

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 18th October, 1979

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

## BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. **Esperance Port Authority Lands Bill.**  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.
2. **Perth Theatre Trust Bill.**  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr P. V. Jones (Minister for Cultural Affairs), and read a first time.
3. **Health Act Amendment Bill.**  
Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Young (Minister for Health), and read a first time.

## INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Report

Report of Committee adopted.

### Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Labour and Industry) [2.21 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

**MR TONKIN** (Morley) [2.22 p.m.]: The Opposition does not want to reiterate matters raised in the debate last night. However, an Opposition can be caught in a dilemma when parts of a Bill are most acceptable to it, while other parts are wholly unacceptable. It is almost a matter of flipping a coin to determine whether the Bill should be supported or opposed at the second reading.

To ensure that the record is straight, and because the Minister for Labour and Industry last night seemed to be in some confusion in respect of our attitude, I would like to emphasise that the Opposition welcomes those parts of the Bill which provide to fire brigade officers, prison officers, and police officers access to the Industrial Commission, and which provide jurisdiction over them by the commission.

However, the Opposition cannot understand why the same courtesy and coverage should not

be granted to the academic staff of tertiary education institutions of Western Australia; unless it is that the Government has a quaint 19th century notion of snobbery and suggests that perhaps they are not workers or employees. Nor can the Opposition accept the exclusion from the jurisdiction of the commission of people who work at Parliament House and in the Governor's Establishment.

We reject the 19th century notion put forward by interjection by the member for Cottesloe that it is perfectly acceptable for the employer to arbitrate in a dispute between the employer and the employee. That very notion in itself is laughable and shows how out of date are those 19th century men opposite.

So we indicate that we will not divide on the third reading. We have indicated in Committee our attitude to the various parts of the Bill. We adhere to the views we expressed last night. We do not believe that the people who are being excluded from the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission should be so excluded.

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Labour and Industry) [2.24 p.m.]: I want to reiterate that the Government is well aware of all aspects of the Bill. I doubt very much that members opposite are aware of them.

**Mr Bryce**: That is nasty.

**Mr Pearce**: It is sheer nonsense. Weren't you here last night when we showed that we understood the Bill perfectly?

**MR O'CONNOR**: Just listen to the member for Gosnells! He is—

**Mr Bertram**: One of the brighter members.

**Mr Tonkin**: A brilliant young member.

**The SPEAKER**: Order!

**MR O'CONNOR**: —a member we have just heard speaking on the radio and stating he could not understand why the Government introduced this Bill, in view of the fact that the Industrial Arbitration Bill was presented to Parliament in the last day or two. He said this indicates the Government's insincerity. If the member for Gosnells was at all sincere—and I doubt it very much—

**Mr Tonkin**: Is that an invitation?

### Point of Order

**Mr PEARCE**: I am sorry, Mr Speaker; I do not often do this. However, I ask for a withdrawal of that comment because under Standing Orders it is impugning an improper motive on my part.

The SPEAKER: The comment does impugn an improper motive, and I would ask the Minister to withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw the comment, Mr Speaker, because I do not have any doubt about it.

Mr Tonkin: Show respect for the Chair.

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, I would ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

Mr Bertram: A disgraceful performance.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr O'CONNOR: However, I do say that the member for Gosnells when speaking on the radio this afternoon stated very clearly that he could not understand why the Government introduced this Bill when the Industrial Arbitration Bill was before the Chamber. The member spoke in the debate last night, and he should realise this Bill was introduced in an effort to bring fire brigade, police, and other officers under the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission as quickly as possible, so that certain issues they have before the arbitration court could be dealt with expeditiously. If the member for Gosnells wanted the debate to be deferred, he should have requested that last night. Today in an effort to gain political advantage and, in my opinion, virtually to mislead the people, he indicated very clearly—

Mr Jamieson: Bringing politics into this place!

Mr O'CONNOR:—that he could not understand why the Government introduced this Bill. I have already made quite clear the reason the Government introduced it; and bear in mind that the officers concerned have no tribunal to determine salary matters, as the academics do. Therefore, in the opinion of the Government, these officers are in a much different category.

Mr Hodge: Set up a new tribunal.

Mr O'CONNOR: We indicated clearly that we intend to do that. Had the member listened last night instead of sleeping, he would understand that.

Mr Tonkin: You are bringing the fire brigades under it.

Mr O'CONNOR: The fire brigades do come within this category. I find it hard to understand why a member who listened to the debate last night could not comprehend why the Government introduced the Bill.

Several members interjected.

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

Mr Pearce: I indicated that in the debate last night; you didn't mention it in your second reading reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members, and particularly the member for Gosnells, to cease interjecting.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, I am sorry to raise a procedural matter again, but I am being attacked by the Minister in his reply to the third reading debate, in respect of remarks I made during the second reading debate which have nothing to do with any matter that has intruded into the third reading debate. As the Minister has taken the floor, I cannot reply to his comments. Under those circumstances—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gosnells will resume his seat. There is no point of order.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr O'CONNOR: Had the member for Gosnells been listening to me, he would have been aware that I was talking about statements he made on the radio today.

Mr Pearce: No you are not; I made them in the Parliament last night.

Mr O'CONNOR: Obviously the member has not listened to what has gone on. I say sincerely—especially for the benefit of the member for Gosnells—that the Government introduced this Bill in an effort to give police, fire brigade, and other officers a privilege to which we believe they are entitled.

Mr Tonkin: You shouldn't have appealed in the first place. You caused the problem.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### **RESERVES BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 16th August.

MR H. D. EVANS (Warren) [2.30 p.m.]: It is customary at this time of the year for the Reserves Bill to be introduced. Its purpose is to change the designation of certain lands and in other ways to comply with the Land Act. The introduction of the Bill usually is left until fairly late in the session so that as many items requiring

attention as possible can be dealt with at the one time.

On this occasion, the Bill seeks to effect 11 separate amendments. Of those 11 items, four could be described as regularising existing situations; I refer to clauses 2, 7, 8, and 12. Another two clauses could be described as machinery amendments, included for the specific purpose of allowing certain actions to be taken on reserves for particular purposes, to which I will refer as I proceed. Two clauses deal with the change of designation of land which previously was held under some other tenure; I refer to clauses 4 and 6. Clause 9 involves an exchange of land and clause 10, the excision of a piece of land from a Class "A" reserve. Finally, clause 11 deals with a readjustment which involves a change.

Clause 2 seeks to regularise a situation which already exists. It would appear that as long ago as 1910, Reserve No. 12553 was set apart for "reafforestation"; however, it was included in the gazetted boundaries when State Forest No. 29 was declared in 1928. No action was ever taken formally to expunge the reservation, and clause 2 will regularise the matter.

Another clause deals with Burswood Island and simply seeks to ensure the land complies with the existing metropolitan region town planning scheme, which involves the resumption of a portion of Reserve No. 23251 of some 21.4 hectares, which will enable the Main Roads Department to proceed with the required roadworks which will be necessary to meet the conditions of the MRPA. The third clause seeks to change the designation of a reserve from "parklands" to "national park". The reserve is situated south-east of Cape Clairault; perhaps the member for Vasse will be interested in this one. It seems to be a wise move to bring this unique area under the auspices of the National Parks Authority, with all the additional protection it provides.

The next clause provides for the excision of an additional 468 square metres from Reserve No. 16976 for use as a sewerage pumping station. Although the 1966 Reserves Act provided for an excision for this lowly but important purpose, additional land now is required, and no objection is raised to the proposal.

The next proposal is of interest because it deals with a national park vested in the Merredin Shire Council, involving an area of 1 177.65 hectares. On the recommendation of the EPA, and with the concurrence of the National Parks Authority and the local authority, it now is suggested that this piece of land be redesignated as "recreation and

parkland". It appears the reasons in support of this suggested move are proper and sufficient for us to agree. It has the support of those involved. The Minister very kindly provided a contour map of the area which gives a clear indication of the locality and the attendant problems which have been encountered.

Clause 6 is not unlike clause 4 inasmuch as a small area was excised from the National Parks Authority reserve in the vicinity of Hackett Drive, Crawley. Again, the excision was for the purpose of establishing a sewerage pumping station. It would appear the initial survey undertaken in 1931 and the subsequent excision of the land from Reserve No. 17375 was carried out without parliamentary approval. As a consequence, there is a need for an adjustment to make the excision comply with the provisions of the Land Act.

The next clause, again, seeks to regularise an existing situation. It would appear that an area of land adjacent to the John Forrest National Park has been administered as a national park in conjunction with its neighbour. It seems quite appropriate that it now should be given the designation of "national park", to make the matter official.

Clause 8 affects an area between Pingelly and Katanning and deals with an exchange in which the Government and, therefore, the people of Western Australia, benefit by some 23.8246 hectares. Two landowners have agreed to relinquish 49.1 hectares of their land for inclusion within an "A"-class reserve in exchange for which they will receive 25.3 hectares and \$1 200 in compensation. It has been customary in the past for the Treasury to pay compensation to farmers disadvantaged in land exchanges. One of the reasons for the exchange is the nature of the terrain, which is subject to winter flooding and inundation, which renders the area isolated during the winter months.

Clause 9 is another unusual clause in that it seeks to excise from Class "A" Reserve No. 13805 a small area of 20 square metres for historical grave purposes. It is probably better to exclude this small piece of land from the recreation and timber reserve because, being an historical grave site, it could not be used for the purposes provided for in the initial designation. There could be no objection to that, particularly in view of the fact that the Cue Shire Council is prepared to accept the vesting order.

The Albany Rifle Club has indicated that it desires to realign the Class "C" reserve, rifle range area, and in so doing it takes a portion of a Class "A" reserve, but relinquishes a greater area

which is to be included in Reserve No. 23524. It meets with the approval of the Albany Rifle Club, and there is no objection from the local authority or the National Parks Authority.

The final one is completing the transfer of Class "A" Reserve No. 30538 to its former owners. It would appear that the Melville City Council, at one stage, became involved in obtaining a piece of land from the Melville Roman Catholic Church. The land was not used for the purpose for which it was intended originally. I understand that was to be a rose garden. As a consequence it seems reasonable and fair for the land to be returned to its rightful owners. I do not think anybody would object to that.

In summary, the Reserves Bill has several rather novel, if not unique, transactions that require the sanction of this Parliament; but the reasons advanced appear to be sound and sufficient.

**MRS CRAIG** (Wellington—Minister for Local Government) [2.41 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its general support of the measures contained in the Reserves Bill.

For the interest of the House, I thought I might tell members about the graves that have been found in the historical grave site mentioned in one of the clauses of the Bill. I am informed that those graves are located on Reserve No. 13805, side by side, and their position is about 200 metres, on a bearing of 300 degrees, from Milly Soak. The site is marked on the plan which has been tabled. Each grave has an individual plaque of flat galvanised iron. They bear the following inscriptions—

Sacred to the Memory of  
George Hamersley  
Died 1893

Sacred to the Memory of  
George Hardy  
Died 1893

Sacred to the Memory of . .

Unfortunately we cannot decipher the Christian name, but it is "Harris". That man died also in 1893. It is understood that those men knew there was water adjacent to the stock route. They went in to obtain it, but they were unable to find it and the three of them perished. The water is close to the site where their bodies are now interred.

I again thank the Opposition for its support of this Bill:

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Watt) in the Chair; Mrs Craig (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Reserve No. 23251 at Burswood Island—

**Mr SKIDMORE**: I am concerned about the proposal before the Committee to excise some of the land which is now zoned as parks and recreation and controlled access road under the metropolitan region planning scheme for Burswood Island. It is about time the Government started to recognise—maybe the Minister will inform me I am wrong—that the excision of land merely to have it on a plan as needed for some future occasion is not a good thing. The cutting up of the wetlands of the Swan River has to stop.

