had Mr Whitlam been in power it could have been 30 per cent.

I would like to quote a couple of paragraphs from newspaper articles in order to make my point. The first is from *The National Times* of 12-18 October. The article was written by a Mr Paul Kelly, and it states—

Hayden tried to dodge the capital gains tax blow by switching his policy and pledging no such tax until after the 1983 poll. This was a direct contradiction of his shadow Treasurer Ralph Willis.

I might say also that it was in direct contradiction of statements that were made by Mr Hayden on other occasions. It is strange that the Opposition from time to time veers away from its policy, even though the Australian Labor Party is bound Australia-wide to its policy. During elections members of the ALP will depart from their policy in respect of items that are politically unfavourable to them, even though they are bound by their policy and even though statements have been made in direct conflict with what they are then saying.

Let me now quote from *The Weekend Australian* of 11-12 October as follows—

Goaded by NCP strongman Peter Nixon, Walsh said Labor's attitude on taxes was quite clear. "We will be holding an inquiry into the distribution of wealth in Australia," Senator Walsh said.

Let me point out that Mr Walsh is a Labor senator in Canberra. The article continues—

"The Labor Party believes there ought to be some form of capital taxation. It ought to be noted that Australia is the only country in the OECD that doesn't have some form of capital taxation."

Then, referring to Mr Hayden, the article says that for the first time he gave a firm commitment that the tax would not be imposed before the 1983 election.

Those are some of the quotations I wish to produce, and I intend to produce others later, to show that a firm commitment has been made by the Australian Labor Party in connection with a capital gains tax and a wealth tax. Even members in another place have made quotations which have indicated very clearly the attitude of the Labor Party in this area.

In the *Daily News* of 23 January 1979 we saw the heading, "Hayden calls for gains tax". The article stated—

The Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr Hayden, has called for the imposition of a capital gains tax and a resources rental tax.

Repeating policy statements made in his alternative Budget speech last year, Mr Hayden said yesterday that the revenue gap could be bridged by the taxes.

Yet we have members of the Labor Party today squirming and running away from this issue because it is politically unfavourable for them at this time. They have not the courage to go forward with the policies which are a part of their platform, and which have been in their platform for so long. Mr Hayden made another statement in March when an article appeared in *The West Australian* under the heading, "Gains-tax pledge by Hayden". This is the tax he is now running away from; it is the tax he would use to bolster his spending in other areas if elected.

Let me point out to the House that, on Treasury and Government costing, six of the promises Mr Hayden has made already will run into \$2 500 million, which would amount to more than \$10 a week for every working person in Australia; yet in some areas he is talking about a reduction of \$3 in income tax.

The SPEAKER: I understand the House desires me at this time to leave the Chair until 7.30 p.m. I point out that I have been given an indication that questions without notice will be taken at 9.00 p.m.

*Sitting suspended from 5.46 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr O'CONNOR: Prior to the tea suspension I was—

Mr T. H. Jones: Making a fool of yourself.

Mr O'CONNOR: We can expect that sort of thing from the Opposition. I hope I will never be dragged into saying the sorts of things they say. I was trying to explain to the House the facts of this matter. This motion was moved by members of the State Opposition to try to hold up the flagging fortunes of their colleagues in Canberra. Part of the letter reads—

..... for the purpose of discussing the effects of inflation on the living standards of Western Australians .....

We have only to consider the situation when Labor was in power. When there was a Labor Government in Canberra, we know what happened with inflation. Members opposite think the community have short memories, but fortunately most people are aware of what happened, and what will happen again if virtually the same people are in power. We will have the same policies, and the same prejudices as we had in the Whitlam era. We will have a Prime Minister who was the Treasurer in the Whitlam Government. He will be trying to implement his policies.

Six of the policies of the Labor Party have been costed. The cost to the community of those six would be \$2 500 million.

Mr Parker: That has been shown to be untrue.

Mr O'CONNOR: They are talking of—

Opposition members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: They are talking of a reduction of \$3—

Mr Barnett: You know the sorts of things we are saying.

Mr O'CONNOR: Opposition members do not like to give a fellow a fair go.

Mr Barnett: Turn it up. What about the advertising we are talking about?

Mr O'CONNOR: The members of the community know how those opposite think. I will not comment on the remark by the member for Rockingham, because all he does is come in with these sorts of obscene interjections. I will disregard them.

The Labor Party talks about reducing taxation by \$3, and yet the \$2 500 million would cost \$10 per family per week. What about the 250 other promises made by the Labor party?

We still had high inflation in the Whitlam era. If a Labor Government was returned, we could expect a wealth tax, a capital gains tax, a resources tax, and increased probate duty.

Mr Harman: You are telling lies.

### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr O'CONNOR: I ask for a retraction of that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): The Deputy Premier has asked that the member for Maylands withdraw the word he has just used.

Mr HARMAN: Mr Acting Speaker, he made several statements—

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Acting Speaker—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member will resume his seat.

Mr HARMAN: Which one do you want me to retract that was a lie?

The ACTING SPEAKER: The use of the word "lies" must be withdrawn unequivocally.

Mr HARMAN: In deference to you, I withdraw the remark; but he cannot get away with telling this House that certain things were going to happen that are not going to happen.

Mr Young: They are in your platform.

### *Debate Resumed*

Mr O'CONNOR: That is the way Western Australians give a man a fair go! The Opposition does not want to hear what I have to say.

Let us listen to what Mr Hayden had to say. I have quoted this, but I will quote it again. This is an extract from the *Daily News* of 23 January.

Mr Barnett interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: The little boy from Rockingham keeps cutting in, but I will take no notice. The quote is as follows—

The Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr Hayden, has called for the imposition of a capital gains tax and a resources rental tax.

Members opposite say that is not the case. Of course it is the case.

My next quote is from *The West Australian* in March—

The next Federal Labor government's commitment to the poor and disadvantaged would be financed by a capital-gains tax yielding an annual minimum of \$300 million, the Federal Opposition Leader, Mr Hayden, said in Perth last night.

Members opposite say that is not fact. If they do not want to believe what their leader in Canberra is saying, that is up to them. I say that the people here would know that if the Labor Party regained power, we could have a wealth tax, a capital gains tax, a resources tax, and probate duty will be increased.

Let us look at Labor Party policy—

Secondly, as a democratic-socialist party concerned to achieve a more just and equitable society, Labor's economic policy aims to redistribute income and wealth on an egalitarian basis...

That indicates clearly that anyone who wants to work for money, and to try to accumulate anything in the long term, will have it taken from him by the Labor Party so it can give it to some people who are not prepared to work.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: In another place, Mr Berinson stated very clearly that some form of capital tax would apply under a Labor Government. However, members opposite in this House are saying the sort of nonsense we have heard tonight.

Mr Harman: That has been denied in the Press.

Mr O'CONNOR: This motion has been put up by the Labor Party as an election bait. It will poison the electors, if they take the bait.

Mr B. T. Burke: What do you say about Mr Anthony's statement on a resources tax?

Mr O'CONNOR: I am not answering Mr Anthony; I am answering the motion tonight. The member for Balcatta quoted something in connection with the number of wells that had been drilled during the previous Labor regime. What he did not indicate was that it took a while for the number that had been started before by the Liberal Government to drop off.

Mr B. T. Burke: But the Premier did not say that when he made the statement.

Mr O'CONNOR: In 1975, under Labor, there were 29 wells being put down in Western Australia. Today, under the present Government, we have 107. If Labor is elected to power, it will take the money and the confidence out of the country, as it did in the Whitlam era. Whether the economy could ever recover is extremely doubtful.

Opposition members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: If Labor is returned, the same policies will apply. I am sure the people understand that.

Let us consider what happened in Western Australia in the last year. Anybody who wants to check these statistics will find they are true. Up to 30 June, there were an additional 28 000 jobs in Western Australia.

Mr B. T. Burke: Half of them were part-time jobs which lasted a week; and you know that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: In relation to the statistics for people looking for jobs, many of them are part-time people. The statistics have always been the same.

Mr B. T. Burke: I am not saying they are not.

Mr O'CONNOR: An additional 28 000 people were employed at 30 June, over and above those employed last year. This has been achieved by having stable Governments in the Commonwealth and the State. Let us consider the Consumer Price Index when Labor was in power in 1975. The CPI went up 18.1 per cent.

Mr E. T. Evans: When?

Mr O'CONNOR: In 1975. I will table these papers at the conclusion of my speech. Of course, it takes a while to recover from the sorts of difficulties created by the Whitlam Labor Government. The CPI figure for 1976 was 14.1 per cent and in 1977 it went up to 15.7 per cent. At this time we started to feel the effects of a good Liberal coalition Government in Canberra. In 1978—

Mr B. T. Burke: Yes, and when did inflation first reach 20 per cent?

Mr O'CONNOR: That occurred during the term of the Whitlam Government.

Mr B. T. Burke: It occurred during the time of Bob Menzies in 1950.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Balcatta should remember 1975. The CPI figure dropped to 10.1 per cent in 1978; it dropped to 8.1 per cent in 1979; and in 1980 it dropped to 9.4 per cent. What a tremendous improvement! Members opposite are complaining, yet a Liberal Government has cut the figure to half what it was in 1975 when a Federal Labor Government was in power. Just imagine if a Labor Government had managed to cut the figure from 18.1 per cent to 9.4 per cent; all sorts of glorious remarks would have been made about their colleagues in Canberra; yet Opposition members ridicule what a Liberal Government has achieved.

This motion is a farce; there is no doubt about that at all. It shows just how weak the Opposition is and how few points it has to put forward to criticise the Government.

Mr T. H. Jones: The Speaker did not hold that opinion.

Mr O'CONNOR: We have had good Governments in both Canberra and this State. Members opposite have cited the number of wells drilled up to 1975 and, in fact, they were citing figures of wells sunk because of good government prior to the Federal Labor Government coming to power; they were trying to take credit for wells

sunk before the Whitlam Government was in power. This shows the farcical nature of the arguments being put forward by members of the Opposition.

Mr Young: What about the member for Welshpool when he was Deputy Leader of the Opposition; what did he say about inflation? He said, "Let it run on".

Mr B. T. Burke: The Premier said he would fix it in six months.

Mr Young: He was your deputy leader, mate!

Mr B. T. Burke: He was your Premier!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! The House will come to order!

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Acting Speaker, I thank you for at least trying to be Australian and giving us a fair go, which is not what the Opposition is prepared to do.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Minister for Health is an Australian.

Mr O'CONNOR: It is a pity we could not have records of what goes on in this House which would indicate just how the Opposition members try to drown the comments of Government members when we have good arguments to put forward.

Mr T. H. Jones: You did not do a bad job on the member for Balcatta.

Mr O'CONNOR: How often did I interject on him?

Quite frankly, the Fraser Government in Canberra had a difficult job to do when it came into power because of the atrocious way the Whitlam Government had managed things. It was faced with many difficulties because of the investment which was taken out of the country and the loss of confidence among investors. This brought about a loss of jobs. It takes a while to get back to a position where there is confidence and people are investing in the country.

I remind members opposite that 28 000 additional jobs were created in Western Australia alone during the last 12 months, and that is the best figure for the last 15 years throughout Australia. This indicates how the motion is a farce. I can hardly understand it being moved by the Opposition, and it should receive its just deserts.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask that the Minister table the papers he referred to earlier. They will be tabled for the remainder of the day's sitting.

MR PARKER (Fremantle) [7.45 p.m.]: I am delighted to be able to speak tonight in this

debate and to talk about the deception which has been perpetrated on the country by the Liberal Party of Australia. Before doing so, I shall comment on the contributions by the Minister for Education and the Deputy Premier.

The Minister for Education consistently referred to the 20 per cent inflation which would become evident during the course of a future Hayden Government and which had come close to being evident during the course of the Whitlam Labor Government in Canberra.

Mr Grayden: I didn't even mention it as far as a Hayden Government was concerned.

Mr PARKER: Members opposite may have taken some solace from one of the opinion polls published last week which showed that the Labor Party would receive 57 per cent of votes in a two-party preferred vote. Another poll showed that it would receive 53 per cent of a two-party preferred vote, and another showed that it would receive 51 per cent of a two-party preferred vote. If that gave members opposite some solace, they obviously have not got much to talk about.

The Morgan poll, as members everywhere would know, is the poll which is the most consistently conservative in respect of the vote of the Labor Party and which in general terms has been reasonably accurate in predicting previous elections, such as those in 1975 and 1977.

Mr MacKinnon: Was it accurate in 1977?

Mr PARKER: Yes, it was. The week before last the Morgan poll showed that the Labor Party had a two-party preferred vote of 50 per cent and the figure for last week was 53 per cent.

I am advised that, in spite of publicity to the contrary, the Morgan poll indicates that today the Australian Labor Party would receive 54 per cent of a two-party preferred vote. Those figures were released today and will be published in this week's issue of *The Bulletin*. Perhaps members opposite have not heard that.

Mr Young: I am advised that this time next week you will know the result of the election.

Mr PARKER: That is true, and I am confident—

Mr Young: That is the only poll which counts.

Mr PARKER: That is not the attitude of the Liberal Party nationally. It has completely changed its tactics. The party's advertisements, on the basis of all Gallup polls, shows this is so. Had it not been for the Liberal Party's change in advertising tactics, this motion would not have been moved. Whilst we might disagree with the earlier advertisements the Liberal Party ran, which were reasonably legitimate in the



circumstances and which attempted to show that the Government could stand on its record, once it saw the results of the Gallup polls the advertisements changed. The Liberal Party changed its tactics and instigated this gutter political activity which is the reason for our moving this motion.

Mr MacKinnon: Do not get in the gutter; it is fully utilised.

Mr PARKER: I am aware that some members opposite have a caveat on gutters. The behaviour of some members would indicate there is still some room remaining.

The Minister for Education referred to the fact that the Treasury had advised the Government on 22 April 1975 that there could be 30 per cent inflation by the middle of that year. There was not 30 per cent inflation at any stage in 1975; there was not 20 per cent inflation as has been claimed by some supporters of the Liberal Party; and there was not 19 per cent inflation, as the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations in another place kept saying on TV.

The highest figure that inflation ever reached under the Whitlam Government was 16.7 per cent, and I admit that is not a satisfactory figure. It is obvious that under the Whitlam Government inflation did not reach 30 per cent or 20 per cent by the middle of 1975 or at any other stage. The Whitlam Government did not allow inflation to reach those levels, and that Treasury prediction was shown to be untrue. That reflects the poverty of advice which some Governments—perhaps all Governments—get from those officers.

Mr Sodeman: You are the first member opposite to admit that inflation got over 12 per cent.

Mr PARKER: No-one could deny that it did not go over that figure. That is not something we ought necessarily to be proud of. I will come back to this point later and describe the figures—the incredible figures—which have resulted from actions taken by this Government and show that they are peanuts compared with the sorts of things the people of Australia are having to put up with at the moment.

The Deputy Premier raised the question of inflation and the activities which the current Government engaged in to reduce inflation. I vividly recall a "Nationwide" TV programme last year in which the then and current Treasurer of the Federal Government (Mr Howard) in answer to a question by Richard Carlton, admitted that his Government—the Government of which he was senior financial Minister—had failed in its approach to inflation. Those were his words.

He admitted this and he stated this Government would not be able to keep the promises it had made to the Australian people at the end of 1977. I recall Richard Carlton being astonished by the frankness of that admission; but that person at that time made those comments. Nothing more than the figures quoted earlier this evening by the Leader of the Opposition is needed to prove that statement.

The Deputy Premier referred also to people who will apparently, on the election of a Labor Government next Saturday, remove their money from the country. According to the Deputy Premier they will take their money away from this country. They will not invest their money here. I do not know whether or not that is correct. I very much doubt it is true. I am sure such people who would be looking for a stable country in which to invest, would look at the political situation here and would probably feel the differences between the policies of the Labor Party and the Liberal Party are infinitesimal, particularly when one looks at such matters as resources and rental taxes. When one looks at the Governments in most parts of the world, including the OECD, one can see that most countries impose a tax on excess profits and wealth. It is not as though the companies which wish to invest money have much choice.

Mr B. T. Burke: Both Viner and Anthony have advocated a resources tax.

Mr PARKER: With the possible exception of Haiti, and perhaps one or two other countries, almost every Government in the world imposes higher royalties than those in Australia and some form of rental and resources tax, such as that mentioned by the Labor Party, on companies resident in their country.

Mr Sodeman: What higher royalties?

Mr PARKER: It is clear that, indeed, the companies which intend to invest money have little choice.

That is the first point I wished to make. The second point I wish to make is that, however great we in Australia may see the differences between the parties as being, those differences are nowhere nearly as great as the differences which exist, for example, between the Government of the Shah of Iran and the Government of the Ayatollah Khomeini. We cannot compare the differences between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party in Australia with the differences in the policies of the Government of the Shah of Iran and the Government of the Ayatollah Khomeini. Any international investor, looking for a place to invest his money, would infinitely prefer to invest it in a

country where a democratic system prevails and where the stability and security of the nation is assured.

Mr MacKinnon: How many international investors have you talked to?

Mr PARKER: I have talked to a number.

Mr MacKinnon: What are their names?

Mr PARKER: I daresay I have talked to as many international investors as has the member for Murdoch.

Mr B. T. Burke: Do you ever stand up on your feet and make a speech?

Mr PARKER: It is clear that the differences between the parties which obtain here, are nowhere near as great as those which operate in some countries overseas. That situation is perceived by investors.