I believe there is no need presently for the excision of this piece of the reserve. It should remain as it is unless it can be shown to the Committee that there is a need for its excision.

I do not know how advanced is the Government's intention in regard to the proposed bridge and roadworks which are to take place. However, if one can look at the position, that has been evidenced by the area on the other side of the river. On the eastern side of the river in the area of Orrong Road there has been a great deal of concern about the extension of that road.

It is about time the Government ceased taking these reserves willy-nilly and carving them up. Far too much of our wetlands is disappearing to meet the needs of the future.

If the Minister can assure me that the land is needed within the next few years for the Burswood Island bridge, that would be fair enough; but it is not necessary to take the reserve for preliminary surveys. If the Minister can inform me of the Government's intentions, I would like to hear them. At the moment, I oppose this part of the Bill. I believe it is not necessary, and it should not be part of the amending Bill.

**Mrs CRAIG**: All I can say in reply to the member is the area of land to which he refers is presently zoned under the metropolitan region scheme. I am not aware of the background as far as the Main Roads Department is concerned. I know it is the intention to have this portion of the reserve excised in order to ensure it is available when, in the future, the road is constructed there.

I cannot give the member for Swan an assurance that the road will be built in three years. Nor can I give him an assurance it will be built in 10 years. I know this is a very sound part

of future planning to cope with the growth of Western Australia and the future transport needs that will arise.

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not accept the Minister's reply. It is nebulous, and it has absolutely no substance.

The Minister wants to have a look at the whole of the reserve as an "A"-class reserve. It is already under the control of the Government. There is no need for it to be sliced up into smaller sections for any purpose. The Government could do that at the appropriate time.

I have said time and time again—and I repeat myself—that I am becoming absolutely fed up with the Government's taking land in the wetlands of the Swan River for some extension of a road, a bridge, or roadworks in the future.

If the Minister is suggesting I am not aware of the needs of Western Australia, I will disabuse her mind of that suggestion. I am conscious of the need for roadworks to be provided in this State, and particularly to allow a free flow of traffic to and from our capital.

It seems to be quite wrong and improper, when one considers the many changes made to the metropolitan region planning scheme since 1963—and I was challenged by the Minister the other day to go and have a look at that, and I did. I deal particularly with this road, because it is not subject to any advance planning.

My only fear is that it is not intended to do anything in any case. I do not know that survey pegs banged into the ground would make any difference to it. I do not think it will matter if there are some survey trenches dug on the wetlands. I do not see anything wrong with that.

This is a needless excision of land at the moment. The purpose of it could change easily in the future. The whole system of the metropolitan region planning scheme needs straightening out. As far as I am concerned, there is plenty of work to be done for the road systems in Perth and the metropolitan area.

Certainly the evidence presented to me indicates that rather than caution being exercised with respect to the use of our wetlands—and the Canning River is a classic example of Government bungling—it appears the Government looks on this land as being the cheapest and easiest land to provide roads and so forth without any thought for the desecration of our precious resources. It needs to be remembered that the recreational needs of our people will increase 50-fold within 10 or 15 years. If it is thought these wetland areas will be needed for

recreation purposes, why is the Government taking away this land?

I strongly oppose this clause. It is an inopportune time for the Government to take this action. The time is too early and it is an unnecessary infringement upon the rights of the people. Their heritage in this respect is being eroded by the Government, which is persistently removing parts of the Swan River wetlands, areas which will be needed by the people of the State, particularly those in the metropolitan area.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Reserve No. 23580 at Merredin—

Mr JAMIESON: I would like to know whether the Merredin Shire Council requested the excision of this area of 1 177.650 hectares, which seems to be a fairly large area. It is about five square miles in the old parlance. The cost of maintaining this area for recreation and parkland would be considerable. Would it have been better to excise just a small portion for the shire's needs and leave the rest as a national park?

I realise I am stepping onto unfamiliar ground and perhaps the member for Merredin might be prepared to tear strips off me. Nevertheless, it seems a rather large parcel of land to be transferred from the jurisdiction of the National Parks Authority to this shire council for the purposes of recreation and parkland.

Mrs CRAIG: As far as I am aware, the National Parks Authority indicated the area of land was too small to fit into its new efficient method of management. The authority conferred with the shire council which agreed to accept the area for recreation and parkland. So, this move was at the instigation of the National Parks Authority and met with the concurrence of the Merredin Shire Council.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 10 put and passed.

Clause 11: Reserve No. 24258 at Albany—

Mr SKIDMORE: My understanding is—and I have been unable to check so I am relying on memory—that when this matter was last before the Chamber and land was excised which involved the Albany rifle range, I forwarded that something like this amendment would take place. I indicated previously that I had no objection to the rifle range being given a piece of land subject to its being okay with the National Parks Authority. If it is true the land was vested with the Albany Rifle Club, I remind members that I warned then I felt that ought to be enough and there should be no further need to excise any more land for the

future use of the club. If that did happen and we are now excising a further 44.5 hectares of Class "A" reserve, I would like to know what the hell is going on?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member not to use that sort of expression as I consider it to be unparliamentary.

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the Chair and I am asking the member not to use the expression, "what the hell". It does nothing to improve the standing of the Chamber.

Mr SKIDMORE: I have used worse than that.

The CHAIRMAN: The member is very capable of using far better terms.

Mr SKIDMORE: The description to be used by members is the prerogative of the Chairman. I will not use the term "hell" again; I shall refer to it as the "hot place" or "hades". I do not want to ridicule this Chamber.

I made it clear to the Government on that previous occasion that no more land should be excised for use by this rifle club. However, I do not know whether that previous excision was made. If we are now to excise this 44.5 hectares it seems the previous excision was unnecessary or else a mistake was made and we are now to correct it.

I get concerned when areas of national parks zoned for reserves and recreation get carved up. I hope the club has made up its mind as to what it needs and that the Government will do the necessary thing.

I trust the Minister can give an explanation for this excision.

Mr WATT: I believe I can offer the member for Swan certain explanations he requested. Being an ex-resident of Albany, he would realise that the Frenchman Bay Road has a number of sharp turns in it and the Albany Rifle Club is sited near one of these. The new road alignment will cut through the club's range at about the 500 yard mark and will go through the clubhouse and other buildings as well.

Therefore, it has become necessary for them to develop a new rifle range. Of course this was done in conjunction with the Department of the Army and the Albany Rifle Club has conducted all its negotiations with that department. The club has been guided by the department in all its negotiations.

The department led the club to believe that all the necessary arrangements for the new site for the range had been concluded approximately three years ago and the club in fact went ahead

with the development of the earthworks for the new range.

Only recently the club was made aware of the fact that nothing had been done and it should not be working on the range. The club was asked to stop the work in which it was involved.

The main thrust of this particular change which has resulted in the vesting order in the Bill relates to the safety area which must surround a rifle range. The necessity for this is obvious.

The concern of the member for Swan about carving up the national park—I believe those were his words—is quite unfounded, because the area will not be touched at all. In fact, the area which has been developed already in large measure for the rifle range will remain and it is purely and simply an area of bush on each side of the range which will give adequate protection so that any person who might happen to be enjoying the use of the national park will not be in danger, when the club is having one of its shoots.

Mr H. D. Evans: This Bill was introduced so that this could occur.

Mr WATT: It was introduced so that the work which was commenced could be continued. It is desirable that all the mounds are grassed and if it is left any longer, the growing season will be missed. Of course, once the roadworks proceed the club will be in no man's land if it has not had a chance to develop the range properly. I hope that answers the concern of the member for Swan.

Mr SKIDMORE: I notice the Minister was not prepared to rise and defend her position. I thank the member for Albany for his lucid explanation of what has taken place; but surely his comments bear out what I have said.

On the coast north of Perth a range is used for naval exercises and whilst it is true the physical character of the land has not changed as a result of a line on a map excising certain land for the purpose of a target area, the use of the land has changed.

The Navy has fenced that area and nobody may go in there during the times that the Navy is conducting shooting exercises.

In this case some fishing shacks were situated on the coast. The people who own the shacks have had an agreement with the naval authorities for many years that they will vacate the premises when a shoot is held. They have done so for their own safety. The houses were not actually within range when a shoot was conducted under normal circumstances, but allowance had to be made for

somebody like myself who could not hit a tin can at two yards with a splatter gun.

Mr Watt: The member for Swan is aware of the area in Albany. It backs onto sandhills so there is no danger. I should like to point out also that there are no buildings in the area and there are no roads either. People do not go there. The analogy drawn by the member for Swan between this area and the area north of Perth is not a correct one. The Torndirrup National Park also has many thousands of acres.

Mr SKIDMORE: I thank the member for Albany for his suggestions. However, I would like to make the point that when the rifle range was set up initially in Helena Valley there was no thought it would interfere with the welfare of the people in the area. Today we have a problem there. Whilst we do not have a problem in regard to the rifle range in Albany at the present time, problems could arise over the next 10 or 15 years in that area.

It can be said that a great deal of expansion would have to take place for that to be the case; but if this type of land is available cheaply in the future, although it is not desirable land for development at the present time, this kind of expansion could take place.

We should be very careful about such matters. We must bear in mind that a reserve in the backwaters of Augusta has been used by an unauthorised person who has erected shelters on it and would have continued using it *ad infinitum* had it not been brought to his attention that he was infringing on a reserve.

The analogy I draw between that situation and the actions of the rifle club is relevant. The club went onto a reserve before it had a right to do so.

Mr Watt: It did so in good faith.

Mr SKIDMORE: The farmer took this action in good faith also; but that does not make the actions of the Government, the Lands Department, or whoever is responsible any less culpable.

The great tragedy about the situation is that once the land is vested for a purpose other than that of a national park, recreational area, or reserve it is difficult for it to be returned to its original vesting. If the Government intends to go against the wishes of the people, it will face many problems in the future.

Mrs CRAIG: The member for Swan asked whether this area of land was the same as that which was under discussion during the debate on the previous Reserves Bill. I do not have that

information at the present time, but I undertake to provide it to the member at a later stage.

The member was concerned about the diminution of the area of land which would be available as a national park. In fact this measure increases the area of land that comes into the hands of the National Parks Authority.

Mr Skidmore: There has been an overall diminution of the whole area.

Mrs CRAIG: I should like to refer to the introductory speech made during the second reading stage of the Bill and indicate that a large part of what is now a redundant portion of the reserve which was used for rifle shooting is now in the hands of the National Parks Authority. This was not the case previously.

I cannot indicate to the member how it came to pass that these activities were allowed to commence prior to the legislation passing through the Chamber. The member knows I am handling this Bill for a Minister in another place and I was not aware that question would arise.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 12 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading*

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mrs Craig (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

## **FAMILY COURT ACT AMENDMENT AND ACTS REPEAL BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 9th October.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [3.10 p.m.]: The Government is applying the gag and guillotine procedure to this Bill. However, the stifling of debate is not altogether new; the public is often kept in the dark on these matters. This is the third time that this has occurred in the last two to three weeks.

I have asked a number of questions of the Minister representing the Attorney General with regard to the Bills which will amend the Western Australian Trustee Act and the Perpetual Trustee Act. Very few of these questions were answered. I also asked several questions about the Motor

Vehicle Insurance Trust and the Act under which it operates. I did not receive any answers to these, either. One could say there were no answers at all.

We are now dealing with this Bill which was introduced on the 9th October. Today it appeared on the notice paper as order of the day No. 3 when there are, in fact, 54 orders of the day listed. Some of these matters were introduced weeks or even months ago and have been waiting their turn, but other items have been dealt with out of turn. Now, without any notice or any intimation that there is any urgency for this Bill, the Opposition is forced to deal with it only a few days after it was introduced.

I have place a question on today's notice paper which reads as follows—

What are the various provisions of the Family Court Act Amendment and Acts Repeal Bill which have not already been agreed to and form part of the present law?