I am well aware the person who would be the Minister for Minerals and Resources Development in the Commonwealth Government were the Labor Party to win the election on Saturday—that is, Mr Paul Keating—is highly regarded by these very same people.

Members opposite have asked me to mention names. Let me mention just two names.

Mr Rushton: Colonel Sanders!

Mr PARKER: I should like to mention the names of two individuals who have expressed concern at the attitudes of the current Fraser Government, who believe it is socially divisive, and that the best atmosphere in which their companies can work and grow is a community which is less socially divisive than that governed by the Fraser Government and in which the social distribution of wealth is more equal. Those two gentlemen are Mr Loton from BHP and Sir Roderick Carnegie from CRA. Both of those gentlemen have said they believe their companies will not be able to grow as they want them to grow in a situation where the social distribution of wealth does not take place in the appropriate way. They are the views of those two gentlemen. I would be astonished if anyone could show that those men are supporters of the Labor Party.

As the member for Balcatta said by way of interjection during the course of the Deputy Premier's speech, the only time in the history of this nation that inflation reached 20 per cent was in 1950 during the term of office of the Menzies Government. I suppose members opposite will probably blame that on Ben Chifley. I am astonished that members of the Liberal Government believe they have only Gough Whitlam to blame for the problems experienced in this country. I am surprised they do not go

back to the days of the Cook and Fisher Governments in the early 1900s and blame them for the problems experienced in this country today. I am surprised members opposite do not say the problems we are experiencing were started by those early Labor Governments which set us off on the wrong track! I am astonished members of the Liberal Government have not chosen to place the blame in that area. I am surprised the Liberal Government has not claimed that this country started on a downward path as a result of the actions of those early Labor Governments which, in fact, this country was fortunate to possess.

I should like to turn now to the substance of my speech. The advertisements we have seen the Liberal Party promote and publish are incredible deceptions. Earlier in this debate, comment was made that it was not appropriate for a motion such as this to be dealt with in this House, because of its lack of relevance. Let me say it is extremely relevant to one of the States of the Commonwealth and to the Legislature of one of those States that the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth is a liar. That is extremely important. It concerns me greatly.

For many years I have disagreed with the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth. I do not have any truck with his views; but that is a different matter. However, it is inconceivable that the Prime Minister of this country can stand up on a public platform in this country and lie to the people.

Mr Grayden: It is a lie to make that statement.

Mr PARKER: On yesterday's "AM" programme the Prime Minister of this country was lying about the distribution of wealth in this country.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! I do not know whether the member is aware that it is a convention of this Parliament that to call a member of another Parliament a "liar" is considered to be unparliamentary. I would ask the member to withdraw his remark.

Mr PARKER: In deference to you, Sir, I will withdraw it, as long as you do not make me say the Prime Minister is not a liar.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Government members interjected.

Mr B. T. Burke: Come on! He could not lie straight in bed!

Mr PARKER: In *The Weekend Australian* of 11-12 October, an advertisement appeared in similar terms to comments made by the Prime Minister on the "AM" programme yesterday morning. I am holding a copy of the advertisement in my hand. It says, "Labor's 'Wealth' Tax threatens the unwealthy family". I should like to read the advertisement to members and comment on it as I go through.

The first sentence reads as follows—

Labor is committed to a new tax which would hit middle-income earners just as violently as the wealthy.

That is not true. In the first instance, we are not committed to any such tax. What we have said is that there is no statistical basis of information within Australia on which one could decide whether or not there ought to be some form of tax on capital or wealth and, if there should be such a tax, the extent to which it should be applied and on whom it should be applied.

Mr Young: For the time being!

Mr PARKER: That is the first point I wish to make; there is no statistical base on which to form such an opinion. Therefore, we have said that we cannot and will not commit ourselves to any form of a tax of that nature during the first term of office of a Labor Government. However, we will commit ourselves to the appointment of an inquiry which will determine the distribution of wealth in this Commonwealth and which will enable both our Government and any other Government which might follow—

Mr MacKinnon: To impose the tax.

Mr PARKER: —and, indeed, State Governments and other organisations to have regard for the real distribution of wealth in this country, because it is not possible to do so at the moment. That is what we have said.

We have said also that if any proposals for such a tax arise out of such an inquiry, then those proposals, clearly enunciated, defined, and drawn up will be put to the people at the 1983 election, so they can determine the course we will take.

Mr O'Connor: Is that according to your policy? Of course it is not.

Mr PARKER: This is the policy which has been announced by the leader of our party.

Mr MacKinnon: It is not binding.

Mr PARKER: It is binding. It is completely binding on our party.

Of course, it is the Labor Party which has a history of honouring its election promises,

whereas the Liberal Party has broken every policy on which it went to the people in 1977.

Let us look at the next statement in this advertisement. In relation to what the Labor Party favours it says—

This so-called "Wealth" Tax would steal the savings of people who, through superannuation, insurance policies and small investments have attempted to provide for their old age or their children.

What nonsense! What absolute nonsense! Even at the time when there was discussion on the economic alternatives which ought to be available to any Government of Australia, the leader of the Federal Opposition (Mr Hayden) was saying—in reply to last year's Budget—that the Labor Party had canvassed a range of alternatives which ought to be considered by the Government. He said that no such policy would apply. There would be no capital gains tax—I stress the words "capital gains"; it is not a wealth tax—on earnings under \$200 000. To say that in one year a person who could make a capital gain of \$200 000 is not wealthy is completely absurd. In order to make a capital gain on investment one would have to invest \$1 million or even \$2 million to make such a gain in one year. If someone can say that a person who can make a capital gain of \$200 000 in one year is not wealthy, then the mind boggles. If the Liberal Party thinks that such a person is not wealthy, then that party is out of touch with reality and out of touch with the people of Australia.

The advertisement continues to say that it does not matter whether one sells one's house or buys another; even if the house has increased in value by the inflation rate, one would have to pay a capital gains tax. Again, that is a complete lie. This advertisement inserted by the Liberal Party is a complete lie.

The Labor Party has, at every stage, canvassed the question of a capital gains tax as an alternative which is available. The Labor Party has said specifically that no matter what its value may be, the owners of a residence would not be subject to a capital gains tax or a wealth tax in respect of that residence. This fact has been stated clearly time and time again.

Mrs Craig: What about houses on farms?

Mr PARKER: That situation also was canvassed last year by the Federal Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking about the possible alternatives available. He said that people who were working productive farms also would be exempted from the capital gains tax in respect of those farms. Of course, a capital gains tax in

every country can be imposed only at the time a capital gain is realised. It is not an annual impost, it can be imposed only at the time the capital gain is realised.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr PARKER: I have another advertisement which is entitled "Don't risk your job". This advertisement was inserted by a group of ordinary Australians concerned about getting a responsible Government in Australia! The advertisement was authorised by D. Daws of 12 Campbell Street, Kalgoorlie. This same Mr Daws was the person who stood more than a little unsuccessfully against the current member for Kalgoorlie during the State election in February this year. Mr Daws was responsible for the advertisement "Good 'eavens, not another Evans". Apparently a concerned Australian, concerned about not receiving a parliamentary income and hardly a man who could be called a responsible, ordinary Australian, or ordinary businessman. He is a member of the Liberal Party.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [8.04 p.m.]: The motion this evening relates, amongst other things, to the question of political advertising in Australia today, and particularly—so the motion urges—in regard to the urgency of maintaining correct and honest advertising.

When I listened to the Leader of the Opposition's speech, it seemed to me that he spent a long time talking about the price of lamb chops. I believe that most of what he said in terms of the increases in the prices of goods in Australia could well be included in the speeches of the Government. It would do the people of Australia a great deal of good if the increases in prices under the Fraser Government were compared with the increases in prices for goods—including lamb chops—under the Whitlam Government.

The price of lamb chops is not a good way to measure inflation. Anyone who is concerned with economics knows that when assessing the increases in prices of goods a parcel of goods, a regimen, is made up. It is a carefully chosen mixture of goods which are in basic use. This parcel of goods is used as a basis for measuring the increases in the inflation rate.

There has been a great deal of argument in regard to what figure should be used, and although it is not surprising, it is very heartening for me to hear the member for Fremantle admit that the inflation rate under a Labor Government did rise to 16.7 per cent. The member for Fremantle said the highest inflation rate under a Labor Government was 16.7 per cent. I used the

figure of 17 per cent during my speech last Tuesday, and I was roared down by the Opposition. I congratulate the member for Fremantle on his correct figure.

I wish to expose the sham of the supporters of the Labor Party objecting to advertising which talks about inflation. In the Federal election of May 1974 the Labor Party ran an advertisement which stated, "We have brought inflation down to 9.6 per cent". The advertisement continued to describe how the inflation rate for the January to March quarter was 2.4 per cent. Multiplying that figure by four gave a figure of 9.6 per cent. The Labor Party also said that inflation in 1973 had been approximately 13 per cent.

Therefore, the Labor Party asserted that it had made tremendous inroads into inflation. That was one of the greatest pieces of dishonesty ever printed in Australia in regard to inflation statistics. The Labor Party used the figure from January to March, and anyone who knows anything about economics would be aware that the January to March figure is always the lowest in the year, with few exceptions if any.

The member for Fremantle referred to the inflation rate which was reached in the 1950s during the Korean War. That was a totally unusual period of time. The war affected the Australian economy because wool sales are dramatically affected by war.

So we had the situation in 1974 where that particular quarter—which is always the lowest quarter in any year—was chosen by the Labor Party as being a fair one to multiply by four. The Labor Party did not say that the January-March figure for 1974 was the highest figure ever reached in Australia since the Korean War. Certainly in the 20 years after that war, the January-March figure was never as high. That was gross political dishonesty.

To state an inflation rate in such a manner is totally dishonest and totally unacceptable to anyone who knows even a minimum about economics. So, I expose the charade and sham of the motion placed before us this evening.

The other night I mentioned how the inflation rate had run to a figure of over 19 per cent during a quarterly period of the Labor Government.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr CLARKO: The quarterly figure was 4.8 per cent, the highest quarter I am aware of under the Labor Government. Now, to multiply that figure by four, gives a total of 19 per cent. I did not use the figure of 19 per cent because I did not

think it was proper and appropriate. Similarly I would not use the highest January-March figure for 20 years, and multiply it by four.

When we talk about inflation rates we must be careful. For 23 years we maintained under the Menzies Government an inflation rate which averaged 3 per cent. That figure of 3 per cent or less was maintained throughout the 1960s. The highest figure was about 4 per cent when Bill McMahon ceased to be Prime Minister. Now, that is a dramatically different figure from the figure of either the Whitlam or the Fraser Government.

The inflation rate reached 16 per cent under a Labor Government. Around the world there was a significant rise in inflation. That was also the scene in the last days of the McMahon Government.

Mr Harman: Why?

Mr CLARKO: In the rest of the world the rate doubled from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. We were down at 3 or 4 per cent and it went up to, at its best under Labor, to about 13 per cent per annum. That figure was arrived at from the previous four quarters.

Mr Harman: Why not say why?

Mr CLARKO: The member opposite wants me to say why. I could choose a figure to suit myself; that is what the Labor Party did. No matter what the best figures they can choose may be, they do not compare with our figures.

The current situation is that inflation is approximately 10.7 per cent which is tremendously below 17 per cent. Members opposite are aware that when speaking recently I used a figure of 10.5 per cent, a significant part of which—about 2 per cent—was due to the world parity pricing of oil. The facts are that even if we did not have world parity pricing there would be inflation as a consequence of higher oil prices in other parts of the world. If we did not use the world parity system, instead of the figure being 2 per cent, it might be 1 per cent. But, if the 1 per cent or 2 per cent were taken off—and that is the inflation rate attributable to world parity pricing of oil admitted by the Opposition—and the resultant figure is compared with an inflation rate of 17 per cent, there is a dramatic difference. Of course, lamb chops will be much dearer with an inflation rate of 17 per cent than with an inflation rate of 10 per cent.

Mr O'Connor: Everyone would be cooked, not only the lamb chops.

Mr Harman: That is being completely dishonest.

Mr CLARKO: I have tried to show the actual statistics. I have talked about an inflation rate of 10 per cent, a figure which is accepted by everybody. I have not tried to claim a favourable figure, as did the member for Ascot when he referred to the Whitlam years and said that the inflation rate was 12 per cent. The member for Fremantle said it was approximately 17 per cent.

In order to look at inflation as part of economic policy, one has only to look at the deficit under the Labor Government in the first three months after the introduction of the Hayden Budget, which was \$2 800 million. A few weeks ago I sat down and added up the deficits of earlier Liberal Governments, and I got to four or five years before I had a comparable figure of \$2 800 million.

Mr B. T. Burke: What happened to the national debt under the Fraser Government?

Mr CLARKO: That does not have a significant effect on the inflation rate. Certainly, it does not significantly affect our present rate of inflation of 10.5 per cent.

Mr B. T. Burke: It does on future commitments.

Mr Harman: What is the national debt?

Mr CLARKO: The member may like to look at our real economic growth. I think he has done one unit in economics. He should talk to his brother who could teach him a great deal.

Mr Harman: It is probable I have done a lot more than has the member who is speaking.

Mr CLARKO: In 1978-79 our real economic growth was 3.7 per cent. On 28 February 1975 Mr Whitlam spoke to the Sydney Chamber of Commerce and said that his Government had inflation under control. He said he expected to have a real growth of the order of about 6 or 7 per cent. That was in 1975.

In August of that year, when the Hayden Budget was brought down, an article appeared in *The Bulletin* establishing that in the financial year just finished there actually had been a deficit—a negative growth as the economists refer to it—in the economic growth of Australia of 3 per cent. In February Mr Whitlam had said he expected real growth of 6 to 7 per cent. That, of course, was the figure he had forecast back in November-December, 1972, prior to the election in which Labor was successful. So, there was a difference between that year and the year during which Mr Hayden was Treasurer, in 1975. There was a negative growth rate of 3 per cent in the figures I have just quoted.

The fundamental difference between the two political parties is seen when we note that in 1978-79 real economic growth shows an increase of 3.7 per cent.

Mr B. T. Burke: What is your Treasurer's prediction for the growth rate this year? Is it 2 per cent?

Mr CLARKO: The member for Balcatta probably is correct; that could be the figure they are looking at. A figure of 2 to 3 per cent certainly is different from the halcyon days of the Menzies Government. The Fraser Government has had to endure a tremendous debit which it inherited from the Whitlam era and, particularly, from Mr Hayden himself who was Treasurer in 1975.

I will refer to consumer prices for the year ended December 1979. Consumer prices in Australia rose by 10 per cent, and the OECD countries had an average of 12 per cent. In the United Kingdom consumer prices rose by 17.2 per cent; the United States, 13.3 per cent; France, 11.8 per cent; and when we refer to a country such as Italy, the rate was 18.8 per cent. Those figures give some idea of what the price of lamb chops would be if a Labor Government had still been in office in this country. We would not be eating lamb chops or hogget chops, we would be eating chops from sheep which are referred to as broken mouthed or crackers, as I am advised by my rural friends. The situation would be vastly inferior today. That is something fundamental to any examination of inflation.

I will quote also from a list of figures which is headed "Cost of living".

Mr Harman: Is it from the Institute of Public Affairs?

Mr CLARKO: No, but I am happy to use those figures. The member for Maylands does not use any figures at all. The list to which I am referring covers 21 countries, and deals with the period from 1966 to 1972. For that period the inflation rate in Australia was 4.1 per cent. The list which I have shows that Australia was the sixth lowest in the level of inflation out of the 21 countries.

In September-October 1973, after Labor had been in office for less than a year, the situation in this country had deteriorated to the extent that out of the 21 countries only four had a higher level of inflation than Australia. We went from sixth lowest out of 21 countries to seventeenth. That was the measure of inflation due to the Labor Government.

Mr Harman: What caused that?

Mr CLARKO: The reckless policy of expenditure by the Labor Government.

Mr Harman: Come on; you are supposed to be an academic.

Mr CLARKO: During the period of three years the Labor Government increased both the collection of taxes and expenditure to the order of well over 100 per cent. Labor increased Government spending by 20 per cent in its first year, 46 per cent in its second year, and 23 per cent in the next year. That was the record of the last Labor Government. It collected much more by way of taxation than had ever been collected previously. From memory, the McMahon Government collected a sum of \$8 000 million in personal income tax.

Revenue from taxation collected annually by the Labor Government during its three years of office amounted to \$10 000 million, \$14 000 million, and \$17 000 million. Those are the figures. I invite the member for Maylands to refer to the Budget booklets which were written by his colleagues, Mr Crean and Mr Hayden.

Mr Harman: Political nonsense.

Mr CLARKO: Crean was not a very capable politician but he was more competent than the run-of-the-mill Labor Treasurers. Cairns was one of the oddest people Australia ever saw—a man with some considerable academic brilliance, but without any practical sense at all. "Papa Hayden" is dead and gone, and I think he will remain dead and buried.

We welcome an opportunity to debate inflation, because that is the strongest point in favour of the Fraser Government's five years in office. No-one else in this world has been so able to turn the situation around. Looking at the OECD countries is an excellent way to see the situation, because they are similar to this country. Our record changed from being one of the top four of five most affluent OECD countries, down to the bottom four or five under Labor, and is now again moving up to the top quarter under the Fraser Government.

If we go further and look at the deficits—

Mr Harman: A man with your academic ability—

Mr CLARKO: I am not making any pretensions to academic ability. Let us look at the performance of Labor rather than listen to its promises. The Whitlam promise was real growth of 6 or 7 per cent; in fact, in 1974-75 he gave us negative growth of 3 per cent. That is typical of Labor promises. The deficit in 1975-76 was \$3 585 million under the Labor Government; in

1979-80 under the Fraser Government the deficit was \$1 566 million, which is obviously much less in real terms. In the current year, 1980-81, we have a small surplus of \$35 million, which is not significant in percentage terms—I am the first to say that—but it is quite different from the situation in 1975 when the Labor Party planned for a deficit of \$4 000 million.

Everyone knows that if a Government has a deficit of that order it will cause tremendous pressures throughout the community. It must be more difficult to buy a house; inflation affects interest rates; prices must go up; workers must press for higher wages; and if workers get higher wages, those on fixed incomes are subjected to greater pressures and stress.

Let us look at what Whitlam did to the manufacturing industries, particularly the textile industry. In one year alone he and the Labor Government of that day were responsible for an increase in unemployment of over 120 000 people in the manufacturing sector alone. That was in only one sector of the economy.

I said last Tuesday night that the Labor Government inherited a situation where the unemployment level was 83 000, and in three years the number had quadrupled to 315 000. Under the present Federal Government there has been a significant increase in employment but it is most noteworthy that in the 12 months to February this year, 155 000 additional persons were in employment in Australia. Everyone agrees that the level of unemployment in Australia is too high, but Liberal Governments have an outstanding record for increasing employment.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The Opposition now seeks leave of the House to withdraw the motion, but stresses once again that it is a Standing Order to which it takes exception.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### **BILLS (4): THIRD READING**

1. Land Tax Assessment Amendment Bill.
2. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Amendment Bill.
3. Business Franchise (Tobacco) Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr O'Connor (Deputy Premier), and transmitted to the Council.

4. Rural and Industries Bank Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier), and transmitted to the Council.

#### **BANANA INDUSTRY COMPENSATION TRUST FUND AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Resources Development) [8.27 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Banana growers at Carnarvon have expressed dissatisfaction with the compensation that was paid from the trust fund following cyclone "Hazel" in March 1979.

After a series of meetings and petitions it became clear that unless the Act was amended growers would vote for its abolition. This would be unfortunate as the compensation scheme has been the means whereby the plantations have been able to redevelop following cyclone damage.

Suggestions for changes to the collection and disbursement of funds were put before the growers in a referendum, and the majority favoured the proposals which gave rise to the amendments now before the House.

The main features of the proposals are to provide compensation to meet claims for damage to banana crops where such damage is assessed at more than 10 per cent. It is considered desirable to have a grower contribution.

It is also proposed to raise the rate of compensation payable to \$1.75 per 16-kilogram carton of bananas from the previous rate of \$1.30 per carton. Growers pressed for an even higher rate, but \$1.75 was considered the maximum that was reasonable in view of the proposal to pay on the full assessed damage and the need to keep levy payments as low as possible.

The proposed increases in compensation rate and damage assessment payments will not be practicable without some rise in levy; and the proposed new rate of levy is 20c per carton, compared with 14c previously. The Government contribution will increase proportionately to 10c per 16-kilogram carton, compared with 7c previously.

Since it is not possible to predict the frequency or destructiveness of cyclones it is necessary to make provision for backing from public funds if severe losses occur in successive years. In that event and if the trust fund balance is insufficient to make payments for assessed damage at the proposed new rate, the Treasury will support the fund to the extent that at least 80 per cent of the compensation due is paid.

Lastly, an amendment is proposed so that the Act shall apply to the Carnarvon district only. Areas such as the Ord and Kimberley which are

capable of producing bananas and are much less prone to cyclone damage are excluded from the provisions of the amending legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett.

## **BEE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**MR P. V. JONES** (Narrogin—Minister for Resources Development) [8.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Act provides for the establishment of a fund to compensate beekeepers whose bees or equipment are destroyed or whose equipment requires disinfection in the control of specified diseases.

The fund is financed from licence fees which are currently 25c a colony for each five-year registration period. It is administered by a compensation fund committee appointed by the Minister.

It has become apparent to the committee, after consultation with industry, that a number of amendments to the Act are desirable. Therefore the changes envisaged in the Bill reflect the needs of the industry.

The indiscriminate use of therapeutic substances such as antibiotics for the treatment of bee diseases is not recommended. This is because such drugs mask the symptoms of brood diseases without destroying the disease spores, thereby enabling such diseases to build up and spread through an apiary or even between apiaries before they are recognised.

It is considered necessary that there be control over the use of such therapeutic drugs on bees, and it is proposed that section 12 should include provision to refuse payment for compensation, or to reduce the amount of compensation payable, where the committee is satisfied that an infection which is the subject of compensation has been spread through the apiary due to the beekeeper's neglect or through the use of a prescribed substance—for example, a specified antibiotic drug—when such use has not been approved in writing by an inspector.

The Act, while making provision for the appointment of members of the compensation fund committee, fails to provide for the termination of such appointments. It is now proposed that there should be a finite term for such appointments, that the maximum period of office be three years, and that, in order to

maintain continuity of the committee's experience, members should be retired alternately one each year. This should apply also to the appointment and retirement of deputies.

The maximum amount that can be held in the compensation fund is \$30 000 under the provisions of section 11 (1). This amount is no longer relevant in view of inflationary trends and it is considered that reference to a fixed upper amount held in the fund should be removed.

The existing maximum contribution to the fund, as set out in the Act, is 25c a colony over the five-year registration period. It is now proposed to reduce this to a two-year registration period; and in the interests of achieving flexibility in setting an appropriate fee, it is envisaged that each registration period contribution should be set by the Minister on the recommendation of the committee. This would enable a fee to be set and varied in accord with the needs of the industry with no specific fee being listed in the Act.

Breaches of the Act now attract a penalty of \$50, which was set in 1950. With present inflationary trends such a low penalty is not considered to provide a realistic deterrent; hence the proposal that section 15(1)(d) be updated to provide a maximum penalty of \$500.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett.

## **BEEKEEPERS AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

**MR P. V. JONES** (Narrogin—Minister for Resources Development) [8.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Beekeepers Act is intended to provide for the eradication of diseases and pests among bees as well as the orderly conduct of the industry. Following discussions with the industry it has become evident that the legislation may be better applied to the benefit of the industry with certain amendments.

Currently beekeepers are required to register as such at five-yearly intervals. This requirement was introduced in 1972 and continued in 1977.

Experience has shown that five years is too long a period for records to be meaningful. This is due, at least in part, to the transient nature of the industry. It would seem more appropriate therefore for registration to be required at two-yearly intervals, this change being supported by the industry.

In the Act there is no provision to designate an area in the event of a serious disease outbreak.



Some diseases—for example, European brood disease—can be most satisfactorily controlled by having power to declare an area as being an infected area in order to halt all movement of bees or hive products from the area in question.

It is considered essential that provision be made for the Minister to gazette an area to be an infected area in the event of the presence of a serious infectious disease being identified in that area, and clause 13 provides accordingly.

The current penalty for a breach of the Act or impersonating an inspector is \$100. At the present value of honey this is not believed to be a significant deterrent. It is considered that the penalty should be increased to a maximum of \$1 000 for a breach of the Act, and \$500 for impersonating an inspector.

Other amendments which the Bill proposes relate to situations where a nuisance may be caused to a person following the keeping of bees; and to provide that a beekeeper shall not use a prescribed substance—for example, an antibiotic drug—for the treatment of a disease of bees without the prior approval of an inspector.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

### BILLS (3): MESSAGES

#### *Appropriations*

Messages from the Administrator received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the following Bills—

1. Banana Industry Compensation Trust Fund Amendment Bill.
2. Bee Industry Compensation Amendment Bill.
3. Beekeepers Amendment Bill.

### COLLEGES AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Education) [8.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is intended to clarify eligibility for membership of the Western Australian Post-Secondary Education Superannuation Scheme. This scheme was carried over from the Western Australian Teacher Education Authority and is an alternative superannuation provision to that available through the State Superannuation Board.

The intention and practice have been to confine membership of the superannuation scheme to permanent full-time staff. The amendment makes it clear that academic staff members who are employed on a part-time or contract basis are not eligible to join.

The conditions for eligibility and non-eligibility will then be consistent with those that applied under the former scheme and with those under the State superannuation scheme.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett.

### CEMETERIES AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

MRS CRAIG (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [8.40 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Although a comprehensive review of all the provisions of the Cemeteries Act is at present under way, the need has arisen for the amendments contained in this Bill to proceed immediately.

The Bill provides for the Cemeteries Act to be amended in two ways. It provides, firstly, for an amendment to allow the trustees of a cemetery to construct buildings that are required for cemetery purposes or for the use of visitors to the cemetery.

The Karrakatta Cemetery Board wishes to modernise the main cemetery entrance, including the provision of a new kiosk to replace the present, inadequate building. However, the Cemeteries Act does not confer authority on trustees to undertake works of this nature and legal advice given to the Karrakatta Cemetery Board indicated that it had no power to proceed.

The provisions of this Bill will rectify that deficiency by conferring power on trustees to construct such buildings as are required for cemetery purposes or for the use of visitors to a cemetery. Trustees will also have to be able to arrange for buildings in the latter category to be let out or leased.

The Bill also provides for the Auditor General to be responsible for the audit of all cemetery accounts. At present, Local Government Department inspectors are required to conduct the audits of those cemeteries where municipal councils have been appointed as the trustees.

This change in audit arrangements is part of a proposal for the Local Government Department audit branch to be amalgamated with the State Audit Department. I will shortly be proposing

amendments to the Local Government Act for this purpose.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Barnett.

## ROAD TRAFFIC AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR HASSELL** (Cottesloe—Minister for Police and Traffic) [8.43 p.m.]: 1 move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1974-1979, to give effect to a number of changes to fees levied under the Act as announced in the Treasurer's Budget speech. At the same time it is proposed to rationalise the procedure for obtaining a motor driver's licence, including the charging of a single composite fee in place of a series of minor charges levied at present.

The Bill also provides for a change in the distribution of motor drivers' licence revenue between the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the Main Roads Trust Account.

Seven sections of the Act and one schedule are involved in the proposed amendments and I will refer to them in the order in which they are contained in the Bill.

Vehicle licence fees comprise two elements, a recording fee of \$4 which applies to all vehicles on the occasion of each renewal of licence with the balance of the licence fee being a tax levied for road construction and maintenance which varies with the class of the vehicle.

The recording fee is paid to Consolidated Revenue to recoup the cost of administering vehicle licensing and has remained at \$4 since it was introduced in 1975. However, a recent review of the costs incurred in administering the licensing functions of the Road Traffic Act revealed that the cost of administering motor vehicle licensing currently averages \$5.58 for each registration and renewal.

As the original intention was that the recording fee should cover the cost of licensing, it is proposed that the fee be increased to \$6 from 1 January 1981. As it will be necessary to vary the recording fee from time to time to offset the effects of inflation and as the fee is a cost related charge and not a tax, it is proposed that in future the fee will be prescribed by regulation and will not be specified in part 1 of the second schedule to the Act as at present.

It should be said in passing that administrative procedures for the issue of renewal of motor

vehicle licences and motor drivers' licences are efficiently handled and that in recent years a very large increase in the volume of transactions has been absorbed with little increase in the staff involved. This is because the procedures were transferred some years ago to computer, enabling the very large volume of transactions that have to be processed each day to be undertaken at minimum cost.

It is to be expected that any increase in the recording fee in future years will be much less than the corresponding rate of increase in wage and other costs.

Currently when a vehicle licence is cancelled a fee of \$1 is charged on the refund of the unused portion of the cancelled vehicle licence. It is considered that the cost involved in processing refunds should be covered by the vehicle recording fee and it is therefore proposed to abolish the vehicle refund cancellation fee.

At the present time, a person wishing to obtain a driver's licence pays separate fees on taking out a learner's permit, which is valid for three months only, on applying for a driving test and then, if successful, on applying for a licence. The total of these charges could vary from \$7 upwards depending upon the length of time and the number of tests that are taken.

Research has shown that 88 per cent of applicants obtain their driver's licence on either the first or second test with the remaining 12 per cent requiring three or more tests. Based on these figures, it is considered that the concept of one fee being levied to cover the whole process of obtaining a driver's licence should also include extension of the period for which a learner's permit is valid from three months to 12 months and also cover two practical driving tests.

It should be noted that the administrative cost involved in processing an applicant from the learner's permit stage, including two practical driving tests, is currently over \$24.

It is therefore proposed that from 1 January next, learners' permits will be issued free of charge and be valid for 12 months. On application for a licence, including examination and testing, a fee of \$20 will be charged which will also cover a second driver's test should that be necessary.

The estimated cost to the Road Traffic Authority is \$9.64 for each practical driving test and it is therefore proposed that if an applicant is unsuccessful after two tests, a fee of \$10 will be charged for each subsequent test.

As with the vehicle licence recording fee, it is proposed that in future these fees be prescribed by regulation and the Bill provides accordingly.

The fee charged for the issue of licence plates is currently \$3 which compares with an estimated cost of purchase and handling of over \$4 with costs in this area constantly rising. It is therefore proposed that a fee of \$5 will be charged from the commencement of next year.

Dealers' plates are currently charged at \$20, may be transferred from vehicle to vehicle and can be used six days a week for moving vehicles on the road, demonstrations, etc. The fee is small compared to the licence fees paid by ordinary motorists and an increase to \$40 is proposed. As these fees are already able to be prescribed by regulation, no amendment to the Act is necessary to implement these measures and it is mentioned solely for the information of members.

For many years, revenue from motor drivers' licences has been divided 50 per cent to Consolidated Revenue to offset the cost of collection and also to make some contribution towards meeting the costs of motorist related services such as ambulance, medical and road safety services, and 50 per cent to the Main Roads Trust Account.

The examination of administrative costs to which I referred earlier, shows that currently the cost of administering motor drivers' licensing is \$5.94 per licence against a licence fee of \$7.

Thus, of estimated collections of \$4.6 million this year, of which \$2.3 million is to be paid to Consolidated Revenue, the cost of collection and administration borne by Consolidated Revenue will amount to \$3.9 million, a loss of \$1.6 million.

At the same time the Government has introduced a fuel franchise levy for the purpose of obtaining additional funds for necessary road works. The levy is paid by Government departments, including the Metropolitan Transport Trust, which has added to costs and therefore represents an additional payment from Consolidated Revenue to the Main Roads Trust Account.

In 1979-80 an amount of \$640 000 was recouped to Consolidated Revenue from the Main Roads Trust Account to offset this additional cost pending resolution of this matter. As it was the intention of the fuel franchise levy legislation that the charge would be paid by all users without exception, it has been decided that the proper course is for Government departments to pay the levy without a recoup being obtained, and to reconsider the distribution of motor drivers' licence revenue with this in mind.

It is proposed that from 1981-82 the whole of motor drivers' licence revenue will be paid to Consolidated Revenue to offset the cost of

collection and also the impact of the fuel franchise levy on departmental and Metropolitan Transport Trust costs, leaving the whole of the proceeds of the fuel franchise levy available for expenditure on roads.

To allow the Main Roads Department time to adjust the financing of the road construction and maintenance programme to the new funding arrangements, the Bill provides for a transitional year in 1980-81 with 33½ per cent of motor driver's licence revenue being credited to the Main Roads Trust Account and 66½ per cent to Consolidated Revenue. The proposed amendment is such that the Act will not provide for any specific distribution of these fees in 1981-82 and subsequent years so that under the provisions of the Constitution Act the whole of the proceeds will be paid to Consolidated Revenue.

The proposed changes are in part designed to obtain additional revenue to offset increased costs involved in the licensing process and also to achieve a desirable rationalisation of charges currently levied to remove some irritants to the public inherent in the present multiple fee system.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr T. H. Jones.

#### MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: OFFICES OF PROFIT

*Inquiry by Joint Select Committee: Motion*

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Premier)  
[8.53 p.m.]: I move—

That this House doth resolve—

(1) That a Joint Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council be appointed to enquire as to—

(a) the suitability of the present law relating to Members of Parliament holding offices of profit under the Crown, or having contracts or agreements with the Crown; and

(b) in the event of that law being considered unsuitable in any respect, what changes should be made in that law.

(2) That the Committee prepare a report to each House of Parliament setting forth its findings and recommendations.