Of course we have not reached question time today so I do not have the answer. The question was really a self-help device to ascertain what was happening.

Perhaps I should look at the Bill a little further in order to find out what is going on. One may say that a reasonable man might think that this is only a short Bill. However, this particular Bill contains 39 clauses. It seeks to amend an Act which has 36 or more sections. It repeals two Acts, one of which has over 100 sections—50 of which are still alive and kicking—and another Act with 28 sections in it.

The Opposition has had only three or four days in which to study this Bill and do what is right by the people in this State and—more particularly, though not exclusively—for the people it represents. This is not fair. It is not reasonable or sensible. This is an example of what Governments do when they have the numbers in the Parliament. They do not care two hoots whether they lose touch with the people. The Government stands over the Bill, the people outside, and the Opposition.

Mr B. T. Burke: And some of its own members as well.

Mr BERTRAM: All the Opposition can do is speak to the Bill in a cursory manner and no more. This is thoroughly unacceptable and unsatisfactory.

The object of the Bill appears to be to bring matters of family law—children and the like—under the one umbrella of the Family Court in this State. On the face of it that may not be a bad idea; it may in fact be a good idea. However,

the Opposition at this stage is not in a position to give an opinion at all. If it is a good idea, the Opposition would like to know why it was not done in the first place.

At present the judges of the Supreme Court have jurisdiction over the Guardianship of Infants Act. However, with the repeal of that Act people concerned about the guardianship of children will no longer be able to take their proceedings before any justice of the Supreme Court. That door is being closed.

Without in any way being disrespectful to the judges of the Family Court, I do not think they are necessarily of a better calibre than those of the Supreme Court. It is interesting to observe that their decisions go to the Supreme Court for appeal. This should give some indication as to their relative standing.

The jurisdiction has been taken away from the judges of the Supreme Court so that matters which were previously dealt with under that Act will be dealt with by the judges of the Family Court. The Opposition does not know whether this is a good decision because it has not had an opportunity to give it consideration. There has been little, if any, public debate on this matter because the Opposition has not been given the opportunity to confer with people who would be experts on it or others who are concerned with the functions of the Family Law Court.

As I have said, effectively and without any motion being put before this Assembly that there should be a time limit on speeches, or a guillotine placed on the Opposition or on a certain debate, that in effect is what is happening. This is a back-door method of stifling proper open discussion and debate on what is an exceptionally important matter; to wit, matters to do with the custody and guardianship of children, property settlement, maintenance, and all sorts of extraordinary things which will be affected directly or indirectly by this measure. The Opposition is being denied a reasonable and proper opportunity to argue the Bill.

If members look through the Minister's speech, which appears at page 3664 of *Hansard* they will not find any suggestion of urgency in this matter—no suggestion of urgency. If there is urgency it should have been stated; the Opposition should have been given some notice instead of being summarily dismissed in the way it has been. When the Opposition is treated unfairly, all the people outside this place are being treated unfairly. We represent one side of politics here, but in many respects we have a duty and when permitted we discharge it to all people



irrespective of their political persuasion—assuming they have a political persuasion—and even to those with no political persuasion.

I notice from the Minister's second reading speech that in 1978 Parliament conferred on the court further jurisdiction in the property area to overcome hardship which was found to be occasioned by the limitation of Commonwealth power. That is true as far as I know, but I think there is quite a bit of feeling that that action was not necessarily a good thing. I touch on it here simply because the Minister mentioned it.

There are many people in this sensitive area of family law and family relationships, and so on, who are now concerned that the amendment passed in 1978 is having the effect not of keeping marriages together, but of hastening the opposite; to wit, the dissolution of marriage. If I recall the amendment correctly, it enabled people, during the course of marriage and before they commenced divorce proceedings, to be able to go to the Family Court and initiate action for the settlement of property.

So, before people have even made up their minds that they will divorce, and before they sue for divorce, they are able to set about carving up the matrimonial property. For that reason we should be a little careful when tampering with matrimonial law and related matters. It is a very important area of the law. It has very real repercussions, and in view of the rate at which marriages are breaking up today, and the rate at which marriages are not being entered into today, the Government's treatment of this measure in the cavalier fashion I have indicated is a disgrace. It is an inevitable legacy of a Government which has a majority—a huge majority—which it uses without fear.

Mr Mensaros: Are you suggesting any Government is elected unless it has a majority?

Mr BERTRAM: The Government opposite has a huge majority in this House. If the people of Western Australia as a result of the election I expect to be held in December allow that situation to continue, then all I can say with the greatest regret is that they deserve what they get because they have seen what goes on in this place where the Government has been given too much leeway, and where the Parliament is denied an effective numerical Opposition.

Having been successfully stifled—

Mr Clarko: By the Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

Mr O'Neil: A very appropriate comment.

Mr Bryce: The member for Mt. Hawthorn has unlimited time.

Mr Pearce: It all makes for team work.

Mr BERTRAM: I do not want to do what the member for Karrinyup did last night when he squandered half an hour of the time of this House just to deny the Opposition an opportunity to speak and make a real and effective contribution.

Mr O'Neil: When will you start to make your contribution?

Mr BERTRAM: I think it would be most unacceptable were I to follow the example set by the member for Karrinyup.

Mr O'Neil: I asked when you intended to start your contribution.

Mr BERTRAM: One cannot debate a Bill when one has little or no information. It does not seem to have got through to the Minister.

Mr O'Neil: It got through that you only work on sitting days.

Mr BERTRAM: I wish that were the case.

Mr O'Neil: That is what you said. You should check back on what you said about the lack of time available to study a Bill.

Mr BERTRAM: I am glad the Minister has assisted me in this respect because it is an area on which I did not intend to touch. However, if the Minister would care to come to the office of the member for Mt. Hawthorn at 193 Main Street, Osborne Park, he would find a never-ending queue of people, coming in droves for advice and assistance from their member, which necessitates his very often visiting his constituents and working on Saturdays and Sundays.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! I suggest the member get back to the Bill and do the very thing he has assured us he wants to do.

Mr BERTRAM: I did not want to disappoint the Minister, because that would be quite improper and rude.

Mr Sodeman: You will have the member for Dianella chastising you for not resting on Sunday.

Mr BERTRAM: The Minister touched on one or two other points. One was in relation to the office of collector of maintenance. He may have a good point in what he intends to do, but once again the Opposition does not know. The Minister did not go to any particular length really to justify what he intended to do. The Opposition has had insufficient time in which to ask questions or obtain any information.

The other matter mentioned by the Minister is that proposed new section 23 will allow the Registrar of the Family Court to hold a

concurrent appointment as a stipendiary magistrate. Whether that is good, I do not know. It will create an additional magistrate. I do not know what will happen to all the other magistrates from whom the existing power may be taken. There is no evidence to suggest what will be the repercussions generally on magistrates or otherwise.

It is a thoroughly unsatisfactory state of affairs that we are being forced to debate this matter in the way I have indicated and the blame must be laid fairly and squarely at the feet of the Government. The Opposition—make no mistake—recognises the importance of family law and the various matters governed by the parent Act which we are amending; that is, the Family Court Act. We certainly are not in a position—and we will not be bulldozed into the position by the Government either—to debate the Bill when we are not able to do so responsibly; and we will not attempt to do so. In those circumstances, the Opposition has no option but to oppose the Bill.

**MR GRILL** (Yilgarn-Dundas) [3.30 p.m.]: The action taken by the Government in this particular case is of course quite improper. I think that has been quite adequately pointed out by the member for Mt. Hawthorn. This particular Bill least of all should be rushed through Parliament. It has aspects which are sensitive as far as the public in general are concerned and it should at least have some public discussion, debate, and feed-back. It is quite wrong that the Opposition does not have an opportunity to examine this legislation. It is quite improper that the Government should try to rush it through in the way it has.

This particular area of the law is one in which I have some expertise and in which I practise almost every day of the week. It is not a simple area of the law, and although the Opposition does not have any opposition to the fundamental points put forward by the Government in respect of this legislation, we want to be sure the ramifications of the changes are correct and that the law will be a proper and good law which is properly formulated. We do not want to be associated with the sort of reputation the Government now so well deserves for serving up sloppy legislation which has to come back to this House to be amended because it does not do the job it set out to do in the first place.

This particular Bill has 39 provisions. It seeks to repeal two Acts of Parliament—the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act and the Guardianship of Children Act—and it seeks to incorporate those provisions in the Family Court Act. I point out that the Family Court Act

now has to be read in conjunction with the Federal Family Law Act to ascertain the substantive nature of the law in respect of matrimonial matters. It is a complicated piece of legislation which necessitates the reading of the two Acts of Parliament which will be repealed, the Act of Parliament into which the provisions of those Acts will be incorporated, and the Family Law Act itself; and the latter Act has about 160 provisions.

**Mr O'Neil**: Only 50 of them remain at the moment.

**Mr GRILL**: Of that order. I do not want to speak at any length on the Bill because there is not much one can say about it without going into some detail. Apart from that, I wish to move a motion that the debate be adjourned. I have set out quite clearly why I think it should be adjourned.

#### *Adjournment of Debate*

I now formally move—

That the debate be adjourned.

**MR O'NEIL** (East Melville—Deputy Premier) [3.33 p.m.]: The motion is that the debate be adjourned, and I understand it is moved on the basis of the argument raised by the member for Mt. Hawthorn, in which the Opposition is stating it has not had adequate time to consider the legislation, which has been promoted on the notice paper above 50-odd Orders of the Day which are already on it.

I want to deny that any particular action was taken to promote this Bill in order to stifle or gag the Opposition. The Bill was introduced into this House some nine days ago, despite the fact that the member for Mt. Hawthorn referred to sitting days. It has been the custom since we have been in government that, other than by arrangement with the Leader of the Opposition, Bills will remain on the notice paper for at least seven days. This Bill falls into that category; it has been on the notice paper for more than seven days.

As for the allegation that it has been promoted in order to provide a gag in respect of a question on the notice paper, let us look at the evidence. There are 51 or so Orders of the Day listed on the notice paper. They include 20 or so which are motions or Bills moved by the Opposition. There are about 30 Orders of the Day which are Government business.

On yesterday's notice paper the Family Court Act Amendment and Acts Repeal Bill, the one we are now discussing, was seventh on the list in respect of Government business. It was in fact Order of the Day No. 26, but the first Order of the Day for Government business was No. 20. All

the preceding Orders of the Day were private members' business. The only Bills it has stepped over today are the Appropriation Bills, and the Fisheries Act Amendment Bill which has been considered by this Chamber and by the Committee on a couple of occasions.

Mr Bertram: How many has it stepped over in all?

Mr O'NEIL: In all, it has stepped over two Orders of the Day which involved Bills, and the two Appropriation Bills. That is all.

Mr Bertram: That is not the position at all.

Mr O'NEIL: The Leader of the Opposition was given a copy of the notice paper for today. He raised no objection to it.

The other point the honourable member made was that he had had only so many sitting days to consider the Bill, which to me implies that is the only time he works on parliamentary business. I point out to him that of the 30 Bills or notices on this notice paper which are Government business, 20 happen to fall within my responsibility and most of them in respect of the portfolio of the Attorney General who is in another place. So I wonder who is the over-worked person in this place.

Once again, I agree that the Bill contains some very important provisions in respect of family law and the Family Court.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! The Minister will resume his seat. It has been drawn to my attention that under Standing Order No. 167 a number of matters are not permitted to be debated, and one of them is the adjournment of a debate. I will therefore put the question, and I apologise to the House—

Mr Jamieson: It is doubtful that the adjournment should have been moved.

Motion put and negatived.

#### *Debate Resumed*

MR O'NEIL (East Melville—Deputy Premier) (3.38 p.m.): I am now resuming the debate on the second reading of this Bill. I have covered most of the points raised by the Opposition—

Mr Grill: There are eight Bills which have been adjourned by me, which relate to your portfolio, and which have been on the notice paper for weeks. Why didn't you bring one of those forward?

Mr O'NEIL: Almost all of those have already passed through the Legislative Council.

Mr Bertram: What has that got to do with it?

Mr O'NEIL: It is the responsibility of the Government to manage the passage of legislation. When I was illegally debating the adjournment motion I was—

Mr Grill: You moved an amendment to a Bill to amend this Act in the dying hours of the last Parliament so that it would not get any Press coverage. You are doing the same thing here.

Mr O'NEIL: I continue and indicate there is no pushing, guillotining, gagging, or anything else. It is the responsibility of the Government to progress its legislation in reasonable terms.

Mr Grill: There will be a public outcry over it and you want to push it through in five minutes.

Mr O'NEIL: I understand it is Thursday afternoon; but let us look again at the notice paper of yesterday. What is the Bill immediately below the Family Court Bill and when was that introduced? On the 11th October. So that just falls within the category of those which are allowed to be considered by the Opposition for not less than a week.

Mr Grill: Why does it come up now?

Mr O'NEIL: The next measure was introduced on the 12th October. I admit that the Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill was introduced on the 1st May, but the Bill after that was introduced on the 16th October. It is a responsibility of this Parliament and the Government to ensure that legislation progresses reasonably. Members of the Opposition say that nine days is not enough time in which to consider a Bill, and yet very early in my second reading speech I stated—

The Bill which is now before the House is basically a tidying up exercise of the Family Court Act.

Mr Bertram: Order of the day No. 25 was introduced on the 9th August.

Mr O'NEIL: I indicated that matters contained in other legislation would be incorporated into the Family Court Act.

No basic change of principle was announced. In fact, the Bill contains what is often referred to in this place as "lawyers' law". It is farcical for the Opposition to indicate that there is any attempt to guillotine this measure, and an ex-Attorney General has admitted that in nine days he cannot understand a consolidation of the law. That is something he ought to be ashamed of.

Mr Bertram: That is not true.

Mr O'NEIL: This House knows very well the performance of that member. Inevitably the notice paper contains very many questions to be asked by this member about matters not

contained in a Bill, but rather contained in the second reading speech of the Minister responsible for a Bill. There is one such question on today's notice paper, and I have the answer with me because I recognised that this Bill would come up for debate prior to question time. Members should be aware of the procedure we usually adopt on Thursdays. I saw this question last night when the copies of questions were handed around, and I cannot understand it.

Mr Grill: That is a reflection on you.

Mr O'NEIL: Let me ask the member for Yilgarn-Dundas whether he can understand what his question means. It reads—

What are the various provisions of the Family Court Act Amendment and Acts Repeal Bill which have not already been agreed to and form part of the present law?

I have discussed this question with various people, and although I have an answer to it, I do not know whether the answer relates to the question. In my opinion the question is unintelligible.

Mr Grill: It is as clear as crystal.

Mr O'NEIL: What does it mean?

Mr Grill: If you do not understand it, it is not for me to tell you.

Mr Bryce: Here is a Deputy Premier who wants the Opposition to supply the answers to questions for him.

Mr O'NEIL: This is the usual performance of the member for Mt. Hawthorn.

Mr Bryce: You give us the questions and we will provide the answers.

Mr Wilson: Where did the answer come from?

Mr O'NEIL: I have the answer and I will read it out.

Mr Bertram: Are you going to conceal that too?

Mr O'NEIL: I will give the honourable member the answer.

Mr Wilson: You said it was unanswerable.

Mr O'NEIL: I cannot understand it.

Mr Wilson: Who supplied the answer?

Mr O'NEIL: I obtained the answer from the Crown Law Department. The question was not asked of me; it was asked of the Attorney General. We have had to guess what the honourable member is referring to. However, the question is not based on the legislation; it is based on a statement I made in my second reading speech which reads—

The matters which are dealt with in the Bill are largely matters which have already

been agreed to and form part of the present law.

The honourable member is asking what it is that has not been agreed to and that does not form part of the present law. I would like to read the answer provided, and I will then hand the answer in at question time in order to save time. The answer provided by the Crown Law Department reads as follows—

Clause 4 in so far as the clause relates to the collector of maintenance.

Clauses 8 and 26 dealing with provisions to enable the registrar to concurrently exercise powers of a stipendiary magistrate.

Those two matters mentioned are changes which are not in the present law. The clauses provide for the appointment of a collector of maintenance, and for a registrar to be given the power of a stipendiary magistrate. In my second reading speech I told members exactly why these changes were to take place. So not only has the honourable member not studied the Bill in the nine days he has had it, but also he has not read my second reading speech. The answer provided continues—

Clause 13 in so far as the clause enables the court to exercise the powers of a Children's Court when a child appears to be in need of care and protection and includes giving the right to the Director of Community Welfare to intervene where appropriate.

Other provisions of the Bill relating to the welfare of children generally have been redrafted to follow the text of the Family Law Act 1975, of the Commonwealth, to ensure that ex-nuptial children will be subject to the same considerations as a child of a marriage. These provisions include those contained in the Acts which will be repealed by this legislation.

So the Crown Law Department is saying that these few changes have been mentioned specifically and the other provisions which are not presently contained in the Family Court Act are being taken out of the Acts to be repealed and inserted in the Family Court Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.03 p.m.*

*In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr O'Neil (Deputy Premier) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

Mr BERTRAM: I intend to move that the Committee report progress and seek leave to sit again. I repeat the reasons for that motion, as advanced in my second reading speech. You will recall, Mr Deputy Chairman, that the Minister gave this Bill a rating of No. 3 on the notice paper. However, when we look at the notice paper we find a number of Bills and motions have been before the Chamber for months. Order of the Day No. 25 is the Acts Amendment (Master, Supreme Court) Bill which the Minister introduced on the 9th August. The Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill was introduced on the 17th May. Those Bills occupy 23rd and 25th positions on the notice paper, and yet the Bill we are now debating was introduced on the 9th October and occupies third position. I have cited only two items on the notice paper, and I can assure the Chamber there are plenty of others.

Those Bills seem to me to be relatively innocuous; they are not important or prodigious Bills such as the one before us. It has been said it is a matter of taking large slabs out of repealed Acts and including them in this measure with only a few word changes; but such changes can alter completely the meaning of a Statute.

If the Opposition had merely to ascertain that the transcription of the repealed Acts into the new Bill was carried out accurately, that in itself would be a sizeable job, because the existing Acts would have to be read to ascertain whether any repercussions will occur. The transcription may have been done with precision and accuracy; but the Opposition does not know whether that is so.

I do not think I have a reputation for dilly dallying around with Bills, for not being ready, or for not studying measures. Many members on the other side do not speak at all because they cannot, will not, or are not permitted to. Others merely put together a few words in respect of a Bill and the experienced ones amongst us know how much homework they have or have not done. I do not think anyone has ever yet alleged that I lightly pass over Bills.

Therefore, I do not think it is reasonable, sensible, or responsible for the Committee now to examine the detail of this Bill when the Opposition has not had a reasonable opportunity to confer with certain experts in the matter and people who want their views to be made known. That does not mean the Opposition necessarily would act upon their views, but it would give due

weight to them. If the Committee proceeds at this time the Opposition has not the opportunity to give due weight to anything because it has not had a reasonable opportunity to study the Bill or to seek advice from any source at all. This is one of the most important Bills that has been before the Parliament this year.

If the Government opposes my motion it will put the Opposition in a position where it cannot function during the Committee stage and, as far as I am concerned, the clauses will simply go through without debate because the Opposition is not ready to debate them. I am giving notice to the Government that if it wants that to happen it will insist that it be done. I am simply giving the reasons for the Opposition's attitude. They are not self-made reasons, but are thoroughly legitimate.

Because I ask questions relating to Bills and other members do not, that does not make me inefficient and others efficient. I would suggest to members that the reverse might apply. I am staggered at the few questions asked in this place about Bills. I know that in other courts—and this is a court—one of the first things anybody does is to quiz one's opponents in order that one receives the proper information to enable one to know what the contest is all about before hopping into the ring with one's competitors in the appropriate forum.

Those who have been here a few years will remember that Speaker Guthrie happened to share that view; namely, that it is quite right and proper for a member who wants to debate a Bill to seek the facts before the debate by way of questions rather than by asking them during the debate, when, as we all know, the Minister responsible for the Bill usually tells us nothing. We know, of course, we often receive silly answers or no answers at all to questions. However, it is the prerogative—more than prerogative; it is the duty—of the Opposition to ask questions on Bills.

Thus far on this Bill I have asked only one question which contains a few subheadings. Ordinarily, there would be many more questions than that in respect of a Bill as important as this one. I remind the Committee it relates to extremely important social questions. It deals with family life, family law, children, maintenance, custody, property settlements; it affects thousands and thousands of Western Australians.

Some Bills have been on the notice paper virtually since Adam was a boy but are of little significance when compared with the magnitude of this Bill; they are nondescript. This Bill is of vital importance. If the Government opposes my

motion it is saying to the people it does not care two hoots about them.

An article on page 6 of tonight's issue of the *Daily News* gives some indication of the Premier's knowledge of the importance of limited adjournments. He knows the mechanics of opposition. The Opposition does not have a department of skilled officers behind it, advising it 24 hours a day. The Opposition, to do its job properly, must have time to make inquiries. The Premier is making his attitude manifestly obvious by that article in tonight's paper.

This Bill is one which could very easily bring forth a tremendous amount of public debate. An inquiry has been conducted recently into the Family Law Act, as distinct from the Family Court Act; that is not an unrelated matter, and is something the Opposition should have had the opportunity to examine before this Bill is debated. Yet we have not been given that opportunity.

If the Government wishes to snuff out opposition in this place it will do what I expect it to do; namely, oppose my motion. That will be the end of this Committee discussion and the Bill, to all intents and purposes, will not have been given a proper ventilation. It will not be the fault of the Opposition. We are prepared to act fairly and responsibly. However, we do not make the rules in this Committee. The Government has that power and it is now up to the Government to determine whether it will act fairly or continue in the manner it adopted during the second reading stage when the Opposition sought to adjourn the debate but was denied the opportunity, so that the second reading took place without proper debate.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Crane): Order! It is not permissible for a member to debate a motion to report progress. Therefore I cannot accept the honourable member's motion. I regard the speech he has just completed as being his first speech on this clause. However, it is competent for any other member to move that we do now report progress.

### *Progress*

Mr PEARCE: I move—

That the Committee do now report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion put and negatived.

### *Committee Resumed*

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 39 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### *As to Third Reading*

Mr O'NEIL: I seek leave to proceed forthwith to the third reading of the Bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Is leave granted?

Opposition members: No.

Leave not granted.

### **QUESTIONS**

Questions were taken at this stage.

### **APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)**

#### *Second Reading: Budget Debate*

Debate resumed from the 10th October.

MR BRYCE (Ascot—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.44 p.m.]: The documents referred to as the 1979-80 Budget documents and which have been presented to this Chamber certainly give Western Australians no reason to feel any comfort about the future. The Budget presented by the Premier was indeed a gloomy and depressing document.

Mr Sibson: It was from your point of view.

Mr BRYCE: It typified the essence of the Liberal Party's philosophy of cut-backs, savage surgery, and denial of a whole range of very significant needs throughout the community.

Mr Laurance: It was a bit of realism.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Gascoyne calls it "realism", but he knows that in fact it is Fraserism. This particular Government stands shoulder to shoulder with the Fraser Government against the wave of reactionaryism which has swept the country since Fraser took over.

People of the ilk of Milton Friedman and his 19th century precursors have just about screwed the Australian economy to the wall to the point where this Government is now in a state of paralysis and the next stage is *rigor mortis*.