- (3) That in carrying out its functions the Committee shall give particular attention to the recommendations in the Law Reform Committee's report of March 9, 1971, and to the changes in the law proposed in the Acts Amendment and Repeal (Disqualification for Parliament) Bill 1979 introduced during the Third Session of the Twenty-ninth Parliament.
- (4) That the Committee consist of nine members of whom four shall be appointed by the Legislative Assembly and five by the Legislative Council.
- (5) That the Legislative Assembly be represented on the Committee by the following members, namely—  
     Mr B. Blaikie,  
     Mr J. Clarko,  
     Mr J. J. Harman,  
     Mr J. E. Skidmore.
- (6) That the Legislative Council be requested to appoint five members of the Legislative Council to serve on the Committee, and to appoint one of those members to be the Chairman of the Committee.
- (7) That in the absence of the Chairman from any meeting of the Committee the members present may appoint one of their number to act temporarily as Chairman.
- (8) That the Committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from time to time and from place to place, and, except as hereinafter provided, to sit on any day and at any time.
- (9) That the Committee shall not sit while either House is actually sitting unless leave is granted by that House.
- (10) That five members of the Committee, irrespective of the House by which they are appointed, shall constitute a quorum of the Committee and, so long as a quorum is present at any meeting, the members present shall be competent to exercise and perform all the powers, authorities and functions of the Committee.
- (11) That the Chairman, or person acting as Chairman, of the Committee shall have a deliberative vote only, and in any case where, at any meeting of the Committee, the voting on any question is equal, that question shall pass in the negative.
- (12) That the first meeting of the Committee be held at a time and place appointed by the Chairman.
- (13) That the Committee have leave to report from time to time on its proceedings.
- (14) That when the Committee has concluded its sittings a copy of its report, signed by the Chairman, shall be presented to each House by one of the members appointed by that House to serve on the Committee.
- (15) That the Chairman of the Committee shall have power to make arrangements with the Clerk of the Legislative Council for the provision of clerical assistance to the Committee.
- (16) That the foregoing provisions of this Resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders and that any member be entitled to sit on the Joint Select Committee notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 359.
- (17) That in respect of matters not provided for in this Resolution, the Standing Orders of the Houses relating to Select Committees shall be followed as far as they can be applied.
- (18) That a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting it of this Resolution and requesting it to agree to the appointment of a Joint Select Committee in accordance with the terms of this Resolution and to take action accordingly.

In moving this motion, it would seem to be appropriate that I give members some background information leading up to this present proposal.

Those members who were present in this Chamber in 1979 will recall that a Bill was introduced to amend the Constitution Act. It was dealt with and passed in another place but, although received by this Chamber, was not dealt with here due to pressure of business. It lapsed at the end of the parliamentary sitting. Certain aspects of the 1979 Bill concerned with disqualification for Parliament were reintroduced in this Chamber a short time ago and subsequently passed by both Houses. In speaking to that Bill, I indicated that the Government considered that it was necessary to deal with a number of specific situations that had recently come under notice. I also said, however, that the Government intended to provide the means for the whole question of disqualification for

Parliament to be fully considered at a later stage of the parliamentary sitting.

The Bill which has just been enacted did not attempt to deal with the general question of an office of profit under the Crown or contracts or agreements with the Crown as it would affect all members of Parliament, but restricted itself to the immediate problems which had arisen. Apart from the specific situations referred to in that Bill, the position as far as members of Parliament are concerned has not changed.

Thus, great uncertainty remains as to the kinds of offices that members can accept without risking disqualification. For instance, it is not clear whether the restrictions apply only to appointments made by or on behalf of the Crown or whether, perhaps, all offices connected with the Public Service in any way may infringe the restrictions. As to the term "profit", it is possible that the mere receipt of travelling allowances and necessary expenses transforms an office into one of profit even though the holder does not stand to gain any reward for his services. So far as Government contracts are concerned, the law is so obscure that any arrangement that an ordinary citizen might enter into with a State instrumentality, such as a contract of insurance with the State Government Insurance Office, could fall into the prohibited category.

The need for legislation in this area is probably best summed up by the remarks of the Law Reform Committee—predecessor of the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia—in its report on this subject in 1971. That committee was of the opinion that qualification for membership of Parliament should be on as wide a basis as possible, and that any restriction in membership should be included in legislation which was easily interpreted by those who might be affected. The committee further considered that, measured against such criteria, the present legislation was defective, being in parts obscure and in parts too rigid. It is therefore in the best interests of members and the public generally that the laws relating to these matters are resolved and rectified as they have been in the United Kingdom.

The motion which is currently before the House deals with the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of both this House and the Legislative Council to inquire into—

- (a) The suitability of the present law relating to members of Parliament holding offices of profit under the Crown, or having contracts or agreements with the Crown; and

- (b) In the event of that law being considered unsuitable in any respect, what changes should be made in that law.

The terms of reference are not in any way restrictive and should enable the committee to produce a report which will be of benefit to all members of Parliament.

It is proposed that the committee shall consist of nine members, four from the Legislative Assembly and five from the Legislative Council. The remaining portions of the resolution deal with the formalities associated with the committee, its powers, and the procedure to be followed in submitting its report. Members will note that the committee will also be given the power to report to Parliament from time to time should this be considered necessary.

At this stage I would like to emphasise that the subject of disqualification for Parliament is not a party political matter, and any member could unwittingly prejudice his seat under the present state of legal uncertainty. As the matter is of general interest and importance to all members of Parliament—as well as, of course, to the public—I am glad that the Opposition has agreed to co-operate in the setting up of the Joint Select Committee.

I should make one further explanation so it is recorded, although I have discussed it with the Leader of the Opposition. Most members will know that the draft motion was submitted to the Opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition was good enough to advise the position of his party, and nominate the members who are prepared to serve on the Joint Select Committee. The names of those members from the Assembly have been incorporated in this motion. In due course the names of the others will be incorporated in another place, when we send the message to the Legislative Council in accordance with paragraph (18) of the motion.

The paragraph to which I want to draw the attention of members is paragraph (16) because this is a modification of the original draft. I had explained to the Leader of the Opposition why it had been included.

I refer members to Standing Order No. 359 which reads—

No Member shall sit on a Select Committee who shall have a pecuniary interest in the matters to be investigated by such Committee.

It was pointed out that, under that Standing Order, we would not be able to have any members on the Joint Select Committee, so paragraph (16) has been prepared to overcome that situation. For

the sake of the record, I indicate paragraph (16) is as follows—

- (16) That the foregoing provisions of this Resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders and that any member be entitled to sit on the Joint Select Committee notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 359.

In other words, for the purpose of this Joint Select Committee, all members of this Chamber will be relieved of the restriction that would apply normally under Standing Order No. 359.

I thank the Opposition for its support of the proposal. It is one which concerns us all, and it is not a party political matter.

Mr O'CONNOR: I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr H. D. Evans (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

### QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

### METROPOLITAN (PERTH) PASSENGER TRANSPORT TRUST AMENDMENT BILL

*Returned*

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

### APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

*Second Reading: Budget Debate*

Debate resumed from 9 October.

**MR BRIDGE** (Kimberley) [9.15 p.m.]: I should like to preface my comments this evening, which will be basically an attack upon the State Budget and also remarks in unfavourable terms in relation to the Fraser Administration, by saying that, in looking at the funding which has been directed towards the Kimberley in the State Budget, I acknowledge consideration was given in some areas. Indeed, in certain areas reasonably adequate funding was made available. I should like that to be understood. I do not intend to say the Kimberley missed out completely.

However, it is clear that shortfalls occurred in certain areas and I propose in the next 45 minutes to highlight some of those areas by using examples wherever I can and generally endeavouring to illustrate those shortfalls to the House tonight.

Before I move on to the State Budget I should like to deal briefly with the Federal scene and the Fraser Administration. I am prompted to do so because of the comments which have flowed across the floor of the House tonight and in debate over the last few weeks, particularly from members who are generally considered to represent the rural sector. It has been rather interesting to sit back and watch the way in which Government members have spoken constantly about the benefits made available and the wonderful policies put forward by the Fraser Government during its term of office.

As far as I am concerned, as a member representing a rural electorate, it is correct to say that people in rural Australia and, indeed, in the Kimberley, have been battered and bruised more than ever before during the last five years.

Tonight the Leader of the Opposition compared food prices which applied in 1975 with those applying today in metropolitan areas. He referred to a number of items. However, when members look at those increases and recognise they were rather dramatic, they should bear in mind also that they are small in comparison with the increases which have occurred in rural areas. Therefore, for every \$1 increase in prices experienced in the metropolitan area between 1975 and 1980, one would have to allow \$3 for increases which have occurred in rural areas.

I do not intend to call anyone a "liar" or make comments of that nature when referring to the record of the Fraser Government; but I should like to say I believe the Fraser Government has been extremely reckless with the truth, because it is a fact of life that, during the Fraser Administration, rural people have been clobbered. It is the responsibility of members representing rural electorates to recognise that and to stand up and express views along those lines, because people in rural areas are relying on their representatives here to express that point of view, and not collectively to say things are such and such because it is the view of political parties. It is a time for representation.

Irrespective of the party to which one belongs, now is an opportune time to express our dismay about the policies and decisions which have been handed out to people in rural areas in the last five years. We have a situation which has been so bad and has devastated the people in the area so much that a newspaper such as the North Queensland *Register* ran a heading on 23 August 1980 stating "Rural by-pass". Another heading was "The Forgotten sector in the Budget". The newspaper reported the problems of the people in the

outback areas of Australia and stated the challenge the Federal Government must take on to correct the situation.

One matter of the greatest concern to me is the reduced assistance to the primary industry over the last couple of years. The figures supplied to me show that the total assistance to the primary industry—it includes forestry and fishing—has been reduced from \$251.8 million in 1978 to \$167.9 million in 1980-81. Yet, for the same period assistance to the mining and manufacturing industries has increased from \$167.9 million to \$466.2 million. It is apparent from those figures that people in the rural sector—the primary industry area—have received reduced assistance under the Fraser Government's administration.

The greatest problem which the people in the rural areas have had to face has been fuel prices. The rural areas have had to bear the brunt of the continual price increases. I have heard members of this House attempt to justify the Fraser Government's fuel policy. Some of those members have purported to represent rural electorates.

There is no way that these price increases can be justified. If we look at the prices right across the board, in every area people have had to pay an increased price for goods and there has been a devastating increase in fuel prices under the Fraser Government.

In one increase the price for avgas went up by 42 per cent. That increase was followed by a 30 per cent increase which made a total increase of 70 per cent in just one area. Price increases were the same for motor fuel and distillate. It is not true to say that during the time of the Fraser Government policies have been directed positively and constructively towards the rural area. This simply has not been done.

Sir Charles Court: I do not wish to interrupt your train of thought but have you allowed for the cost of fuel equalisation from large and important taxation incentives which have been instituted for primary industry—which were taken away by the Whitlam Government?

Mr BRIDGE: I have done that and I think rural people know about that incentive. The Federal Government did provide that one measure which was an incentive for rural areas, which we recognise and which was an effort to reduce TB and trichomoniasis. As a rural man I acknowledge that fact. That move was the only flickering light at the end of the tunnel about which we can talk with any enthusiasm.

I fail to see how anyone could be happy, proud or enthusiastic about the way in which the Fraser

Administration has looked at the needs of the people in rural areas.

I am also critical of the Fraser Government's policy with regard to the area of employment. That policy has been supported by the very short-sighted views of the State Government. There are many areas where there could be job creation programmes commenced tomorrow but in no way can we get this across to the State Government.

Local government authorities and organisations as well as employers have attempted to get this message across to the State Government, but to no avail. So today we find a situation of extremely high unemployment right throughout the nation.

I would like to return to the State scene and talk about the statistics for the unemployed in the Kimberley area. I am critical of the State Budget and its complete lack of recognition of the serious unemployment situation which exists in the Kimberley.

Currently the employment rate is just under 30 per cent overall and the figure is 73.4 per cent for Aboriginal unemployment.

Mr Skidmore: Is it the national standard?

Mr BRIDGE: These are the statistics which are available for the Kimberley. Those figures are absolutely disgraceful—73.4 per cent for Aboriginal unemployed and 30 per cent overall. They are the figures, despite the fact that there are many people in the Kimberley who do not appear in the statistics because they do not apply for unemployment benefits. They do not seek social welfare assistance and as a consequence of that, there is a large number of people in the Kimberley who are not listed as being unemployed. If those people were added to the list of the already reported unemployed the figure would be far in excess of the one I have quoted.

Statements have appeared in the media that retrenchments will occur in certain areas, particularly in public works. Those numbers of course will increase our list and will add to the devastating situation.

The Government has to accept and recognise our unemployment figures. Despite the claims of the Government and the noises we hear about the need to keep down inflation, unemployment has been rising steadily for the last couple of years. The Deputy Premier was quoted in the newspaper article as saying that this was the eighth consecutive month in which the rate for unemployment was below the national average.

That is not the situation in areas such as the Kimberley. The figures I have quoted are not truly reflective of the position which exists

because if a proper study and analysis of the unemployment situation in Western Australia were made, the situation would be found to be a lot worse.

Despite all the claims by Government members about a responsible Budget, and that it will be productive, the plain truth is that it is far from that. It is a negative Budget. It is unimaginative, and it will create further problems in the area of unemployment.

It is a fact of life that Governments have to share a certain part of the responsibility of creating new projects, and the funding of those projects wherever local authorities and other organisations develop job creation programmes. Those programmes have to rely on funding from the Government.

The Government should get these programmes under way. There is plenty of initiative in the rural areas, but the lack of funding is a shortcoming on the part of the Government. It is an area in which I think the Government has failed most of all. The Government really has made no positive attempt to grapple with unemployment.

We have heard a lot of noise about Federal schemes. One scheme was unveiled in Perth last week by the Federal Minister (Mr Viner). But, that scheme really is a small part of the attack that needs to be made on the problem of unemployment, particularly in the area of Aboriginal unemployment. The problem is far larger than that.

I will turn now to another problem in the Kimberley which is worthy of comment. I refer to the Broome jetty. Ever since I have been involved in politics, and while I have been campaigning, I have heard a constant murmur of criticism from people about the need for handling facilities to be made available at the Broome jetty. I appreciate that the Government has made available a sum of \$2.7 million to upgrade the jetty. But, I understand—if I interpret the funding correctly—that sum of money is for the provision of grain handling facilities. In other words, those facilities will be available for a new venture.

The Broome jetty is in need of facilities to handle the traditional requirements of the area. At the moment, there is not even a forklift capable of handling cargo to the order of 20 tonnes. That is a facility which is required desperately in Broome. I would have thought the Government would recognise that need, but it has not done so.

At this stage Broome does not have the capacity or the facilities to handle many of the

ships which, otherwise, would be able to use the port. It is interesting to note that the Government is looking at the provision of two new ships for the north-west coastal service. They have been described as "sophisticated" ships. But, while the Government is planning the purchase of two so-called sophisticated ships for the north-west service, the jetty at Broome can best be described as "dilapidated".

I think the Government should review its funding in the Broome area because definitely there is a need to upgrade the handling facilities at the Broome jetty, quite apart from the provision of grain handling facilities. As I have already said, the Government is to spend \$2.7 million in the provision of new grain handling facilities at Broome but there definitely is need for container storage. I believe that facility is essential for the mere survival of the Broome port. I suggest, strongly, that the Government should review its funding in this area, particularly as there is a clear commitment that in the future meat deliveries will be by way of container facilities. Therefore, the Government really needs to look at the situation.

Another matter on which I will not be as critical tonight to the same extent as I would have been last night concerns the Derby Regional Hospital. The Minister for Health has somewhat answered my concern in a letter I received from him today. I brought up the matter of the Derby Regional Hospital during my maiden speech. It has been of major concern to many people in the area.

I was in Derby only last week and again I had an opportunity to visit the hospital and see the disgusting situation which exists there. A large number of patients still are accommodated in beds on the verandah. The daily visits by doctors are carried out in the corridors where, in most instances, there is an audience. The situation is far from satisfactory.

A sum of \$85 000 has been made available for nursing accommodation, but that is just a very small part of what needs to be done overall to upgrade the Derby Regional Hospital. The Minister has, to some extent, relieved the definite concern I have for the hospital by indicating there is to be an on-going programme. There has been a commitment by the Government, and an acknowledgment by the Minister, that the areas of concern are recognised by him. To that end I am prepared to acknowledge the Minister is aware of the problem, and that the upgrading will be carried out as a matter of urgency. I understand that the Minister inspected the hospital on a recent visit. The hospital is in a bad



state of repair. Quite apart from the fact that the patients have to be accommodated in the corridors, many other sections of the hospital are far from satisfactory, and the needs of the hospital must be recognised.

The leading surgeon based in the Kimberley at the moment is located at Derby, and major surgery is usually carried out at the Derby Regional Hospital. The upgrading of the hospital ought to be seen by the Government as a high priority area in its Budget funding.

Another area of concern to me, and which has suffered some neglect in the State Budget, is that of tourism. We have heard a great deal about the potential for tourism in the Kimberley. However, on looking through the Budget I was unable to find any encouraging signs of funding. As a consequence, I point out to the Government that there has been a major neglect of one of the most promising industries available to the Kimberley. There is a lot of potential and a great opportunity to develop the tourist industry. But, the same as with most other industries in the Kimberley, tourism requires Government funding. That is essential if we are to get anywhere.

Local authorities carry out as much expansion and development as is possible with regard to tourism, but because of their limited resources they face great difficulties. The same problem applies to private enterprise. Private investors have to pay large sums of money to obtain suitable buses, and air-condition them to be able to serve the public effectively. This is a major cost.

All in all, I think the Government must look at the matter more realistically and set a more positive example in tourism to develop the industry in an area like the Kimberley to its full capacity.

I would now like to touch on a matter which has received great attention and comment in this Parliament; that is, equal rights and equal privileges for all people. The Minister for Cultural Affairs has referred to this principle on many occasions, and it has been expressed freely by several members of this House and the other House. In raising the whole question of the so-called equal rights for all, I will refer to a particular community in the Kimberley which is known as the Guda Guda community.

The Guda Guda community is located six miles out of the town of Wyndham and within the town boundaries. I choose the Guda Guda community for the purpose of my comments because it is perhaps the most ideal community with which to illustrate the problems faced by some of the

communities, and the great difficulty they have in achieving equal opportunities and equal rights. The Guda Guda community is a group of Aboriginal people with traditional perspectives who demonstrate care and concern for the fundamental human values that have survived the emergence of white settlement.

In the late 1960s a small group of men and women were turned off a property called Bow River Station which is about 120 miles from Wyndham. They then established a camp on a small block of land which was available to them and which is now known as Guda Guda.

In the years since then Guda Guda has been developed along the lines of what might be described as a *de facto* hostel for children from nearby stations who attend school at Wyndham, for medical patients in transit from outlying stations, for unemployed people, stockmen, discharged prisoners, alcoholics, and the like. A small core of about 10 elderly people contribute their unemployment benefits, and from these fairly meagre funds and a few Government funds which are available to them they care for about 40 children, mostly belonging to station workers, and an average population of about 50 transients. These visitors come in regularly from surrounding stations to the Guda Guda community village, which is really the only place in the Wyndham area where they can stay. Some of them have been discharged from gaol, and others are just waiting around until such time as they can get home. Accommodation, food, and other types of assistance are made available to them.

The Guda Guda community is not unlike the Noonkanbah community, in that it comprises a group of reliable people who have seen the need to set up facilities to assist people coming in from the surrounding stations which do not have the facilities which are generally available to the people in Wyndham. I would have thought that in the circumstances the Government would recognise their initiative and give them support by way of funds for further developments. What happens instead is that the community has to struggle to provide for itself and those whom it takes into its care. In many instances, this struggle goes on completely unnoticed and unsupported. At this stage, anyway, the Government's financial contribution to the Guda Guda people has been nil.

The result is that at the moment there is a fair measure of overcrowding. In one instance, 26 people share a small tin shed, and this gives rise to all sorts of health problems and social diseases which are associated with overcrowding. The

result is a shocking state of poverty for many of the people.

We hear quite often about the squandering of money by Aboriginal communities. The people of Australia have been encouraged to believe that a lot of money comes into the hands of these people and that if they did not spend money on "grog" but spent it on essential requirements such as food and clothing, they would be fairly well off and have ample finance for everything.

The interesting point is that according to figures from the Department of Social Security the income of the people at Guda Guda is \$16 a week per person. A similar situation applies in most Aboriginal communities. From the \$16 a week per person the children and adults have to obtain food and clothing, and other provisions necessary to keep them going. In addition, outpatients and people in transit live there until such time as they can get back to the station or wherever else they come from. The only means of transport to town is a dilapidated truck. It is the only link with the town, and more often than not the people have to walk because the truck has broken down.

The proposition of the Minister for Cultural Affairs and others that all have equal rights and opportunities does not stand up to close scrutiny. Those people at Wyndham are clearly visible to us, and they can do nothing to change their situation. In no way do they have the opportunity to achieve equal rights and equal opportunities; it is not possible.

The people in that community have been faced with another great problem of which I am sure the Government must have had some indication; that is, the lack of a suitable water supply at the present time. The only water available to the people is from an old stock well located nearby. However, this water has been described by the local shire health surveyor as being contaminated with salmonella bacteria. So we have a situation in which children often suffer as a result of drinking the water, and sores and other conditions which occur as a result of lack of suitable water are prevalent in the Guda Guda community. Children generally go to school in a fairly dirty state because of the lack of any kind of laundry facilities.

Here again, I think the Government is displaying considerable shortsightedness. In this respect, I refer not only to the State Government, but also to the Federal Government. For the last 10 years or so the Government has been considering the extension of the water supply from the town of Wyndham to the Guda Guda

community. Some years ago it was suggested the supply of water would cost about \$180 000; but despite all the work which has been done in the town area in respect of the provision of services, no positive steps have been taken to provide a suitable water supply for the people at Guda Guda. Currently they have no suitable water supply apart from the well which, as I pointed out, has been described as unsuitable.

The other interesting thing about the situation of the Guda Guda community at Wyndham is that we have heard a great deal said about the benefits which mining may bring to the Aboriginal people in the Kimberley. I guess in many areas people have been saying that once development occurs problems such as those faced by the Guda Guda people might well disappear.

However, a close look at the situation at the moment does not suggest that will happen; certainly, it will not happen for quite a while. It is interesting to see what has happened to the leading members of the Guda Guda community. Two of them were amongst the six people involved in the recent agreement between Aborigines and CRA in respect of diamond mining in the Kimberley. A great deal was said in the Press and much was mentioned in various circles about how a great deal of money would be made available to these people and how they would be well provided for under agreements; so much so that they would certainly be able to develop and progress as a group of people.

Yet as I understand the situation from a fairly reliable source of information, the position at the moment in the Kimberley is that the two people from Guda Guda who were among the six involved in the agreement are still drawing unemployment benefit and relying solely upon it as their means of sustenance. So one questions just how much value mining development holds for communities such as Guda Guda.

Mr Grayden: About 30 people signed the agreement.

Mr BRIDGE: No, the Minister would be aware that only six were involved.

Mr Grayden: A meeting was held in the Kimberley and at least 30 people signed; and they sent six representatives to Perth.

Mr BRIDGE: The six people sent to Perth were the ones who signed the agreement.

Mr Grayden: Yes, at the behest of 30 others. We have all the signatures.

Mr BRIDGE: Only four people came down to Perth; is that not so?

Mr Grayden: Yes. I understand two could not come.

Mr BRIDGE: They were the main ones who signed the document.

Mr Grayden: I have not seen the agreement, but I understand the company concerned is going to spend money on the station, not on individuals.

Mr BRIDGE: Well, we have yet to see it. As I understand the situation—and I can only state the information which has been passed to me—the only indication of any benefit for the good of the people is two Land Rovers.

Mr Grayden: I can tell you this: You have seen the public details of the amount, which is a very large one, and that money certainly will be spent if the company undertook to spend it.

Mr Skidmore: When will they get it?

Mr BRIDGE: The amount published certainly was large; I would agree with that. However, I have made the point that the amount of money expected by the six people who signed certainly has not been forthcoming to this time, and it is now three months since the agreement was signed.

Mr Grayden: It would be less than that.

Mr BRIDGE: No, it would not be.

Mr Grayden: Secondly, the company was granted permission to go on with the lease only about two weeks ago.

Mr BRIDGE: Those are the main points in respect of which I wish to offer criticism about the State Budget. I criticised the Federal Administration in the earlier part of my speech. There is no way anybody genuinely interested in looking after the interests of rural Australia can be anything but critical of the way in which the Fraser Administration has operated over the last few years. Incentives are being whittled away rapidly. In the area of small business I would say there is now very much less incentive than there was 10 or 12 years ago. I know, because I was in business some years ago and I would say it is now much harder for a small businessman to be successful in the Kimberley than it was 10 or 12 years ago. Cost factors are killing small businesses. It is impossible for small businessmen to pass on all cost increases to their customers, and there is a tendency for them to absorb the increases themselves.

Mr Rushton: Many costs are less. Transport costs are lower than before. Take the chiller service to the Kimberley; you could not get anything cheaper than that.

Mr BRIDGE: That might well be the case in the area of road transport but, generally speaking,

there is nothing in the Kimberley that has not increased in price.

Mr Sodeman: That is not fair. What about State housing, which was reduced by 30 per cent not so long ago? It is cheaper than in the metropolitan area.

Mr MacKinnon: Electricity is the same price.

Mr BRIDGE: The position as I see it is that people in rural Australia cannot feel happy about any prospect of the Fraser Government having another term of office. Many people oppose the Fraser Government; not only those of us in this place who have an inclination to criticise because we are in an opposing party, but also papers in Queensland which are most conservative are being rather vicious in their attacks upon the Administration over which Fraser has presided for the last three years.

There was absolutely no joy at all in the Budget brought down recently by the Fraser Government; it was a continuation of the brutal attack on the people of Australia. Unfortunately, apart from a few exceptions, the recently handed down State Budget is in much the same category.

MR E. T. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [9.59 p.m.]: I, too, intend to speak on a wide range of subjects in respect of country areas in general and in respect of my seat and the Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie in particular. As members are probably aware, the Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie takes in seven-eighths of the State, and State and Federal issues do intermingle, particularly in matters of economics.

I would make the observation that since I have been in this place—and it is not very long—I have noticed that the economic policy of the Government is very simple. This policy comes across to us in most speeches made by members of the Government and in the answers to questions we ask in this place. According to this Government, anything good which comes out of the economy is the result of good government, sound, responsible economic management, good housekeeping, and all the other adjectives we have come to recognise and expect from the Premier and his Ministers.

Mr Blaikie: Hear hear!

Mr E. T. EVANS: It is even simpler for the Government when things are bad: Just blame Gough. Inflation is running at 11 per cent in the country and in this State generally, but the answer of members opposite is, "It was worse under Whitlam." Unemployment in Western Australia is at 35 000, but that problem is supposed to be a flow-on from Whitlam. Interest rates are at record levels but, according to the

Government, they were also high when Whitlam was in government. If the Government does not have any money to spend because Fraser will not give us any, it is because Gough spent it all! This seems to be the tack adopted by this Government in answer to all our economic problems.

Mr Blaikie: Could I just make a point to you—

Mr E. T. EVANS: I will just finish my point, if the honourable member does not mind. The Government can fool some of the people some of the time, but it cannot fool all the people all of the time. Next Saturday the Government will have somebody else to blame; we will have a Hayden Federal Government and this Government will be able to blame Hayden for all its troubles.

Mr Young: That makes two of you who will be sorry.

Mr E. T. EVANS: If the Minister for Health thinks this is such a frivolous matter, why was he so worried about the \$2.5 billion wiped off share values in the last few weeks in Stock Exchanges around Australia? Why is the Federal Government spending \$1 million on advertisements in the newspapers containing all the rubbish we have been reading?

Mr Young: We are letting people work things out for themselves.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The Minister for Health does not sound very confident; however, we will all know on Saturday. I understand the Premier thought Claremont would go premiers this year, but of course they did not. They were bundled out in the same way Fraser will be bundled out on Saturday.

The simple facts are that we have had five years of Fraser-ism and six years of conservative rule by this Government. As the member for Karrinyup said, we have had "good, conservative government"—

Mr Blaikie: Hear, hear!

Mr E. T. EVANS: The member for Vasse says, "Hear, hear!" but what has been the result of this "good, conservative government"? Inflation is on the move again.

Mr Hassell: Downwards.

Mr E. T. EVANS: That is an interesting statement from the Chief Secretary; I wonder whether he has the facts to back up his interjection, because everyone else believes inflation is on the way up. Anyway, why should inflation worry us in Western Australia? It was only six years ago that the Premier said inflation could be beaten on a State-by-State basis. Of

course it cannot; if the nation has inflation, the State has inflation.

Interest rates are soaring, so much so that young people no longer can afford to buy their own homes.

Mr MacKinnon: That is not true.

Mr E. T. EVANS: What would the Honorary Minister know about this matter? When was the last time he tried to buy a home? When did he last sit down with his constituents and discuss their housing problems?

Mr MacKinnon: Don't you think I represent the people of my electorate?

Mr E. T. EVANS: Sometimes I wonder.

There is no getting away from the fact that Western Australia has the highest unemployment since the great Depression. It is no good the Premier continually blaming the Whitlam Government for these problems; it is his turn to stand and be counted. He cannot blame forever a Government which was in power six years ago. He and his Canberra counterparts are to blame for our problems.

Mr Blaikie: Fair go; you are being a bit rough now.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The Deputy Premier likes to blame migration from interstate and New Zealand for our unemployment problem.

Mr O'Connor: It is a fact.

Mr E. T. EVANS: In 1970, when I was employed by Hamersley Iron at Dampier, 70 per cent of all Hamersley Iron employees were from interstate or New Zealand.

Mr Blaikie: Your figures should have been higher, Mr Deputy Premier.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The Deputy Premier quoted only recent figures.

Mr O'Connor: I agree with your figures.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The Deputy Premier obviously does not understand what I am saying. Half the work force of the Pilbara came here from interstate and New Zealand between 1968 and 1970, when we had full employment. They were part of the work force then, and are part of the work force now. How can the Deputy Premier now say they are still causing unemployment?

Mr O'Connor: I did not say that.

Mr E. T. EVANS: That is what the Deputy Premier said. Obviously, we did not have full employment then, because some people came from New Zealand and the Eastern States.

Mr O'Connor: You are wrong. What I said was that there were a number of people coming from

interstate and New Zealand and we are cushioning the effect of the problems in the Eastern States. I said that I did not object to those people coming to Western Australia. You are right off the beam again.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The Deputy Premier has blamed unemployment in Western Australia on migration from the Eastern States and New Zealand.

Mr Pearce: He was not the only one to do it.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The same situation applied during the nickel boom. All the companies, including Western Mining, Anaconda, Selcast, Poseidon, and others employed full-time recruiting officers in all the capital cities to attract people to Western Australia.

Mr Blaikie: Why?

Mr E. T. EVANS: It was to recruit people to fill jobs caused by development projects in this State.

Mr O'Connor: You are ruining a good speech now.

Mr E. T. EVANS: What I am telling members opposite is that—

Mr Sodeman: The Deputy Premier is right.

Mr E. T. EVANS: —the Government created development which attracted people to Western Australia, but it did not follow up this development. Where are these people now? They are all unemployed and are hanging around in Perth, because every mining company has a big office in St. George's Terrace. Members opposite must realise that this is the case. Therefore, the Deputy Premier cannot blame interstate migration for our unemployment problems.

Mr Blaikie: Even your own members are becoming concerned at what your saying.

Mr Pearce: We are not at all concerned, because his point is exactly accurate.

Mr Sodeman: I'll bet the member for Swan did not write your speech.

Mr E. T. EVANS: When members opposite read my speech they might understand it.

Mr Young: You mean after you have corrected it! We had better put a lock on *Hansard*.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I should like to ask the Deputy Premier how many people left this State to seek employment in the Eastern States.

Mr Blaikie: Very few.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I directed my question to the Deputy Premier.

Mr O'Connor: You are making the speech; you tell us.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I just wondered. The Deputy Premier seems to know how many came over to Western Australia, but he does not tell us how many people left this State. His is using a one-sided argument.

Mr O'Connor: You are quite wrong again. I know how many people moved to Western Australia and registered as being unemployed, but I do not know how many people left Western Australia during a given period, and neither do you.

Mr H. D. Evans: Tell us the net gain.

Mr Young: I do not think we should get side-tracked. We should let the member for Kalgoorlie make his speech.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I will come to the Minister for Health later.

What will this Budget do to relieve unemployment? In my area and in other country areas, it will have the effect of reducing employment in the Public Works Department by 83 jobs. It took us some three days of questions in this place to ascertain from the Minister whether in fact there would be retrenchments and in the end, he admitted this would be the case. We were informed some retrenchments were expected in Geraldton and in other country centres. Later, we read in the Press that these retrenchments were to be of the order of 83 positions. It is patently stupid for the Government to retrench men at Kalgoorlie. At present we have 854 people unemployed in Kalgoorlie. However, as members are aware, the mines are reopening, the area around Kalgoorlie is booming, and we hope we will see full employment within the next couple of years. The Government will retrench people in the PWD, and then in 12 months' time it will try to attract them back, as it has done in past years. It just does not make sense.

I tried strenuously to ask some questions of the Minister for Mines about the State Batteries. However, I did not find out much.

Mr P. V. Jones: Yes you did.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I wonder whether there will be retrenchments there.

Mr P. V. Jones: You got the questions answered.

Mr E. T. EVANS: "Yes", "No", "Not yet"—I know all about that.

Mr P. V. Jones: The question you asked was answered by our saying there will be major works at five batteries, and upgrading and maintenance at all the batteries.

Mr E. T. EVANS: There will be a works programme at 16 batteries, and the Government has budgeted \$178 000. That will go a long way!

Mr P. V. Jones: Five State Batteries will receive special funding. One of those batteries is in need of a major amount of funding, which is still being costed; so far from giving 16 all the same amount, for one of the batteries—perhaps it might surprise you, or you might be pleased with it—a works programme is being considered now that funding is agreed, and we will concentrate in that way.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The total allocation in the Budget is \$178 000. Perhaps the Minister has something up his sleeve. An amount of \$178 000 will not go far amongst 16 batteries.

Mr Blaikie: It sounds like privileged treatment.

Mr E. T. EVANS: Last year the wages bill was \$203 996. This year it will be \$199 000, so obviously there will be retrenchments in that area, unless the Government is going to cut wages.

Mr Pearce: Give the Minister a chance to deny that there will be retrenchments there.

Mr Blaikie: Who is making this speech?

Mr E. T. EVANS: I ask the Minister will there be retrenchments in the State Batteries?

Mr P. V. Jones: You wait and see in the Committee debate on the Budget. Ask your question then.

Mr Pearce: We know what that means. There is a headline for somebody: "Retrenchments in State Batteries".

Mr E. T. EVANS: "Development" is a word about which we hear a lot in this place. One would think the Premier had invented it. As most people are aware, the Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie is on the brink of a boom. I said we were on the brink of a gold boom; but in addition we have the giant North-West Shelf gas project about which there has been a lot of talk.

Mr Blaikie: That is good government and good Government policies!

Mr Pearce: Only because there was gas under the sea. It does not matter about State Government policies.

Government members interjected.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I have never seen any development in Nedlands and most of the electorates represented by the loud voices on the Government side. Most of the development is taking place in the Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie.

Nearer to home, I am more concerned with the gold boom that is taking place. The Golden Mile

is about to reopen, and gold prices are at record levels.