When this Government was elected in 1974 and re-elected in 1977 it made some very brave and imaginative promises about the employment opportunities which would be provided. Members will recall the 100 000 jobs which the Government said would be made available. The Government made brave promises about what it was going to do in regard to inflation; it made brave promises about what it intended doing with State taxes and charges; but we see, after six years at the helm of the economic destiny of this State, that the

Government has either gone to sleep at the wheel on the one hand or is in fact in a state of paralysis on the other hand.

The Government does not know which way to turn and the basic reason for that is it has stood shoulder to shoulder with the Fraser Administration in Canberra. Over the next few months in this State we can expect to hear utterances from the Premier seeking to distance himself from the Prime Minister. However, any thinking individual in this State knows that the staunchest political ally of the Prime Minister in his reactionary economic doctrines has been the Premier of Western Australia.

If this document which the Premier has introduced to this place as a Budget was designed to fan the flame of excitement in this "State of Excitement", it has indeed been a very damp squib; might I say at this stage I believe it is as damp a squib as the Industrial Arbitration Bill which the Government has introduced. It will fall flat on its face and the Government, expecting all hell to break loose in Western Australia, will indeed be very disappointed, because all hell is not likely to break loose.

Mr Hassell: Are you going to support it?

Mr BRYCE: That is a subject for debate on a different day and that will be the appropriate time for me to exchange arguments with the member for Cottesloe on the matter.

Instead of providing encouragement to the private sector by way of stimulating activity, the Government has cut back savagely. It has supported the Fraser Government doctrine of surgery and cut-backs to the public sector. Not only does this have a disincentive effect as far as the multiplier is concerned, but also it has a very serious psychological effect. This Government knows that Governments have a responsibility to provide leadership and all this Government, together with its Federal counterpart, has done has been to cut back and deprive people and investors of opportunities to invest. The Government has deliberately denied the economy the right to grow.

Mr Laurance: The politics of fantasy on the other side.

Mr BRYCE: Inside our own State, one of the reasons the State has performed badly is the appalling performance of the Department of Industrial Development. This department is the creature of the Premier who has attempted to recreate the 1960s.

The Department of Industrial Development was established at a time and in a way that was designed to lead an industrial boom and the

Premier has been attempting to recreate the 1960s ever since he has been in office. He has not yet woken up to the fact that he cannot do it and that it is not possible.

The Department of Industrial Development itself must share a very significant degree of the blame for misleading the people of Western Australia about the so-called "State of Excitement". A short while ago I asked a question in this place of the Minister for Industrial Development. I asked him to communicate to the Parliament how much money the Department of Industrial Development had spent in the promotion and development of Western Australian industry.

His answer revealed a very significant fact that the Department of Industrial Development has become an extension of the Liberal Party's propaganda machine. It seems that the Department of Industrial Development has a fairly single minded charter to convince the people of Western Australia that this is a "State of Excitement", when we are in fact experiencing the most significant recession since the latter part of the 1930s.

To illustrate my point I will quote the figures provided by the Minister in his answer to my question 1518 of the 19th September, 1979. I asked, in part, the following—

How much money was actually spent during each of the last three financial years by the Department of Industrial Development on advertising and promotion of Western Australian industry?

The figures in his answer were as follows—

1976-77	\$663 505
1977-78	\$758 092
1978-79	\$859 095

Almost \$1 million for 1979-80. That in itself is one point but then I asked the Minister to indicate to the Parliament what percentage of this money was spent in Western Australia and what percentage was spent interstate and overseas. The Minister indicated that somewhere between 92 per cent and 88 per cent of the money spent by the Department of Industrial Development on advertising and promotion was spent in Western Australia.

I suggest that that money was deliberately spent as a means of jiggling up the Liberal Party's propaganda machine. Ninety two per cent of the money spent by the Department of Industrial Development is being spent deliberately to mislead the people of Western Australia into believing that they have never had it so good.

If the Government wished to attract money to Western Australia from overseas or other States presumably a reasonable proportion of that money would be spent in those places. However, 92 per cent was spent in 1977-78 inside Western Australia and 88 per cent was spent in 1978-79 inside Western Australia, for the express purpose of deluding Western Australians. Only 5 per cent was spent in other States last year and 7 per cent in other States this year.

This explains and highlights the Government's determination to delude the people of Western Australia. We hear so many public utterances from the Minister and the Premier stating this is the most ideal climate for investment anywhere in Australia. If that means that this is the best place to maximise the degree of rip-off of the people's resources then I wonder whether the Minister really means that. Maybe he is then getting close to the truth because he has spent six years of his life in Government doing his damndest to achieve that. It seems to me that the Government is spending money to expand the Liberal Party propaganda machine. This is reprehensible.

On several occasions I have expressed the view that the Department of Industrial Development has failed to meet the needs, to recognise the needs, and to do something about the needs of the small business sector. It is patently clear to anyone who studies this situation that the dramatic number of small firms going to the wall and the record number of failures are a result of this Government's almost exclusive preoccupation with large-scale glamorous mineral development projects. It has caused the needs of the 25 000 small businesses in Western Australia to be utterly neglected. The Minister knows he has deprived the Small Business Advisory Service of the financial and human resources it requires and so on that score alone, the Government has neglected its responsibility.

Another important matter which causes me concern is one which involves the future. It is an area in which the Minister has indicated to this House that he has very little concern or interest. My very basic criticism of the Department of Industrial Development and the Minister is that practically nothing has been done to safeguard the long-term future interests of this State in respect of the encouragement of the development of an electronics industry.

He may well think that the development of minerals is very exciting and glamorous and perhaps most exciting to the Government's party supporters but they have no right to occupy the Treasury bench and turn their backs so effectively

on the needs of an electronics industry in this State.

Mr Laurance: The greatest technical improvement for people in Australia is the domestic satellite which is being developed in Australia. However, people like yourself and Senator Susan Ryan oppose it.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Gascoyne demonstrated his almost unlimited ignorance of this if he thinks for one moment that the subject of a satellite is the beginning and the be-all and end-all of an electronics industry. He demonstrates to this Chamber that he knows very little about the entire industry.

He demonstrates his ignorance of this but because of my limited time I will ignore his basically ill-informed interjections. I am about to demonstrate to the member for Gascoyne and anyone else who cares to listen how important it is for the long-term security and future of our State to have a very diversified electronics industry.

The type of satellite the member for Gascoyne would put into the sky would no doubt be an imported one. He would be delighted to have it imported from either the United States, Japan, or Britain. That would be the type of decision the member for Gascoyne would enjoy.

The point I am making is that we have a very significant long-term interest in the development of the local electronics industry.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRYCE: On the 2nd October, 1979, I asked the Minister for Industrial Development a question relating to the development of an electronics industry in this State. I asked him what initiatives he or his department had taken to encourage the development of the electronics industry in Western Australia. He answered the question in part as follows—

I quite agree with the tenor of the question. The policy of the Government and the intention of myself and the department, is to try to encourage a wider range of electronic industries in Western Australia than presently exists.

He did not give a single indication of what he had done because the answer is simply that this Government has done nothing. The Minister indicated that to us by way of his answer to that question.

This is an area which has been deliberately neglected because the Government prefers large-scale glamorous overseas control and overseas administered mineral development projects. I repeat, for the benefit of some ignorant members



in this place, that that does not mean for a minute that we on this side of the House do not recognise the fundamental economic importance of those projects and their spin-off.

The single-minded preoccupation with these developmental projects provides a very lopsided economy indeed. We are experiencing the effects of that right now. I suggest there is a need for us to challenge the great Australian sense of defeatism in respect of this area. This particular industry involves an enormous sum of money, a rapidly changing technology, high risk capital, and a very sophisticated and highly skilled work force. Yet, so many people in this State—as well as many in this Chamber—are arguing that it cannot be done, and that we cannot compete with the IBMs and the Honeywells of this world. In fact, we can.

Many precedents have been set overseas by very small countries. What we need is the brains, the enterprise, the foresight, and the commitment.

Mr Laurance: And the union support.

Mr BRYCE: You will get union support.

Mr Laurance: We have not had it yet.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Gascoyne is bridled by his own objections. He has never taken the time to consider seriously what is involved in the development of an Australian electronics industry. He has been carping about a satellite, and the satellite he proposes would probably be imported from overseas. I want to point out the importance to this State and this nation of the development of the capacity to be able to produce our own satellite with our own highly technological resources.

Mr Laurance: The ALP policy with regard to technology costs jobs. You are being hypocritical.

Mr BRYCE: The member for Gascoyne is totally out of touch. He is inventing complete untruths when he says that about the Australian Labor Party. I do not know where he got the idea, but if it is to his benefit to tell lies in this place that is his business. If he indicates that he wants to set that sort of standard, that is his business; but it is palpably untrue and he knows it.

We believe the examples set for us in Europe, Asia, Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, Singapore, and Taiwan demonstrate that an electronics industry can be set up in small countries. A vast population is not necessary. I am not suggesting that we should be able to hop into the electronics industry and seek to compete on the same ground as the major countries—such as the United States of America, Japan, and Britain—in those areas which suit them best. I am suggesting we take a

leaf out of the book of many small European and Asian countries. We should aim to cater for the peripheral market.

Mr Laurance: Now I know why you have stepped down from your previous position. The welcoming of technology is totally against the policy of the ALP.

Mr BRYCE: It hurts the member for Gascoyne to listen to some good sense.

The electronics industry is the key to the development of the future. There is very little doubt in anybody's mind that had it not been for the great space race between Russia and the United States of America, chip technology would not have been developed to the stage where it put the United States ahead in the race. By using chip technology in their circuitry the United States was able to beat the Russians. The next development of the chip technology is being applied generally and is spreading throughout the industry. It is cheap and reliable, and requires very little maintenance in most applications. The social impact will be significant.

I am happy to concede that I am concerned about people because many jobs will disappear. Unlike the member for Gascoyne—who sniggers at the interests and needs of people, and who demonstrates a complete lack of interest in the welfare of people whose jobs will go—I am concerned. There are 1 500 unemployed people in my constituency at the present time, and as the member of Parliament who represents them I find it very unattractive and very ugly that so many people are unemployed. I do not welcome that unemployment, as does the member for Gascoyne.

There will be some very significant social dislocation because of the new technology. Economically we cannot do without it. We cannot afford to be left waiting while the rest of the world grasps all the opportunities. That is the reason I say it is time this Government did something about the development of a local electronics industry instead of sitting back and waiting for the Japanese, the British, the Belgians—and practically every other nation in Europe as well as the United States of America—to seize the tremendously attractive market which is available in this country. Those other nations will grasp the market for their own benefit if we do not do something about it.

One of the things which the member for Gascoyne and so many of his colleagues find difficult to swallow is that in most countries of the world the development of the electronics industry has involved Governments to a fairly significant degree. The member for Gascoyne, on the

extreme right wing fringe of the Liberal Party, would find it difficult to digest but the French, the Belgians, many Scandinavian countries, and the United States of America have found it necessary for Governments to play a significant role. I can accept that on that score alone the member for Gascoyne would dismiss and disallow the whole thing because he would not have a bar of the Government being involved at any price.

In this country at the present time at least 95 per cent of the market for computers—the provision of electronic technology—is serviced by eight companies. They are as follows: IBM (US), 41.6 per cent; Honeywell (US), 15.6 per cent; Control Data Corp. (US), 11.3 per cent; Sperry Univac (US), 9.9 per cent; Burroughs (US), 8.8 per cent; ICL (UK), 7.3 per cent; NCR (US), 4.1 per cent; and DEC (US), 1.4 per cent.

Other important companies supply the market, and they are: Facom (Fujitsu, Japan); Data General (US); Interdata (US); Data 100 (US); and Wang (US). The interesting point is that not one of those companies is Australian.