Mr MacKinnon: Good government!

Mr Pearce: How did the State Government get the price of gold up?

Mr Sodeman: How many shares has the member for Kalgoorlie sold?

Mr E. T. EVANS: I would be happy to place a statement of my pecuniary interests on the Table of the House, if the member for Pilbara would like to do the same.

As I said, there is every indication we are entering our most prosperous period. Every inch of ground has been pegged, and optimism is really high.

Mr Hassell: After six years of Liberal Government!

Mr E. T. EVANS: That has nothing to do with the price of gold. What is the Government doing—

Mr Blaikie: This sounds like the Liberal Party policy speech.

Mr E. T. EVANS: What is this Liberal Government, this development Government, doing to assist development in this area?

Mr Sodeman: We got rid of Gough, for a start.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I am talking about the promise the Fraser Government made to implement a fuel price equalisation scheme.

Mr Watt: They did.

Mr E. T. EVANS: How come we pay 38c a litre in Kalgoorlie, and the price is 31c in Perth? It is 50c in Balladonia, 43c in Norseman, 48c in Leonora—

Mr Watt: Because the equalisation applies to the wholesale price.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The price is 43c at Fortescue River, 40c average in the Kimberley, and 40c average in Pilbara towns. However, the Federal Government promised there would be not 1c difference between country and city prices. I suppose that is true—it is not 1c; it is about 15c.

Mr Watt: They promised 2c a gallon difference between country and city areas.

Mr E. T. EVANS: It was 1c difference, without increasing the price of metropolitan petrol.

Mr Watt: Wholesale prices.

Mr Sodeman: He is talking about retail.

Mr E. T. EVANS: Does the member for Pilbara think I buy my petrol at the wholesale price?

Mr Pearce: It just indicates that is a fraud of a policy, which has built up the expectations of the country people, and the Government never had a chance of meeting it.

Mr Sodeman: It was not misleading.

Mr Pearce: It was.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): Order!

Mr E. T. EVANS: As even members opposite would know, these prices for fuel have affected the prices of all consumer goods. The fuel costs are added to freight costs; and everything we buy in the country is far more expensive than the price city members pay. Every person living in the Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie, which occupies about seven-eighths of this State, is affected by fuel prices. That is part of a deliberate policy of the Federal Government, which is supported by this Government.

One cannot catch a bus to work at Leonora, or catch a train at Meekatharra. I think everyone knows that.

Mr Pearce: You cannot do it in Fremantle these days, either.

Mr E. T. EVANS: Everyone relies on freighting his consumer goods from a major regional centre or the city.

I would like to mention a couple of other promises we have heard. It may be better to call them "indications" because they are not promises when they are broken, are they?

Mr Blaikie: What about telling us about road freight? That is an interesting subject.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I am more interested in my own electorate. The Deputy Premier came to Kalgoorlie on one of his rare visits, with the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs. He promised we would have 17 000 new jobs within the next decade. The people involved in the visit were shown on the front page of the newspaper—the Deputy Premier, three members from the other place, and Mr Viner, with the local Liberal Party members from Kalgoorlie. When I asked a question about the 17 000 jobs in the next 10 years, the Deputy Premier said, "Well, that's got nothing to do with me." He is entitled to his own opinion; but he did not mind being photographed with the Federal Minister, and accepting the big spin-off which was intended to help win the Federal seat of Kalgoorlie with another empty promise similar to the ones made at the last two elections.

Mr Watt: Did you get knocked off the front page?

Mr E. T. EVANS: No. As a matter of fact, I think I am there—but that is by the by.

Mr O'Connor: You are not sure?

Mr Nanovich: Who increased the cost of postage stamps from 5c to 20c?

Mr E. T. EVANS: The member should tell me.

Mr Bertram: Gough Whitlam, I suppose.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The Labor Government increased the price to 13c and the Fraser Government increased it to 20c.

If we are to have an additional 17 000 jobs over the next 10 years, our population in Kalgoorlie will treble. Members opposite might say that this would be magnificent. The Minister for Health is not present, but after I had asked him a number of questions and following a couple of exchanges by mail and in the Press, I have been able to ascertain that there will be no increase in hospital beds at the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital for another four years. Does the Minister mean to say that these 17 000 extra workers and their families will all be healthy and that none will go to hospital over the next 10 years?

I notice that the Minister for Education is present and I point out that the schools in the Kalgoorlie region are inadequate at present in terms of catering for our current population, a fact the Minister would be aware of from approaches made to him. How are we to accommodate the children of the additional 17 000 workers to fill the 17 000 jobs?

Housing in the Kalgoorlie area is in such a state that people are building privately on every single block available, and land is selling for \$8 000 or \$10 000.

Mr Grewar: Incredible.

Mr E. T. EVANS: Incredible, yes, especially for the people making the money.

Mrs Craig: How much does it cost to service these blocks?

Mr E. T. EVANS: Not \$10 000.

Mrs Craig: I think you ought to know.

Mr Pearce: Does the Minister know?

Mr E. T. EVANS: I am merely pointing out the problems faced by people in the Kalgoorlie area. We have seven estate agents of whom none have houses to rent. The caravan parks are full. There is a waiting list of about 100 people applying for SHC accommodation.

Mr McIver: It is the same in Northam.

Mr E. T. EVANS: The SHC will not build one home in Kalgoorlie during this financial year.

Mr Williams: That is a sure sign the State is on the move.

Mr Pearce: Because no-one is building houses? What a ridiculous statement.

Mr E. T. EVANS: Again, I indicate I am pointing out the problems which we will have to face because of the increase in the population. There is absolutely no plan by this Government to cater for the increase in population anywhere in the State, let alone Kalgoorlie.

Mrs Craig: That is not so.

Mr E. T. EVANS: If the Government has something hidden up its sleeve which might assist the people in Kalgoorlie I would very much like to know. As their member of Parliament I have been unable to learn of any plan.

Although the member for Bunbury is not present, I would like to comment on his remark that a Federal Liberal Government assisted Kalgoorlie and made it the great place it is today. He said that a Federal Liberal Government had saved the town. No Government has ever helped Kalgoorlie, so his comment is a lot of rubbish. Kalgoorlie was in deep trouble long before the Whitlam Government ever came to power.

Mr Watt: You have just admitted the Whitlam Government did not help, either.

Mr E. T. EVANS: I am admitting no Government has ever helped Kalgoorlie.

Mr Grayden: What about when they laid the pipeline and built the railway there?

Mr E. T. EVANS: Does the Minister believe that Kalgoorlie assisted the State and that it pulled it out of the Depression in the 1890s? If we waited for those projects to be completed today, we would be waiting a very long time. Kalgoorlie was in trouble long before 1972. The town was in trouble in the days when the Lake View and Star Ltd. and Great Boulder Mines Ltd., which had the two biggest goldmines, requested assistance from the Holt Government in 1967 in an effort to upgrade their plant and to permit development in an endeavour to continue their operations. Those companies received a flat, "No" to their requests and this was the case also with the Gorton and McMahon Liberal Governments. They received no assistance from the Whitlam Government as members opposite have pointed out many times. Whitlam did not assist the industry and neither did Fraser. However, there is one difference: The Fraser Government promised to help the goldmining industry in Kalgoorlie and in fact bought the Federal seat of Kalgoorlie with these promises. I quote from *The West Australian* of 4 December 1975 as follows—

Mr Lynch said here yesterday that a Liberal-National Country Party government

would decide before the end of January the assistance it could give to the ailing goldmining industry.

Further on—

Mr Lynch said that a coalition government would give immediate priority after December 13 to study proposals to assist the industry with the State Government, the companies and local authorities.

And further—

Mr Lynch said that the coalition parties recognised the peculiar difficulties being experienced in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder region.

They acknowledged that it was important for established communities such as Kalgoorlie and Boulder, which had made a great contribution to the nation.

That was prior to the 1975 election. I quote from *The West Australian* of 31 January 1976 as follows—

The Federal Government has dealt the WA goldmining industry a severe blow by rejecting an application by Kalgoorlie Lake View Pty Ltd for financial aid.

This was so because by this time our four companies had been forced to amalgamate into one. We had one company and that was then closed. To continue—

The Premier, Sir Charles Court, described yesterday's decision as a severe setback.

He said he had gained the impression from comments by the Minister for National Resources, Mr Anthony, and the Treasurer, Mr Lynch, before the election that there was more than a 50-50 chance of the aid being approved.

As members can see, a lot of aid was promised. I shall quote now from *The Sunday Times* of 1 February 1976 as follows—

Kalgoorlie's need

... And while on the subject of election promises and part-promises.

Mr Fraser would do well, politically if for no other reason, to take another look at the situation in Kalgoorlie.

Does he really believe Kalgoorlie switched allegiance from Labor to Liberal for any other reason than that the electorate felt a Liberal-NCP Government might help overcome the problems of the area, including those of the gold mining industry?

If he feels the change was the result of a sudden espousing of Liberal-NCP philosophies he is tragically mistaken.



His rejection of Kalgoorlie Lake View's request for financial aid is a clear case of biting the hand that fed him.

Mr Grewar: Is not Kalgoorlie booming now after five years under a Liberal Government?

Mr E. T. EVANS: Why the promises then, and why the promises now? Where are the 17 000 additional jobs? With gold selling at \$600 an ounce, anyone would be doing all right. I could go on and on.

Mr Watt: You are going on and on.

Mr E. T. EVANS: Members have probably had enough.

Mr MacKinnon: Not "probably".

Mr E. T. EVANS: When assistance was refused by the Federal Government and \$6 million was offered of which this company was prepared to put up \$1.5 million, the Federal Government turned it down. It then had to seek assistance from Home Stake, an American company which, for \$8 million, now has half the Golden Mile and half the Mt. Charlotte operation, which has a known life of 12 years and has not yet drilled at any depth.

I ask you, Sir, what you think that would bear as an investment. We are looking at an \$8 million investment in a mine on the Golden Mile which would have possibly a 20-year life span with the price of gold ranging from \$600 an ounce upwards. That is not a bad sort of investment.

Let us contrast this situation with the attitude of the Federal Government to Mount Lyall Copper in Tasmania, where the State Labor Government was able to prevail upon the Fraser Government to assist to the tune of \$5 million. Of course, that was three years ago. It is now making a handsome profit, because all metal prices have increased. Its stocks have risen, it is making a nice profit, and it has paid back its debt. In that case those involved did not have the dislocation caused by retrenchments in all industries which occurred in Kalgoorlie.

Six months later, when the only operating mine left in Kalgoorlie—that is, Mt. Charlotte—was making a very small profit, the Federal Liberal Government decided in its wisdom to withdraw its taxation exemption. It was only after my predecessor, the State member for Kalgoorlie, and the mayor of Kalgoorlie with the Federal member for Kalgoorlie—who obviously could not have his voice heard in his own party—made a visit to Canberra, that the decision was overturned.

If the Federal Government was prepared to tax gold when the Home Stake company and KLV were making approximately \$100 000 a year

profit, what does one think it is likely to do after the election next Saturday? At the moment, every person in the industry believes that if a Federal Liberal Government is returned next Saturday, his taxation exemptions will be removed and there will be a tax on gold.

I believe that, the people of Kalgoorlie believe it, and the people in the industry believe it. The track record of the Government shows that is what will happen.

I do not intend to speak any longer. I should like to thank you, Sir, for displaying patience at this hour.

In conclusion, I should like to point out to members opposite that, after next Saturday, they will have the opportunity to blame someone other than Gough Whitlam for the problems of this country; they will be able to blame Hayden!

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Watt) in the Chair; Sir Charles Court (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

#### **Part 1: Parliament—**

**Vote: Legislative Council, \$170 000—put and passed.**

**Vote: Legislative Assembly, \$260 000—**

**Item No. 1: Salaries, Wages and Allowances, \$134 000—**

Mr DAVIES: I want to speak generally on this item and, more particularly, on the future of Parliament. I seek from the Premier advice as to whether or not he might be contemplating a redistribution of electorates. I have spoken about this on a number of occasions and even in regard to the existing system, as wrong as it might be.

We feel there is a need for the boundaries to be redistributed, because although we do not have the required number of electorates out of kilter in accordance with the Electoral Districts Act, some electorates are so badly out of kilter that something needs to be done about them.

I have mentioned the electorate of Whitford on a number of occasions. I believe the member for Whitford has approximately 27 000 electors in his electorate. My electorate of Victoria Park contains about the average number of electors and has about the same number as it had when the boundaries were last distributed; that is, approximately 16 000.

The number of electors in my electorate may have dropped by a few; but the area has remained

fairly stable. However, if we take, for example, the seat of Gosnells, it can be seen that electorate contains almost 27 000 electors.

Mr Pearce: It is not quite as big as that.

Mr DAVIES: I believe it is not quite that large, but it has over 20 000 electors. It is not right that these members should have so many electors in their areas. Of course, the areas are represented also by members of the Legislative Council, but so are all electorates. I intended to start a debate on the Legislative Council, but I have decided I shall wait until another occasion.

What really concerns me is that there is no justice in the way the boundaries are distributed. I do not want at this stage to become involved in another debate on this matter, because it was discussed in the early part of this session of Parliament. At that time, the Premier gave a firm undertaking that there would be no redistribution.

I believe that decision may have been based on the return of the Chief Electoral Officer, who indicated in his declaration the number of seats which were out of kilter; but because they did not quite meet the number required under the Act, the Premier took it upon himself to say there would not be a redistribution. The Premier is entitled to do that and, from a political point of view, one would expect him to say there would be no redistribution, because the boundaries suit him admirably.

Indeed, although there are some seats now which are "swinging" Liberal seats, there are some which the Opposition would never win if we started now.

Mr B. T. Burke: Not many.

Mr DAVIES: I must agree with the member for Balcatta that the number of seats which are likely to come the way of Labor is increasing.

The Premier is quite happy with the way the boundaries are distributed. If we are going to look at boundaries, of course, we could look at the entire State and the way in which the northern seats are distributed when compared with the seats in the agricultural areas, the goldfields, and the metropolitan area.

I find it less than amusing that one of the seats in the agricultural areas has about 2 000 electors. This compares most unfavourably, even taking its areas into consideration, with some metropolitan electorates, such as those to which I have referred already. Of course, it is high time also something was done in regard to the Pilbara.

If a member in the north has to look after an electorate which is larger than 11 metropolitan seats he has also a much larger area to cover with

more difficult roads to travel. I think communications are fairly reasonable as far as telephones and radio contact are concerned, but a northern electorate is a difficult one to look after.

If there is some justification for keeping one agricultural seat at about 2 000 electors and some Kimberley seats at about 5 000 electors, surely there must be some justification for easing the work load on the Pilbara area which has approximately 15 000 electors.

If what the Premier has indicated will happen does happen, and there is all the economic activity we have been hoping for with regard to the north-west development, then the Pilbara seat will become increasingly difficult to contain because there will be an increase in the population.

Had the Labor Party been elected to government, the Pilbara electorate would have been split. It would have been the simplest way to overcome the problem, but I do not think it would have been the best way. It certainly would have been much fairer to the people who want representation in this Parliament.

I am not querying the activities of the member; it is simply a matter of people wishing to see their member of Parliament occasionally but not being able to do so because of his work load and the distances he must travel.

There are some things which are not very satisfactory with regard to the distribution of electoral boundaries and if we are to obtain value for money—and money is the thing we are talking about now—then in all fairness to the electorate we have to do something about the boundaries.

I am certain there will be pressures on the Premier not to do anything about the boundaries because in this case it is the belief that this is a respectable sort of gerrymander and it will suit some members of the Liberal Party. They are not too concerned about electoral justice. They may like a reasonable kind of gerrymander and that may be something along the lines of their way of thinking. However, I believe the Premier takes a fairer view. We would like to hear from the Premier; he may have something to say in regard to a redistribution.

I apologise to members for not having figures to quote from, but I do not think they are necessary. If we consider the electorates of Whitford, Gosnells, and Pilbara, as well as the electorate of Murchison-Eyre we will realise that there are some distinctions which require attention.

It is no good waiting until just before another election to have a redistribution of boundaries. We want to have the redistribution as soon after an election as possible so that in fairness to all

parties the necessary groundwork can be done before the next election. It is the type of action which should not be taken with some element of surprise.

The Premier likes to give as little notice as possible when there is to be an election. He likes to give as little notice as possible for people to put their names on the roll. He has adopted this stand at the last two elections and that matter is another point for debate.

If we wish to give electors value for the money it is costing to keep members of Parliament here there must be a more even distribution of boundaries.

**Mr B. T. BURKE:** Under the same heading and on the same subject canvassed by the Leader of the Opposition, it seems to me that for some time the argument which is always associated with the opposition to the proposition that there should be one-vote-one-value has centred consistently around the difficulties involved in representing remote areas and the difficulties in servicing electorates which are many thousands of miles from the State capital.

Whilst it is not an ideal system, it seems to me we should be looking at a system whereby people in this place reflect the number of people they represent in their electorate; that is, if the electorate of Whitford has 29 000 electors and the electorate of Balcatta has 18 000 electors then my vote should have a value in proportion to the number of thousands I represent and the member for Whitford should have a vote which represents in value an amount which is proportional to the number of people he represents.

This would allow any Government to maintain a situation whereby remote electorates could be ones with small populations and members representing them could still have the difficulty of that representation catered for. What would happen then would be that within the Parliament there would be a more correct representation in terms of voting strength of the people who are actually represented.

Under that system, I do not see how anyone could persist with the argument that to assign one-vote-one-value throughout the State would cause representation problems which exist at the present time. The electorates could remain as they are now but members when reaching this place could have voting strength according to the number of electors who live within the boundaries of their electorates.

I cannot see any argument against that proposition. There should be one-vote-one-value. If someone lives thousands of miles from the

capital of the State he should not have a vote worth more, simply because he lives so far away. Because he needs to be represented properly, his electorate should be smaller than the electorates in the city. That is well and good from the representation point of view.

Another point about which I have been thinking for some time—and it is no reflection on the present Speaker—is that I cannot see why we do not appoint a judge as the Speaker in this House. It would be a much fairer way of removing the office of Speaker from the political traumas into which it seems to be plunged so often.

I would be interested to know whether or not the Premier has given any thought to the proposition that the office of Speaker be one which is not contested after an election. The Speaker would be apolitical; he would be a member of the judiciary. If that were the case, should the Speaker become senile or have some disability, it would not be difficult for him to be removed by a vote of the House.

It would seem to me that if a judge were appointed as Speaker he would not be subjected to the same sort of criticism as a Speaker who is appointed by political parties.

To recap, all the arguments against one-vote-one-value and representation are catered for if we adopt the system whereby members in this place have voting power in proportion to the numbers in their electorate, and I think it would be a good idea if the Government gave some thought to the proposition that a judge or a member of the judiciary be appointed Speaker of the House.

**Sir CHARLES COURT:** Mr Chairman—

**The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt):** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I point out that the division under debate deals with the Legislative Assembly and item 1 deals with the wages of the staff of the Legislative Assembly. It does not cover members' salaries which are dealt with under special Acts.

**Mr B. T. Burke:** I thought the Speaker's salary was mentioned.

**The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No. Before item 1 the salaries of the Speaker, Chairman of Committees, and members are referred to and at the foot of the page it states that they are provided for under special Acts. They are provided for under the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal Act 1975. I did allow speakers on this matter because I wanted to hear what had to be said before I made a decision.

As we have had two speakers on the subject we ought to continue now to the strict presentation as

read out in the division under part 1. I call on the Premier.

Sir CHARLES COURT: By way of brief responsel say that, you, Mr Deputy Chairman (Mr Watt) have clarified the position for me. There was no item I could speak to because no item was spoken to by the Opposition. By way of brief comment I will mention the last matter raised; that is, the question of a judge being in charge of the House.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Chairman, you will appreciate, perhaps, that some of us have had very little warning that we were to go on with parts this evening.

Sir Charles Court: We are not going very far.

Mr Davies: You said you would adjourn before this stage.

Mr PEARCE: It seems we have slipped through part 1 already. The Premier is fairly shrewd.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr PEARCE: Exactly which section is the Premier cutting off by responding? I sought the call.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier is not cutting off the debate. Under Standing Orders members are entitled to speak three times; the first period for 15 minutes, and on two subsequent occasions each of 10 minutes.

Mr PEARCE: Why did you call on the Premier?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Premier also sought the call.

Mr PEARCE: You gave the Premier the call while he was still sitting in his seat. As long as he is not cutting off debate I will not continue with my point of order.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I asked the Premier to sit down while I made an explanation, and when I had finished my explanation I made the call. That is the reason.

#### *Committee Resumed*

Sir CHARLES COURT: No item was mentioned so I was at the stage where I was wondering how I would respond. In view of your tolerance, Mr Deputy Chairman, I will respond briefly to the question of a judge being the Speaker. Personally, I think it would not be a very wise move because, from time to time, the judge would have to be changed. Judges are required to retire under the 70-year age limit. A judge could want to retire early, and then there would be the

suggestion that the Government selected somebody to suit its own cause rather than the cause of somebody else.

If the position of Speaker, and the position he represents, were under discussion, and the Speaker was still to be a member of Parliament, I could see some merit in canvassing the view put forward.

To step outside of Parliament and bring in the judiciary, I think, would be unfair to the person concerned. Parliament is a political machine, and—no matter how good the idea would be in theory—to expose an outside person to that situation could be intolerable.

The relationship between the Speaker and members generally, is something to be dealt with within the machinery of Parliament. It could be subject to discussions between the parties themselves in order that we might arrive at some understanding if the proposal were thought desirable. Having looked at this matter for a long time, I am of the opinion the present system is better. The Speakership is under the control of Parliament and I cannot get excited about any change. Whoever holds the position will be subject to a certain amount of pressure from time to time because of the very nature of the position and because of the very nature of this institution.

Dealing with the second point raised by the Leader of the Opposition—the question of a redistribution—it is true that when the matter was raised by way of a specific question I said the Government had no intention, at that time, of setting in motion a redistribution. The simple answer was that under the legislation, as I understand it, there was no call for a redistribution. However, the matter has been raised not only by the Leader of the Opposition, but also by a number of other people, and I have asked the Chief Secretary to look at the position with me to see whether the time has come to alter the position, quite apart from the Statute which lays down the formula under which a redistribution is automatic.

To the best of my memory, most redistributions have taken place following a study of the numbers in each electorate after elections. We have got to the point where the Statute will apply very soon. When Governments attempt to introduce Bills to change the constitution of this House, in terms of boundaries, the Opposition usually is suspicious regardless of which party is in Opposition. That is one reason I have been very reluctant to suggest we might anticipate a redistribution under the formula and on a basis which would clearly set out what revised provision would operate.

However, it does appear that the formula in its strict interpretation could apply soon. For that reason, I propose to discuss the matter with the Chief Secretary in the light of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition and one or two members of this Chamber regarding the situation and the number of seats. I do not think I can comment beyond that at this stage.

In answer to the Leader of the Opposition, I thought I indicated that no serious points would be discussed this evening and in any case we would not go past the miscellaneous section.

Mr H. D. Evans: There was an understanding before that.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The understanding was not with me.

Mr H. D. Evans: Who have you put in charge of the House? Make up your mind.

Sir CHARLES COURT: No-one consulted me about the urgency motion moved today.

Mr Davies: Yes, I sent it back with your deputy half an hour before we sat.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I do not want to get involved in a trivial argument.

Mr H. D. Evans: No, because you are wrong again.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Deputy Premier was handed something about 4.15 p.m.

Mr Davies: Exactly—when he came out of the party meeting.

Sir CHARLES COURT: The Leader of the Opposition had an arrangement, I believe, to have the notice paper changed in a different way altogether. He has not mentioned that. He agreed that item 11 would be dealt with as soon as the four third readings were out of the way.

Mr Davies: The matter I raised was one of urgency.

Sir CHARLES COURT: If there were no basic matters of urgency we were to go on.

Mr H. D. Evans: That was not the understanding. You have somebody running the House. Why not let him run it?

Sir CHARLES COURT: My deputy does all the detailed work, and he is doing it very well. There is nothing to get excited about. I said across the floor of the Chamber that if there were no problems we would go on to "Miscellaneous".

Mr H. D. Evans: If you want goodwill, you are going about it the wrong way.

Mr Davies: I was prepared to go on, and I thought that was the understanding. But, I subsequently learnt it was not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: It was my understanding that as soon as we reached "Miscellaneous" we would report progress because that item is usually a paradise for back-benchers. That was the understanding both by my deputy and by myself. We were not to go past "Miscellaneous".

Mr H. D. Evans: It was not our understanding.

Mr Davies: You were to adjourn.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I want to answer the point in order to clean up this particular division. After dealing with the divisions, we will deal only with items.

Mr B. T. Burke: What about the point I raised regarding the voting strength of members in one electorate compared with that of members in another electorate?

Sir CHARLES COURT: That is another matter altogether. The question of the Labor Party wanting the one-vote-one-value system—or whatever it wants—for Parliament does not apply in its own internal workings.

Mr Davies: That is not so.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have made our position clear from time to time. We believe the rural vote is entitled to a different loading from that which applies to the metropolitan area.

Mr B. T. Burke: For what reason?

Sir CHARLES COURT: For the same reasons we have given previously, and the same reasons debated by Labor Governments in the past.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr DAVIES: I seek your ruling, Mr Deputy Chairman on the form of debate. I understand you called part 1, Parliament. Usually there is a general discussion on Parliament, and then we go into the various divisions. Is that correct?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): That is correct. It would have been more appropriate for the question of electoral reform, perhaps, to be discussed under the part.

Mr DAVIES: Actually, what are we discussing?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are discussing division 3, item 1, "Salaries, Wages and Allowances".

Mr DAVIES: That is right. I brought up the matter dealing with the redistribution of boundaries.

Sir Charles Court: We will report progress on division 3.

Mr DAVIES: That brings us up to date; why not report progress now?

Mr Pearce: We could go back to the debate on "Parliament", which we slipped over very quickly.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Watt): I suggest it might be more appropriate for debate on electoral redistribution to take place under the Electoral Office section. Perhaps that might solve the problem.

Mr PEARCE: Mr Deputy Chairman, I seek your guidance on where we stand in regard to this. I am not suggesting that the part is not now open for debate, but I intend to rise to speak to the parliamentary section, except that my leader got the call ahead of me and sought to discuss the question under the expenditure.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not right. When the Leader of the Opposition got the call we had already passed the vote for division 2; so clearly the honourable member did not attempt to rise to debate the part. I think it is appropriate that I suggest now that members plan carefully so that they know precisely to which items they wish to speak, and that they state each time they rise to get the call to which item they wish to speak.

#### *Progress*

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr Sodeman.

*House adjourned at 11.02 p.m.*

# QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

### Staff

1041. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) (a) On what date was the section, generally referred to as the Office of Regional Administration and the North West, transferred from the Department of Industrial Development to the Premier's Department;
- (b) immediately prior to this transfer, how many staff were employed in the section;
- (c) on the date of transfer to the Premier's Department, how many Office of Regional Administration and the North West staff were transferred from the Department of Industrial Development to the Premier's Department?
- (2) (a) Immediately prior to the transfer of the Office of Regional Administration and the North West to the Premier's Department, how many staff were there in the Premier's Department;
- (b) how many staff are there presently in the Premier's Department;
- (c) how many of the present staff are employed in positions associated with the Office of Regional Administration and the North West;
- (d) of the remaining staff in the Premier's Department, in what basic sections are they employed and how many in each of these sections;
- (e) what is the present staff ceiling level set for the Premier's Department, and when was this established?
- (3) How many salaried staff are employed in the following categories that are additional to (2) (b) at the present time—
  - (a) the Premier's Press staff/information officers;
  - (b) the Premier's personal staff?
- (4) (a) How many staff were employed in the Treasury Department as at January 1974 and June 1974;

- (b) how many staff are presently employed in the Treasury Department;
- (c) what is the present staff ceiling level set for the Treasury Department, and when was this established?
- (5) (a) In regard to the article in *The West Australian* of 4 October 1980 concerning State Public Service staffing, how many "graduate assistants, trainee graduate assistants and data processors" and any other staff were recorded on the Public Service Board roll for "administrative convenience";
- (b) how many staff were similarly recorded on the Public Service Board roll for "administrative convenience" in 1974;
- (c) how many staff were employed to service the Public Service Board in 1974;
- (d) how many staff are presently employed to directly service the Public Service Board?
- (6) (a) Apart from the Office of Regional Development and the North West, what other sections now incorporated into the Premier's Department, were parts of other departments in 1974;
- (b) what staff were employed in these sections in 1974, and what staff now serve in these sections within the Premier's Department?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) (a) 1 September 1975;
- (b) 9;
- (c) 9.
- (2) (a) 39;
- (b) 126—including those not related to the day-to-day operations of the Premier's Department;
- (c) 43;
- (d) Administration (12)  
Protocol (4)  
Accounts (5)  
Correspondence and records (7)  
Typists (14)  
Special services (5)  
Government House (1)  
Information Centre (4)  
State Emergency Service (20)  
Rural and Allied Industries Council (1)  
Rate of imprisonment inquiry (2)

Private Secretary to the Ministers  
in the Legislative Council (1)  
Deputy Premier's Office (6)  
Tokyo Office (1);

- (e) departments have an approved establishment rather than a staff ceiling, having regard for overall Government policies and initiatives and the availability of funds to implement same.  
For the Premier's Department — including those not related to the day-to-day operations of the Premier's Department — the approved establishment as at 30 June 1980: 114.
- (3) (a) 4;  
(b) Nil.
- (4) (a) 190 and 208;  
(b) 252;  
(c) departments have an approved establishment rather than a staff ceiling, having regard for overall government policies and initiatives and the availability of funds to implement same. For the Treasury Department approved establishment as at 30 April 1980 — 289.
- (5) (a) 75;  
(b) 49;  
(c) 101;  
(d) 135.
- (6) (a) Staff of Deputy Premier; Official Secretary, Government House; and Tokyo Office;  
(b) 4.

### MINING

#### *South Coast National Park*

1058. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

Of the—

- (a) 108 applications for coalmining leases; and
- (b) three applications for mineral claims,

received for areas within the proposed south coast national park, how many have been granted?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (a) and (b) None.

### LAND: NATIONAL PARK

#### *South Coast: Areas Dedicated*

1059. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Adverting to question 202 of 1980 relevant to the south coast national park, has any decision been taken to declare any areas of the proposed south coast national park as national park?
- (2) If "Yes"—
  - (a) what areas have been, or will be declared;
  - (b) when will they be declared?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) It is hoped that a significant portion of the proposed park can be declared before Christmas.

1060. *This question was postponed.*

### EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

#### *Manjimup*

1061. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Education:

Will finance for the construction of a gymnasium building at the Manjimup Senior High School be available in the 1980-81 financial year and, if so, how much?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

As yet there has not been any definite advice from the Shire of Manjimup as to whether that authority is willing to participate in such a project at the Manjimup Senior High School.

### SEWERAGE

#### *Manjimup*

1062. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) For what specific purposes will the \$380 000 which it is proposed to spend on sewerage works at Manjimup be used and which are the precise areas in which such work will be carried out?
- (2) What is the estimated cost to individual householders in connecting to the sewerage scheme?



Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) The \$380 000 is proposed to be spent in constructing reticulation sewers and associated works to serve area 2B, generally bounded by Somerville, Leman, Brockman, Rose and Lock Streets, and approximately half of area 4 which is generally bounded by Johnson, Collier, Moore, Leman, Highfield, Maxwell, Kelly, Rutherford and Finch Streets.

It should be noted that the \$380 000 largely consists of local authority borrowings and the work cannot be commenced until the funds become available.

- (2) Up to \$1 200, depending on site details and the standard of the existing plumbing.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

### *Metallic Silicon Plant*

1063. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) In regard to the planned metallic silicon production at Wundowie, what is the estimated annual requirement of wood for charcoal?
- (2) If the plans go ahead, what will the total wood requirement be to produce charcoal for consumption at Wundowie?
- (3) From where is this wood to be obtained?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Silicon metal production could be expected to consume about four to five tonnes of firewood per tonne of silicon metal.
- (2) If plans for a silicon metal plant were to proceed, and if a silicon metal plant was located at Wundowie, and if the current pig iron operation is maintained at Wundowie, then total firewood requirements at Wundowie could be expected to be about 200 kilotonnes per annum, depending on the production level of silicon metal actually achieved.
- (3) From selected areas of State forests.

## LAND RESERVES

### *Removal of Sand*

1064. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Further to questions on notice 395 and 396 of 1980 relevant to sand removal from reserves—

(a) in regard to part (7) of question 395, did not a similar instance of sand removal from a coastal reserve occur in the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River at Prevelly about two years ago, and if so, what was the eventual outcome;

(b) are there also limestone or lime sand quarries on reserve 17495, vested in the Manjimup Shire Council for camping and recreation?

- (2) Under what circumstances is it permissible for a board of management under the Parks and Reserves Act to allow quarrying on a reserve under its control, when such activity is inconsistent with the purpose of that reserve?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) Yes. The Shire of Augusta-Margaret River is undertaking rehabilitation work on the reserve in accordance with recommendations by the Commissioner of Soil Conservation and the Department of Conservation and Environment.

(b) The department is not aware of any current quarrying activity on Reserve 17495 which is vested in the Shire of Manjimup as a board of management.

- (2) A board of management must control or manage a reserve under its control as a park or reserve. It is open for a board to decide, in the management of a park or reserve, to grant licences under its express powers contained in section 5 (1)(f) of the Parks and Reserves Act 1895, in return for charges levied against the licensee. Generally, such a decision would be justifiable where the grant of such a licence would not result in undue harm to the relevant park or reserve and where the revenue to be produced for the betterment of the park or reserve warranted permitting the activity.

1065. *This question was postponed.*

## EDUCATION: PRE-PRIMARY CENTRE

### Swan View

1066. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Education:

Further to question 970 of 1980 would he be able to advise me as to when it is intended to relocate the Swan View pre-primary centre?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The Public Works Department team is expected at the school on Monday, 27 October, to commence work on moving three demountable rooms from the site. Relocation of the pre-primary centre on the vacated area will follow immediately.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

### ILDA: Jervoise Bay

1067. Mr TAYLOR, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce:

With respect to those lots on the foreshore of Jervoise Bay, controlled by the Industrial Lands Development Authority and leased to private companies for shipbuilding—

- (a) to whom is each lot leased;
- (b) which lots are presently unoccupied by the lessees;
- (c) which other lots are presently substantially underutilised by the lessees themselves;
- (d) have any lessees been advised of penalties or punitive action because of lack of or underutilisation of their lots;
- (e) If "Yes" to (d), which lessees?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (a) Leases for the five sites are currently being renegotiated with—

Australian Shipbuilding Industries (WA) Pty. Ltd.  
M. G. Kailis Gulf Fisheries Pty. Ltd.  
E.M.S. Holdings Pty. Ltd.  
James McLarty & Son Pty. Ltd.  
Jervoise Bay Investments Pty. Limited.