A significant point is that we must ensure there is an Australian company, and in order to do that we have to overcome the great sense of defeatism—that it cannot be done.

One of the problems we have in this respect is that we must try to make people who are in the position of important decision-makers realise that we are not as isolated as we think we are. We have the brains in this country. If we had the commitment from the Government, at State and national level, and if we could find the high risk capital, we would have a sound basis for the development of an electronics industry.

An interesting point about the Australian situation is that our market at the present time is one of the most competitive in the world. It is the only technological market in the world where the United States, Britain, and Japan are competing. Unlike the United States, where IBM has actually isolated a significant section of the market—65 per cent—in this country that company has only 45 per cent of the market.

The foreign companies are basically supplying computer equipment and operating systems—software—they are maintaining hardware and software, and they are providing software support and consulting services. It is a great regret that our equity in any of those companies is practically zero. The companies are wholly-owned subsidiaries of parent companies in the United States, Japan, and Britain. The

equipment is brought into this country and simply turned around and sold to local consumers.

Only about 4 000 people are involved in the industry at the present time, and about 70 000 Australians hold down jobs defined as “computer related”. However, the National Government and this State Government have not lifted a finger as yet to do anything about encouraging the development of an electronics industry in this State.

We have an embryonic industry and it is struggling. It cannot get people to listen to its needs. It cannot get departmental officials or the Minister to appreciate the long-term significance to this State and nation of the electronics industry.

For the cynics opposite, including the member for Gascoyne, let me draw to the attention of the House the fact that the market for computer equipment in this country over the next five years at 1978 prices is \$2.2 billion. Approximately \$220 million-worth of computer equipment was purchased in this country in 1978. Based on a 20 per cent per annum increase over the next five years, that figure will mean that in that time at 1978 prices the market will be worth \$2.2 billion. Many decision-makers in this Government and at national level are prepared to say they really do not care, that it can go to the foreigners, and the outsiders can have the pickings and do what they will.

There is another very good reason which I should emphasise as to why we ought to have an electronics industry of our own. If members stop to think about the desirability of retaining even a modicum of our own cultural identity in this country, they will reflect upon the extent to which imported canned television in the 1950s and 1960s influenced the development of Australian culture. That experience will be dwarfed by what will happen in the 1980s and 1990s if we do not develop our own software and hardware industry in respect of high technology, because software generally is designed, by the people who build it, to suit themselves according to the way they do things. If we import it from Japan, in particular, or from the United States of America we will finish up with a system in industry and a set of values in respect of many of the occupational and social tasks we undertake in this country which is based upon other people's cultural values.

I can well imagine that the member for Gascoyne will also snigger at the defence implications. By the turn of the next decade this country's defence system, like the defence system of any sophisticated industrial society, will be

predominantly electronic. Therefore, for strategic reasons we should be developing our own computer capability.

I would like to quote for the House the views of a couple of rather significant Australians to help establish the credibility of my argument in this respect. I have become so accustomed to people like the member for Gascoyne scoffing at the significance of this issue.

In *Inside Canberra* on the 10th June, 1977, an article appeared which commented on a rather important Defence Committee report, and I quote—

An interim report to the Australian Parliament by a seven member sub-committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence, voiced strong concern about the contraction of the electronics industry. Evidence placed before the committee showed that by April 1978 the industries workforce had fallen by 13 000 in a little more than 3 years, to 27 000. Some 1 700 were Engineers, Technicians and skilled tradesmen. The committee concluded that the electronics industry was in such a poor state that it was not able to perform even a range of tasks seen by the Defence Department as the minimum necessary. It recommended urgent action by the government to change this situation.

This relates to the point I want to emphasise. As we go into the 1980s, for strategic reasons alone Governments cannot afford to ignore the importance of developing an Australian electronics industry.

In *The Australian* of the 16th October, 1978, Mr A. T. Degan, the Chairman of the Australian Telecommunications Development Associations, is reported as saying—

Australia has not scratched the surface of vital defence, electronic and telecommunications technologies. Development of the electronics and telecommunications industry was vital if Australia was to be able to support modern electronic warfare in all its aspects—how to detect signals from radar, communications or guidance systems on weapons and what to do about them. These are systems technologies rather than hardware technologies but they must be supported by sophisticated hardware.

An adequate number of warnings has been issued in respect of this particular subject. It is a tragic irony that at the very time that Governments around the world are encouraging their local

electronics industries in the development, manufacture, and applications of microelectronics, our industry is languishing. Governments at both national and State level refuse to recognise the significance of the industry and its needs. The member for Gascoyne would be quite happy to see satellites being popped up and buzzing around instead of encouraging an Australian electronics industry. If we do nothing about it and adopt that attitude, we will become the sellers, installers, operators, and maintainers of other people's technology.

A very significant American by the name of Charles Lecht, who has been employed by Governments throughout Europe as well as the Americas to advise them on development and the forms of encouragement necessary for electronics industries, was in Australia on a lecture tour in 1978. On the 2nd October *The Australian Financial Review* reproduced a very significant part of his comment to all Australians on the need for a local electronics industry. This man happens to be one of the world's leading authorities in this area and I would like to commit his warning to the record, sincerely hoping the Minister will take some note of it. He said—

It is crucial for countries like Australia to have a growing independence and self-capability in computers.

This was largely because computers would become absolutely crucial to corporate and Government operations in the 1980's.

Access to parts, components and proper service for the machines would be instrumental in keeping the machines running, which in turn, would keep the economies running. He forecast that some nations stood to have their computer supplies cut off as multinational corporate and national battles evolved during the next decade.

Problems here could vary from a small situation when a tiny company used a mini-computer or terminal to a host of crucial operational tasks such as sales analysis and information monitoring.

Should its computer malfunction, and should it be unable to acquire needed parts or support services to get the system going again, the company would suffer or "go broke". At the other extreme, a country's defence would depend on sophisticated systems such as radar control, or missile direction apparatus.

Without question we will face a very grave situation at the end of the decade if we neglect

the need to encourage and develop an electronics industry in our State or in our nation.

Those people who are so terribly concerned about our ability to produce and sustain an electronics industry should recall that, except for Silicon Valley in California, the principal silicon manufacturing plants in the United States are in the rural mid-west. The manufacturing of what are termed the high technological parts associated with the computer industry involves very small components. The costs of transportation over large distances do not really disadvantage rural or comparatively isolated communities. It would be possible to establish a significant electronics industry in Western Australia.

Governments can act in a number of ways to encourage the development of the electronics industry. I would like to be quite positively constructive in my suggestions to the House and I hope the Minister will give some thought to this question. The rest of the world has left us a long way behind in recognising the crucial importance of the electronics industry, and in developing the strategies necessary to get such an industry off the ground. I will refer to some of the things that State and Federal Governments can, and in my opinion, should do to fill this vacuum. Such actions have been taken in other parts of the world and they can be taken here.

Special tax concessions could be given to the electronics industry—company tax concessions if necessary from the Federal Government, and payroll tax concessions if necessary from the State Government. This has been done, particularly in Japan.

The Minister for Industrial Development will appreciate that a Government's purchasing power as a customer of computer technology is a very significant factor indeed. It would be a simple matter for our national and State Governments to give preference to locally manufactured computer equipment. This is not a new idea; it has been followed for some years in the United States of America. NASA operated on the system of issuing very strict instructions to purchase computer equipment marked, "American made" only, and of course, that idea has had a very encouraging effect on the local manufacturers.

The very fact that the Government buys equipment can aid and abet the sale of that equipment, by reference, to the private sector. Its effect can be very significant indeed.

If Governments have the determination and commitment to act in such a way they could. They should be encouraging joint ventures, encouraging public and private capital if

necessary. Of course, arguments will develop between the respective Governments of the day concerning the degree of public involvement, but let me say simply that these joint ventures ought to be established on a financial and technological basis because in this country we need both the finance and the technology.

Such ideas have been put into practice in Sicily, Belgium, and Ireland—of all places. Joint ventures have been established to develop chip manufacturing plants in those countries. If such a scheme can be successful in those very small countries, it proves that we can do it here—if we have the will.

I have a fourth suggestion to put forward to the Minister. We should give serious consideration to the setting up of an innovations fund, for the development of brilliant ideas. Innovations play a key role in the advancement of the electronics industry. People who are capable of developing those ideas should be encouraged; at the present time they are not.

There is a need for such a fund. Governments, at both State and national level, should be doing their bit to prevail upon the banking industry to change its very conservative, very outmoded attitude to risk capital. This attitude is a carryover from the 1930s and 1940s.

In this country risk capital is a long-term typical problem. The conservatism, the niggardliness, which so often appears in so many parts of the established banking industry is leaving us for dead by comparison with the Asian banking system, and certainly the European banking system. It is possible in those places to come by risk capital.

At this stage I feel obliged to point out to the House an example of this type of thinking. A few months ago, when I visited Sydney, I witnessed a programme in which a young Australian was receiving a national award for a design of the year. He had developed a particularly innovative type of computer technology. Having received the award, this young Australian made a speech. He thanked his wife and family, his colleagues at the University of Sydney, a whole range of other people—and, here comes the rub—at the end he thanked a New Zealand bank. He had hawked his brilliant idea to all the financial institutions of this country but he could not obtain the finance he needed for his idea to grow from its vital backyard beginning. When he received his first \$0.5 million order he could raise only \$40 000 to \$50 000 from the Australian banking institutions; in other words, what amounted to the the balance of his mortgage.

This is another example of the endless demonstrations that it is not very easy to come by high risk capital in this country. Governments have a responsibility to lead, and to help to change those attitudes.

It is time for the Government to undertake a thorough analysis of the existing electronics industry in Western Australia. It should identify those aspects of the industry which it could encourage in the reasonably short term, the medium term, and the long term, by way of different programmes and forms of assistance.

As my time is drawing to an end, I would like to touch briefly on the need to change attitudes; the need for Governments to accept a new role in helping to change attitudes in respect of the universities. Governments must co-ordinate the available expertise, and they must make available to the industry the brain power and the skills available in the universities.

We have an embryonic electronics industry and the Government should take a leading role to encourage the universities and the industry to co-operate. We happen to have in this State universities set up in the Oxford and Cambridge mould and these universities have not properly recognised their responsibilities to be part of the application of technology and higher training to

society in general. We cannot afford that luxurious position any longer.

The Government should step right into the middle of this issue; it must play its role in changing the attitude of the finance industry so that money is made available to encourage universities and other institutions of higher learning to make available the skill and knowledge they possess to other industries on a reciprocal basis.

Mr Mensaros: All you are saying is very nice, but 100 per cent of what you are saying has been done and is being done.

Mr BRYCE: If that is in fact the case, all the Minister need do is to provide us with a pen picture of what the Government has done. However, when he answered my question only a few days ago the reality is that he did not do that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Clarko): Order! The member's time has expired.

Mr Laurance: If the ALP accepts any of what you have been saying as policy, it will be the best thing it has done for a long time.

Mr Skidmore: Why don't you put a sock in it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr McPharlin.

*House adjourned at 5.29 p.m.*

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### PORT: FREMANTLE PORT AUTHORITY

##### *Officers and Pilots*

1812. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it a fact that 48 senior Government officers employed by the Fremantle Port Authority and 10 pilots also employed by the Fremantle Port Authority have been denied a 35-hour week, payment of accumulated sick leave on retirement, and a 25% annual leave loading, which the other 95% or so of the Fremantle Port Authority's work force has been granted?
- (2) Why are these conditions being denied these employees whilst others alongside whom they work enjoy those conditions?
- (3) Is it a fact that these people are "missing out" because they have accepted promotion and that others have refused promotion for that reason?
- (4) Is it a fact that he, in a letter, quoted from section 11(1a) of the Public Service Arbitration Act which he claimed prevented him from granting the improved conditions?
- (5) Is it not a fact that that part of the Act is irrelevant because the request is not being made of the Public Service Arbitrator but of the Government?
- (6) Why did he say in his letter of the 2nd October to Mr K. Campbell that he did not intend to elaborate on the number of "very good reasons" why the conditions could not be granted to the few still denied them?
- (7) Will he grant the courtesy to the Parliament by elaborating now on those reasons?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) These officers are "Government officers" and are subject to the Public Service Arbitration Act.