- (b) and (c) At present only the two first-named companies substantially occupy their sites. Development of the other sites has been hampered by legal problems affecting tenure, but these have now been satisfactorily overcome. Negotiations are proceeding with the lessees for the staged development of the sites.

(d) Not applicable.

(e) Not applicable.

## MINING

### South Coast National Park

1068. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Have any constraints and requirements with regard to the environment been placed on the mining reserves in the area of the proposed south coast national park held by—

- (a) Swan Resources Ltd. and Eagle Corporation (T.R. 7325H and T.R. 7326H); and
- (b) Dampier Mining Company Ltd. (7425H, 7669H, 7670H, 7676H, 7677H, 7678H and 7845H)?

- (2) If "Yes"—

- (a) what are the environmental requirements which have been imposed;
- (b) who is responsible for ensuring that these requirements are being carried out;
- (c) how many inspections of operations of these areas have been made of each of these areas and what were the dates of such inspections;
- (d) what actions were carried out following these inspections?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) Yes.

- (2) (a) A condition of the right of occupancy is that the occupant shall comply with any requirements in connection with the protection of the environment arising out of or incidental to the occupant's operations on the reserves that may be made by the State pursuant to any Act from time to time in force;
- (b) the holder of the right of occupancy;

- (c) and (d) inspections are not carried out on temporary reserves, as they are only granted over Crown land for exploration purposes.

## MINING

### *Gold: Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited*

1069. Mr E. T. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Does he hold responsibility for the Act that allows Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited and Hampton Trust Limited to own by freehold title the land and the minerals on it covering an area in total of approximately 83 800 hectares in the eastern goldfields?
- (2) If "No", who does hold responsibility for this Act?
- (3) How does a bona fide gold prospector go about pegging for gold on this land?
- (4) What were the terms of purchase of the Kambalda nickel leases by Western Mining Corporation from Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited?
- (5) (a) Did Western Mining Corporation inherit the same freehold rights as the vendor company;  
(b) if so, under what Act was this made possible?
- (6) (a) Does Western Mining Corporation pay royalties to the State Government;  
(b) if "Yes", under what Act is this payment made?
- (7) Does Western Mining Corporation pay royalties to Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited?
- (8) What were the total royalties paid by Western Mining Corporation since commencement of production of nickel at Kambalda?

Mr P. V. JONES replied

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) By agreement with the owners of the land.
- (4) Not known.
- (5) (a) Not known;  
(b) answered by (a).
- (6) (a) Not in relation to this land;  
(b) answered by (a).
- (7) Not known.
- (8) \$10 478 585.

## HOUSING

### *Kalgoorlie*

1070. Mr E. T. EVANS, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

What is the waiting list for—

- (a) two-bedroomed State Housing Commission homes;
- (b) three-bedroomed State Housing Commission homes,

in Kalgoorlie?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

The waiting lists for State Housing Commission rental housing in Kalgoorlie—including Boulder—are—

	Common-wealth State Agreement	Aboriginal Housing
Two-bedroomed		
(a) type.....	52	16
Three-bedroomed		
(b) type.....	27	23

## MINING

### *State Batteries*

1071. Mr E. T. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

Further to question 696 of 1980 regarding upgrading of State Batteries, now that the funds have been allocated in the Budget can he inform the Parliament which batteries will be upgraded, and how much will be spent on each?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The programme is still being finalised, but it is anticipated that up to five State Batteries will receive special funding for upgrading and maintenance, in addition to general maintenance work to be carried out on all State Batteries.

## HOSPITAL

### *Kalgoorlie Regional*

1072. Mr E. T. EVANS, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Could he give me the break-up of planned ward beds in the Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital, that is, how many beds are in maternity, surgical, general, etc.?

- (2) What is the breakup of the verandah beds?  
 (3) What was the average bed occupancy for the month of September 1980?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Planned beds total 180, made up as follows—

Maternity .....	14
Paediatric unit.....	40
Intensive care and coronary care unit.....	7
Long-term care.....	20
Surgical .....	26
General acute .....	73
	—
	180

- (2) Permanently enclosed verandah Sun-room beds

Intensive care/coronary care unit.....	2
Surgical ward .....	7
General acute .....	4
Long-term care.....	7
	—
TOTAL .....	20

- (3) 169.5.

1073. *This question was postponed.*

## RURAL AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES COUNCIL

### *Cattle-selling Facilities*

1074. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many submissions have been received by the Rural and Allied Industries Council regarding the establishment of cattle-selling facilities in country areas of Western Australia?  
 (2) From what local government authorities and organisations were these submissions received?  
 (3) When will the receipt of submissions close?  
 (4) When is it expected that the report and recommendations of the Rural and Allied Industries Council will be completed?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Twenty-two detailed submissions have been received by the RAIC regarding the livestock saleyard location study.

- (2) The following organisations and individuals forwarded submissions—

Three Regional Development Committees—Central South, Great Southern and Eastern Goldfields Esperance;

10 shire councils—Plantagenet, Northam, Gingin, Manjimup, Harvey, Albany, Moora, Narrogin, Katanning, and Dandaragan;

two Farmers' Union branches—Perillup-Rocky Gully and Torbay-Young;

the Pastoralists and Graziers Association;

the Town of Albany;

Albany Shire Ratepayers Association;

Albany Executive Development Committee;

Albany Chamber of Commerce; and

two members of Parliament—Hon. T. Knight, MLC, and Mr L. Watt, MLA.

- (3) The date for the receipt of submissions was 31 August 1980, but late submissions could be forwarded up to 31 October 1980.

- (4) A draft report for public comment is due to be completed next month.

## EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

### *Tool and Die Makers*

1075. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Does the statement contained in the publication *Employment Prospects by Occupation* put out by the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs that "The demand for tool and die makers is generally stronger than for other metal trades" and that there is likely to be a worsening of the present labour shortages of tradesmen in the next three to four years, reflect the situation for this trade in Western Australia?

- (2) Is it a fact that the only training programme available in Western Australia for those wishing to take up this trade at Wembley Technical College has been discontinued?
- (3) (a) If "No" to (2), what training programme currently exists for those wishing to take up this trade;
- (b) where is it conducted;
- (c) what form does it take; and
- (d) how many people are presently involved in the programme?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) There is no formal apprenticeship to the trade of tool and die making in the metal trades in Western Australia. Tradesmen fitters and machinists are reclassified and perform the duties. Some fitting and machining apprentices do receive on-the-job training in workshops where the trade is practised. Present indications are that, in common with other metal trades, a shortage could occur in the future.
- (2) and (3) It is understood that an evening class as a post-apprenticeship course is offered by the Technical Education Division if sufficient applicants are available. Further details could be obtained from the Technical Education Division.

#### TRANSPORT: BUSES

##### *Morley Depot*

1076. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What action has been taken to promote discussions between the Metropolitan Transport Trust and the Shire of Bayswater to overcome problems being experienced by residents living adjacent to the Morley bus depot, following the tabling by him of an order exempting the trust from the provisions of the Noise Abatement Act?
- (2) If no such action has yet been taken, when can it be expected?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Discussions have been held between the Department of Health and Medical Services noise abatement branch and the Metropolitan Transport Trust. A copy of the report together with recommendations prepared by the noise abatement branch were provided for the Metropolitan Transport Trust. No discussions have been held with the Shire of Bayswater to date.
- (2) A combined meeting with the Metropolitan Transport Trust, Shire of Bayswater, and officers of the noise abatement branch will be arranged as soon as possible.

#### HOUSING

##### *Pensioners: New Units*

1077. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many of the 320 new dwellings to be constructed in the State Housing Commission's building programme for the current financial year are to be pensioner units?
- (2) In which localities are these pensioner units to be constructed?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) 207.
- (2) Metropolitan 160, and country townships, 47.

#### HOUSING: SHC

##### *Land: Availability*

1078. Mr WILSON, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many serviced blocks for private purchasers are to be made available this year within the context of the land acquisition and development programme of the State Housing Commission, referred to in the Premier's Loan Estimates speech?
- (2) In which localities will these blocks be made available and how many will be made available in each locality?
- (3) How many serviced blocks will be made available for the commission's own use?
- (4) In which localities will these blocks be made available, and how many will be made available in each locality?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) to (4) The funds provided in the commission's 1980-81 budget for land acquisition and development will be utilised to complete works commenced in 1979-80, to provide land towards the 1980-81 sales and construction programme and to provide for a satisfactory level of land stocks to meet future demands.

During 1980-81 it is anticipated that 869 serviced lots will be acquired or produced.

It is proposed to offer for sale in the order of 650 lots throughout the State, but this will depend upon the Government's co-ordinated approach to land release.

95 lots, either from stock, acquisition or development will be utilised for the 1980-81 construction programme.

### INFLATION

#### *Household Goods*

1079. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is it not a fact that many goods required for daily household and personal use in Western Australia have increased in price by as much as 30 per cent since July 1979?
- (2) What has the Government done to correct this inflation of prices?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) There was an increase of 9.7 per cent over 12 months, being the difference in the Consumer Price Index between the figure struck at the end of June 1979 compared with the figure struck at the end of June 1980.
- (2) The increase in the Consumer Price Index for Perth in the period being discussed was lower than any other capital city.

### RECREATION

#### *Football: Sunday*

1080. Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Now that the Government permits test and other cricket matches and other-large scale public entertainments to be played on Sundays, when does he intend to permit league football to be played on that day?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

Under the provisions of the Sunday Entertainments Act, by notice published in the *Government Gazette* of 1 February 1980, permission is not required to conduct sporting events including football matches on Sundays between the hours of 9.00 a.m. and 10.00 p.m.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

#### *Environmental Protection Act: Amendment*

287. Mr BARNETT, to the Premier:

I did give some notice of my question last week, but circumstances have been such that I have not been able to ask it until now. However, is it the Government's intention in this session of Parliament to legislate to alter the structure of the Environmental Protection Authority?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The member did give me notice of this question, but I was absent when questions without notice were taken at the time; I had left the answer with my deputy. If I remember correctly, it was to the effect that all legislation, and not only this particular legislation, is under consideration from time to time; this legislation is no exception. I could not make any statement or commitment at this stage as to whether or not any amendments will be introduced in this session.

## STATE FINANCE

### *Commonwealth Tax-sharing Arrangements*

288. Mr WILSON, to the Premier:

- (1) Can he confirm that the State Premiers, including himself, requested that the Prime Minister give a firm commitment on the future of tax-sharing arrangements with the States, prior to the Federal election?
- (2) If "Yes" to (1), can he say what response there has been to this request?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The State Premiers' meetings in August and September—the first in Melbourne and the second in Adelaide—resolved that certain approaches should be made to the Commonwealth Government, one of which was in connection with the guarantee necessary under the tax-sharing arrangement. We agreed on what would be submitted by way of a case, and the host Premier at the second meeting, if I remember correctly, was requested to advise the Prime Minister accordingly. There has been no question of a meeting before 18 October because this has proved to be physically impractical. It is my understanding that the case for a more detailed consideration of the matter has been completed by the officers involved; but at this stage there is no intention of having a meeting before 18 October. This could not be expected for obvious physical reasons.

Mr Harman: It is a sham by Liberal Premiers.

Sir CHARLES COURT: Labor Premiers also were involved.

## MINING

### *South Coast National Park*

289. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

My question arises from part of an answer given to my question on notice 1068 which asked as follows—

- (1) Have any constraints and requirements with regard to the environment been placed on the mining reserves in the area of the proposed south coast national park . . . .

The Minister replied, "Yes", and in further elaboration of what those constraints were to be, he said—

A condition of the right of occupancy is that the occupant shall comply with any requirements in connection with the protection of the environment arising out of or incidental to the occupant's operations on the reserves that may be made by the State pursuant to any Act from time to time in force.

When it is stated that the responsibility of ensuring those constraints rests with the holder of the right of occupancy and, as this is a temporary reserve, there is no inspection carried out to ascertain whether or not those constraints are fulfilled, does the Minister consider that infringements on the environment do not occur during the exploration period by a miner or a company, and why is there no supervision carried out in those specific cases?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

First of all, my reply in fact stated, "may be made from time to time pursuant to any Act in force". We are not providing an inspector for every single temporary reserve. We are requiring the holder to adhere to certain requirements and conditions set out for any permit or tenement to cover the conditions governing occupancy of reserves.

If a mines inspector can establish that a holder of the occupancy has not adhered to the requirements, that person will have some difficulty in continuing to enjoy both the entitlements which he has been given and the ability to get any more.

If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would like more precise details about the area in question and the companies referred to, I will be happy to supply him with that information.

## MINING

*Gold: Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited*

290. Mr E. T. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

I refer the Minister to my question 1069 directed to him today. Part (1) of my question asked—

- (1) Does he hold responsibility for the Act that allows Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited and Hampton Trust Limited to own by freehold title the land and the minerals on it covering an area in total of approximately 83 800 hectares in the eastern goldfields?

The Minister's reply was, "Yes". I also asked—

- (4) What were the terms of purchase of the Kambalda nickel leases by Western Mining Corporation from Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited?

The Minister replied, "Not known". If the Minister is responsible for the Act, why does he not know the terms of the purchase referred to?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The matter of commercial transactions are confidential between the parties concerned. The Act provides for certain regulatory procedures and statutory obligations so far as the Minister for Mines is concerned as to whether or not he shall agree to the transfer of titles. However, the consideration of the aspects of the agreement asked by the member relates to purely commercial transactions which are no business of the Government.

## FUEL AND ENERGY: STATE ENERGY COMMISSION

*Two-way Radios*

291. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is he aware that the frequency of certain SEC two-way radios was converted or changed during the weekend in the Geraldton area?
- (2) Is he aware the task was subcontracted by a person whose name I have already given to the Minister?

- (3) Is he also aware that this subcontract work was performed by off-duty Telecom employees who used Telecom equipment for at least part of the process?

- (4) Is it his department's policy to direct work from SEC employees to subcontractors in these situations?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (4) This question was phoned to my office this afternoon, I assume. I was certainly made aware of it about 4.15 p.m. I asked that the information be researched. As soon as I have the information I will answer the question, but I do not have it to hand.

## MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

*Chiropractic Colleges: Inspection*

292. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

The Minister stated recently that a party of Government members had inspected the International College of Chiropractic, Preston, Victoria, and the Sydney College of Chiropractic, Sydney, New South Wales. Will the Minister advise me who the members were who visited the Sydney college and the date on which the visit occurred?

Mr YOUNG replied:

I am sorry if I did in fact say to the member for Melville by way of a rather lengthy interjection that certain members of this Parliament visited the Sydney College of Chiropractic. If I did indeed say that at the time I interjected on him, I was incorrect in doing so.

I understand from my colleagues who were members of the parliamentary committee which visited the college in the Eastern States, that they visited the Preston college.

The members who visited that college were: the Hon. Tom Knight, the Hon. Neil Oliver, and the member for Bunbury (Mr John Sibson). However, I understand they did not visit the Sydney college.



## MINING

### *Gold: Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited*

293. Mr E. T. EVANS, to the Minister for Mines:

I should like to follow up the previous question I asked the Minister. It is possible he misunderstood me. I was not interested in the commercial terms but rather I was trying to ascertain from the Minister whether he controls the Act which has responsibility for the ground which Western Mining Corporation Ltd. now owns. I should like to know also whether that company owns the land under the same terms as Hampton Gold Mining Areas Limited held it previously. If the Minister does not know, I should like to know to whom I can direct my question.

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

I am not aware of the purport of the question. However, I can say the situation in regard to Hampton Areas Pty. Ltd. has been the subject of several questions and, as the member would be aware, it is a pre-1899 title.

Mr Harman: You know the answer.

Mr P. V. JONES: I would be only too happy to obtain precise information, as far as is known, on matters other than the commercial transactions and provide it to the member tomorrow.

I may have misunderstood the question as far as responsibility is concerned. However, I will certainly ascertain the situation of Western Mining Corporation Ltd. and provide the information to the member tomorrow.

## EDUCATION

### *Royal Show Holiday*

294. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

Has the Government yet made a decision on the future of the Royal Show

day holiday for schools and, if not, when is such a decision expected?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The matter is under consideration at the present time.

## HEALTH

### *Drug: Atrium*

295. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Health:

Could the Minister inform the House whether Atrium tablets which are available free of charge at the present time to patients with cholesterol problems are to be taken off the "free" list? I should like to know also how many other drugs are to be taken off the "free" list at the same time.

Mr YOUNG replied:

It is clear that, to answer this question, would require some notice. However, I should like to point out the question should properly be directed to the Federal Minister for Health.

## STATE FINANCE

### *Commonwealth Tax-sharing Arrangements*

296. Mr WILSON, to the Premier:

Has the Premier any grounds to believe that if Mr Fraser wins the Federal election, he will insist on the States accepting stage 2 of the new federalism proposals, as a basis of a new tax-sharing arrangement?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I am glad the member shares my confidence that Mr Fraser will be re-elected on Saturday.

Mr Wilson: I said, "if".

Sir CHARLES COURT: The answer to the question is, "No".