Mr. B. T. Burke: How can we know what you are doing wrong if we cannot hear you?

Mr Bryce: Give the man a megaphone.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order!

Mr B. T. Burke: Speak up, mumbles.

Mr RUSHTON: To continue—

The "Government officers" employed by the authority have a long established nexus with "Government officers" employed under the Public Service Act in respect of salaries and conditions of service. There is uniformity in conditions of service for all "Government officers" subject to the Public Service Arbitration Act.

It is Government policy that one small sectional group of "Government officers" should not be treated on an industry-type basis and placed in an advantageous position to all other "Government officers".

Mr B. T. Burke: You can sit down now.

Mr RUSHTON: To continue—

- (3) No.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Section 11(1a) of the Public Service Arbitration Act is relevant as it is consistent with the Government's view that there should be uniformity in conditions of service for all "Government officers" subject to the Public Service Arbitration Act.
- (6) It was not considered necessary as this matter had been raised on a number of occasions since 1974 and the reasons conveyed in writing to the Civil Service Association.
- (7) Answered by (2).

The ACTING SPEAKER: Before proceeding to further questions, I want to remind the House that the interjections during that question should not be a part of the procedure of the House. The noise that the Opposition was making, in my opinion, was the only thing preventing it from hearing the Minister.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr B. T. Burke: Are you bucking for the Cabinet?

#### HOSPITAL: SWAN DISTRICTS

##### *Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Union Award*

1842. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is it fact that the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Union of Workers of WA wrote to the Chairman

of the Public Service Board on the 6th July, 1979 complaining that incorrect information re award conditions of workers employed in the medical services were being circulated amongst public health institutions?

- (2) Will he take steps to ensure that information relevant to Government workers' award conditions sent out by the Public Service Board is correct, and thus avoid industrial confrontation between workers and employers?

Mr O'Neil (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

- (1) Yes.

Mr B. T. Burke: That is much better. Here is a member who tries.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'NEIL: To continue—

- (2) This matter has been raised with the Public Service Board.

Mr B. T. Burke: See how he throws his voice!

Mr O'NEIL: To continue—

The board has modified its system of preparing the many circulars to Government departments and authorities in respect of award variations to provide for a more detailed checking of the information contained in them.

Mr B. T. Burke: Delivery good; content poor!

available for off-road vehicles in the Shires of Gingin, Kwinana, Mandurah, Rockingham, and Swan.

Outside the area to which the Act applies there is obviously no restriction under the Act; but the use of off-road vehicles is still subject to any other legislative controls that may operate in the particular location.

MR C. T. MOLL

*Case: Police Action*

1844. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Further to his answer to question 1805 of the 16th October, 1979 why are the State police continuing to keep a close watch in the—Moll-doctors and others—case?
- (2) (a) Has the State police yet received a complaint concerning this case;  
(b) if "Yes", when?
- (3) What State laws does it appear to the police may have been broken in the—Moll-doctors and others—case?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) In case a breach of State criminal law is disclosed.
- (2) (a) and (b) No.
- (3) None at this time.

## TRAFFIC: OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

### *Permitted Areas*

1843. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Local Government:

As at the 16th October, 1979, where can off-road vehicles be driven within 500 kilometres of Perth?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

The Control of Vehicles (Off-road areas) Act applies to only part of the area mentioned in the question.

As at the 16th October, within the area to which the Act applies, off-road vehicles could be used only on private land where the owner or occupier has given prior consent. However, from the 19th October permitted areas will be

## EDUCATION: UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

### *Guild Council President*

1845. Mr CLARKO, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Did the President of the Guild Council of the University of Western Australia, Mr Ken Strahan, recently travel to Canberra seeking a visa to allow him to visit South Africa?
- (2) (a) What was the cost of this trip; and  
(b) who paid for the expenses of the journey?
- (3) Was the journey funded from moneys which are compulsorily collected from students at the University of Western Australia and are called "amenities and services fees"?

- (4) Is it intended to finance Mr Strahan's proposed visit to South Africa from the same funds?
- (5) Does his department support trips, such as those mentioned, being funded from compulsory student fees?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) I am advised that Mr Strahan did not recently travel to Canberra seeking a visa. Mr Strahan was last in Canberra as a delegate of the University of WA Senate to attend the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee Conference of University Governing Bodies. Conference fares and accommodation costs were met by the Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee.
- (2) (a) Economy class return air fare to Canberra, plus subsistence for two days.  
(b) The Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee.
- (3) The journey was not funded from amenities and services fees.
- (4) I understand that Mr Strahan has no plans to visit South Africa at this time. Should Mr Strahan intend to visit South Africa in the future, amenities and services fees would not be used to finance his trip.
- (5) No.

Mr Pearce: Bad luck!

Mr B. T. Burke: Mr Inaccuracy from Karrinyup!

#### WATER SUPPLIES: RATES

##### *Rebates: Pensioners*

1846. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How many pensioners whose property is on a "purple title" and who previously enjoyed the 25 per cent rebate have paid their current rates in full?
- (2) Will a rebate be made once the matter has been remedied by legislation?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) Any of these pensioners who qualify under the amending legislation will be granted deferment/rebate. If the account has been paid in full, refund of the rebated account will be granted on proof of payment, or credited against future accounts, in accordance with the pensioners' wishes.

Mr Tonkin: Give elocution lessons to the Minister for Transport.

#### RAILWAYS

##### *Wheat, Iron Ore, Bauxite, and Alumina*

1847. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the average cost expressed in cents per tonne/kilometre of transporting wheat by rail from Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited country facilities to port terminals?
- (2) What is the cost expressed in the same terms of transporting iron ore from Koolyanobbing to Kwinana?
- (3) Similarly, what is the cost of transporting bauxite and alumina to Kwinana?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Because there is no unique pattern to the haulage of wheat, this information is not available.
- (2) and (3) These commodities are subject to specific commercial agreements and therefore cost information is confidential.

Mr Barnett: Speak up!

#### TRANSPORT: WOOL

##### *Farmers' Vehicles*

1848. Mr COWAN to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In what areas of Western Australia are farmers able to transport their own wool?
- (2) What is the procedure that must be followed by farmers in these areas if they do wish to cart their own wool without prosecution?
- (3) Can transport operators cart wool in any area of Western Australia?



Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) (a) Within a 50 km radius of the GPO Perth

Within an 80 km radius of Albany

Within the Esperance area

Within a 60 km radius of the railway station at Kalgoorlie

Within the North-eastern and Kimberley area

Within the Meekatharra-Wiluna area

Within the Leonora-Laverton area

From the Darling Range-Wandering area to Perth

From the Badgingarra area to Perth

From the Eneabba area to Perth (provided the property is not situated within 35 km of the Perth-Geraldton railway)

From the West Dandaragan area to Perth

From the Boddington-Quindanning area to Perth

From the Regan's Ford area to Perth

From the Bindoon-Chittering area to Perth

From the Swan-Guildford-Wanneroo area to Perth

From the South Stirling area to Albany

From the Esperance area to Albany

From the Denbarker-Lake Muir area to Albany

From the Nyabing-Pingrup area to Albany or Katanning

From the Borden-Jerramungup area to Albany or Gnowangerup

From the Yuna area to Geraldton

From the Eneabba area to Geraldton

From the Northampton area to Geraldton

Between a farm and the nearest town or railway siding or railway station

- (b) From any area north of the 26° of south latitude to Perth.

From the Murchison area to Perth

From the Coolup area to Perth

From the area situated between the townsites of Northam, York, Toodyay, Pinjarra to Perth.

Within a 65 km radius of major ports.

- (2) (a) For areas shown in answer (1)(a), no permit or licence is required provided the farmer is transporting his own wool in his own farm vehicles.

- (b) For areas shown in answer (1)(b), a permit or licence must be approved prior to the commencement of the journey.

- (3) Yes, provided appropriate permit or licence has been approved.

## TRANSPORT: ROAD

### *Grain*

1849. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What quantity of—

(a) wheat;

(b) barley;

(c) oats,

is transported to Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited port installations by road?

- (2) What amount of this grain comes—

(a) from CBH inland receival points;

(b) directly from farms?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

Based on reports up to the 15th October, 1979 for the 1978-79 season—

- (1) (a) to (c) 1 065 000 tonnes.

- (2) (a) 319 000 tonnes;

(b) 746 000 tonnes.

## EDUCATION: SCHOOLS

### *Millen and Victoria Park*

1850. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Have arrangements yet been finalised for the provision of pre-primary centres at Millen and Victoria Park schools?

- (2) If so, will he give details?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) A conversion of existing accommodation is being undertaken at each school.

## TRANSPORT: AIR FARES

### *Interstate*

1851. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Further to question 1780 of 1979 concerning concessional air fares on interstate routes, will he ascertain from the Federal Minister for Transport whether he has approved any concessional fares, single or return, for interstate air travel in conjunction with a sea journey?
- (2) If "Yes", will he advise me of the details when they become available?
- (3) If "No" to (1), why not?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.

## EDUCATION: SCHOOLS

### *Library Aides*

1852. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Further to question 1651 of 1979 relevant to library facilities at primary schools, what is the cut-off point in respect of the entitlement of a primary school to the services of a library aide?
- (2) Is the same cut off point applicable to all primary schools in the metropolitan area? If not, which schools are exempt and why?
- (3) What are the estimated number of enrolments for next year at each of the following schools—
  - (a) Carawatha Primary School;
  - (b) Willagee Primary School;
  - (c) Palmyra Primary School;
  - (d) Bicton Primary School;
  - (e) Melville Primary School;
  - (f) Booragoon Primary School;
  - (g) Hilton Primary School;

and which of the abovementioned schools will still have the services of a library aide?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) A library aide is appointed in a primary school when its enrolment reaches 275 pupils.

- (2) This policy applies to all appointments made since 1977, but positions filled prior to that, or made to declared disadvantaged schools, have been continued at the old scale of entitlement. Schools in the metropolitan area covered by the old scale are:—

#### Disadvantaged Schools:

Bellevue  
Hamilton Hill  
Koongamia  
Leederville  
North Fremantle  
North Perth  
Rivervale

#### Other Schools:

Bateman  
Belmont  
Birralee  
Booragoon  
East Claremont  
Floreat Park  
Hollywood  
Jolimont  
Rosalie  
Shelley  
West Leederville

When these schools are no longer declared disadvantaged schools or when a new appointment is needed following a retirement or resignation, the next appointment will be according to the new scale.

- (3) Carawatha Primary School—200  
Willagee Primary School—260 + 47 pre-primary  
Palmyra Primary School—286 + 42 pre-primary  
Bicton Primary School—302 + 25 pre-primary  
Melville Primary School—350  
Booragoon Primary School—195 + 44 pre-primary  
Hilton Primary School—370 + 32 pre-primary  
Willagee, Palmyra, Bicton, Melville, Booragoon and Hilton Primary Schools will have library aides in 1980.

## ROAD: BEECHBORO-GOSNELLS FREEWAY

### *Orange Grove School*

1853. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) In view of the concern by parents that the Gosnells-Beechboro Freeway is

possibly going through the Orange Grove Primary School playground, is this so?

- (2) If "Yes", what consideration has been given to the safety of the children attending this school?
- (3) Has consideration been given to providing an alternative school and playground?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No. However, the freeway reserve has been used for play purposes.
- (2) The road reserve will be fenced.
- (3) and (4) The new East Kenwick Primary School, located in Kenwick Road between Brixton Street and Belmont Road, Kenwick, will open for the 1980 school year.

This new school will cater for primary-aged children who live in the Kenwick and Orange Grove (western parts) area.

Once the Gosnells-Beechboro freeway is established, a decision can be made, in conjunction with the wishes of the local parents, on the future of the Orange Grove Primary School.

The recently constructed school buildings are to performance specifications and such design and construction facilities can be relocated.

## BEEKEEPING

### *Sac Brood Disease*

1854. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Have there been any outbreaks of sac brood disease in Western Australia?
- (2) If "Yes":
  - (a) how many outbreaks have been recorded and in what areas;
  - (b) how many hives have been involved;
  - (c) are there any quarantine regulations governing this disease, and if so, what are these?

Mr P. V. Jones (for Mr OLD) replied:

- (1) and (2) Limited surveys suggest that the causal virus of sac brood disease is widespread. Production loss is generally minimal and most hives appear to recover with no after effects. However, a few hives in some apiaries may be severely affected.

In view of these circumstances it has not been considered appropriate to apply quarantine restrictions. However, beekeepers are being urged to carry out strict apiary hygiene to prevent the build up of virus.

## BEEKEEPING: HONEY

### *Imports: Restrictions*

1855. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) (a) Is it now possible for honey and honey products to be imported into Western Australia from the Eastern States; and
  - (b) if so, since when have the restrictions been eased?
- (2) (a) If "Yes" to (1), are there any conditions and requirements which are prerequisites to such importations;
  - (b) if so, what are these?

Mr P. V. Jones (for Mr OLD) replied:

- (1) and (2) There has been no change in the restrictions applicable to the introduction of honey. Honey can be introduced from Tasmania only subject to appropriate freedom from disease certification. However, small quantities of honey for personal use, trade samples or scientific purposes may be introduced provided they comply with the regulation covering such introductions. The conditions under which small quantities of honey may be introduced and the matter of permitting honey to be introduced which has been effectively pasteurised are currently being examined by my department.

## INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION BILL

### *Strikes: Secret Ballot*

1856. Mr HASSELL, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Under the Industrial Arbitration Bill, if a strike is proposed, and if the proponents desire it be lawful, and

therefore seek a secret ballot first, will the Industrial Commission then have a discretion as to whether or not the ballot be taken?

- (2) (a) Will the proposal for a secret ballot need to be referred to the commission;  
 (b) if so, for what purpose; and  
 (c) what will be the role of the commission?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes, however in the event of the proponents seeking a ballot it is most unlikely that the commission would refuse the request.
- (2) (a) Yes, in order to avoid the strike being illegal; however, once referred the commission has the discretion as to whether the ballot is to be held;  
 (b) to avoid having an illegal strike; and  
 (c) to decide whether a ballot should be held, and to order the ballot. Notwithstanding that a vote may support a strike, the commission can still give directions and make orders under sections 44 and 45.

#### FAMILY COURT ACT AMENDMENT AND ACTS REPEAL BILL

##### *Present Law*

1857. Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Attorney-General:

What are the various provisions of the Family Court Act Amendment and Acts Repeal Bill which have not already been agreed to and form part of the present law?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

Clause 4 in so far as the clause relates to the Collector of Maintenance.

Clauses 8 and 26 dealing with provisions to enable the registrar to concurrently exercise powers of a stipendiary magistrate.

Clause 13 in so far as the clause enables the court to exercise the powers of a Children's Court when a child appears to be in need of care and protection and

includes giving the right to the Director of Community Welfare to intervene where appropriate.

Other provisions of the Bill relating to the welfare of children generally have been redrafted to follow the text of the Family Law Act, 1975, of the Commonwealth, to ensure that ex-nuptial children will be subject to the same considerations as a child of a marriage. These provisions include those contained in the Acts which will be repealed by this legislation.

#### RAILWAYS: NARROW GAUGE

##### *Closure*

1858. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to close any narrow gauge railway lines in Western Australia?
- (2) Is there any recommendation in the Southern Western Australia Transport Study report to close any railway line or reduce rail services in any part of Western Australia within the next three years?
- (3) If "Yes" to either question, can he provide details of any recommended or proposed closure or reduction of services?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) The Government has no proposals or recommendations before it.
- (2) The SWATS report has indicated that, under competitive policy, eight railway lines—

Katanning-Nyabing  
 Wonnerup-Nannup  
 Manjimup-Northcliffe  
 Tambellup-Gnowangerup  
 Donnybrook-Katanning  
 Lake Grace-Newdegate  
 Bowelling-Wagin  
 Pinjarra-Dwellingup

might not justify retention on economic grounds.

- (3) The SWATS results were indicative only. In-depth economic analysis is required before any recommendation for line closure can be made.

## RAILWAYS

### *Collie*

1859. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) When will a new shunter's cabin be constructed at the Collie marshalling yards?
- (2) When is it intended to shift the Collie goods shed from its present site to the West Collie area?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Construction of the new shunter's cabin is expected to be undertaken during the current financial year.
- (2) Provision of a new goods shed building at West Collie is anticipated in 1981-82 and construction will be subject to availability of funds at that time.

## POLICE AND ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

### *Trunk Telephone Calls*

1860. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Is it fact that trunk calls made at police stations have to be recorded but trunk calls made at the Road Traffic Authority centres do not have to be recorded?
- (2) If "Yes", will he advise the reasons for the different policies?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A system of recording of telephone trunk line calls has been in operation in the Police Department for many years. In view of the introduction of subscriber trunk dialling, a system of recording was not introduced by the Department of Motor Vehicles or the Road Traffic Authority. Where considered necessary, control is exercised by trunk barring of extensions. It is now proposed to institute a system of recording similar to that of the Police Department.

## EDUCATION: SCHOOL

### *Amaroo*

1861. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Education:

What is the \$30 000 allocated in the Estimates for the Amaroo school, Collie, provided for?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

The \$30 000 is a carry-over commitment from major works undertaken in the previous financial year.

## NOXIOUS WEEDS

### *Skeleton Weed Eradication Fund*

1862. Mr COWAN, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Will the Government give an assurance that administration of the Skeleton Weed (Eradication Fund) levy will remain the responsibility of the Agriculture Protection Board?
- (2) Are there any plans to alter or restructure the Agriculture Protection Board so that the board is placed under direct control by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr P. V. Jones (for Mr OLD) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

## PAY-ROLL TAX

### *Civil Service Association Submission*

1863. Mr McPHARLIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware of the Civil Service Association of WA (Inc.) submission to the committee of inquiry into technological change in Australia?
- (2) If so, is the Government prepared to act on the association's assertion that pay-roll tax is an anachronism and should be discarded?

Mr O'Neil (for Sir CHARLES COURT) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The association's assertion is not new, as many have expressed the same view.

The honourable member knows my often stated views and my criticism of pay-roll tax.

He also knows the reasons that pay-roll tax cannot be abandoned by the States unless the Commonwealth is prepared to provide replacement income through an adjustment of the method of tax sharing with the States.

I shall continue to press the issue.

In the meantime, it is important that the honourable member, and others in the State Parliament, appreciate the reasons for the tax and why there is no easy way of abolishing it or reducing it in a major way without a change of attitude at the Commonwealth level.

### POLICE AND ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

*Mt. Barker*

1864. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Further to question 1721 of the 10th October, 1979 relevant to police duty, of the vehicles available were the two cars Road Traffic Authority vehicles?
- (2) With regard to the vehicle normally stationed at Tambellup referred to in part (3), was it a van or a Road Traffic Authority vehicle?
- (3) On the night of the 31st August, how many vehicles were on duty in Tambellup and how many police were on duty?
- (4) How often are Tambellup vehicles used to carry out duties in Mt. Barker?
- (5) On the night of the 31st August, 1979 was there a breathalyser unit in Mt. Barker?
- (6) If "No" to (5), where was the closest point at which one was available?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A Road Traffic Authority vehicle.
- (3) One van and one Road Traffic Authority vehicle; one patrolman and the officer in charge of the station on call.
- (4) As and when required.
- (5) No.
- (6) Albany.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE HOUSING

*Rural Housing Authority*

1. Mr RIDGE (Minister for Housing):

I seek permission to correct an answer I gave to question 1772 on the 11th October. The question asked by the member for Karrinyup was—

During the last financial year, what was the total sum of money that was approved by the Rural Housing Authority as loans for rural housing?

The answer given was "\$1.453 million". Unfortunately, that was incorrect inasmuch as I gave a progressive figure. The correct reply is that approvals for the financial year under section 16 amounted to \$276 256; under section 18 the figure was \$700 000, the total being \$976 256.

### CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

*Bauxite Mining: Darling Range*

2. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Has the Minister seen the article in today's issue of the *Daily News* headed "Bauxite go-ahead queried", reportedly by a powerful Federal parliamentary committee?
- (2) What participation has the Western Australian Department of Environmental Protection had in this area?
- (3) Does the Minister accept the censure?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The Department of Environmental Protection was involved in the environmental report and management programme and from discussions which I had today with the director of the department, it would seem the department is not unhappy with the result. There was a two-month delay placed on the ERMP in order to receive public or other views.

- (2) A specialist committee was set up comprising two members from the CSIRO, one from the works and water supply, one from the university, one from the Museum Board, and one from the Forests Department. These are all considered to be experts in their field, specialising in salinity and other matters. In view of the fact a specialist group made investigations, the ERMP was displayed for two months for public comment.

The technical advisory group reported on the importance of reducing unemployment and improving export income. Apparently that was not considered in the report we received. At a glance, I fail to see how anyone could say we have failed to do everything necessary in this regard. One does wonder—and I see the member for Kalgoorlie was involved—what the report would have been like had the area of involvement been in that particular member's electorate.

The comment that there has been considerable criticism was not qualified by many people. I wonder how many were involved with this criticism.

The report referred to the Conservation Council of WA and people should realise this is not the Department of Conservation and the Environment, but a totally outside body.

The statement was made in the article that farming had a greater impact than bauxite mining with respect to salinity; but too little notice was given to the number of people involved working in this particular area.

- (3) I reject the criticism of the department with respect to the following through of these matters in Western Australia. My department is quite happy with what was done and with the time given to people to report back on the ERMP and make any comment.

## JANDAKOT WILDLIFE SANCTUARY

### *Government Aid*

3. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

In view of the reported difficulty being faced by the owner of the Jandakot sanctuary, would the Minister consider

the possibility of giving aid to the owner to keep the sanctuary operating, or, alternatively, consider taking over the sanctuary to provide a suitable environment for the treatment of sick and injured fauna?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Although I had no notice of this question, I have in fact discussed the matter this morning with the Department of Environmental Protection. Apart from other matters, it is that department's responsibility to make sure such areas are attractive for tourists and to ensure the animals in sanctuaries are properly protected and looked after.

In the past there has been a great deal of discussion with the individual concerned. I believe there has not been one instance but several where action could have been taken. The department has had a great deal of contact with the man involved and the action it is taking is appropriate and in the interests of the animals generally.

## STATE FINANCE: SHORT-TERM INTEREST TRANSACTIONS

### *Secrecy*

4. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Deputy Premier:

My question concerns the secrecy which apparently cloaks many of the Government's activities.

I ask the Deputy Premier when this House can expect to receive some straightforward answers and information about the way in which this Government is investing money in the short-term money market?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

As I am not the Treasurer, I suggest the member put the question on notice and direct it to the Treasurer.

## EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

*Teachers' Aides*

5. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that teachers' aides previously employed by the Pre-School Board are currently paid wages in excess of those prescribed for aides in the Teachers' Aides Board?
- (2) How does the department propose to make the wages of these aides comply with the teachers' aides award?
- (3) Will this represent a reduction of wage rates for these aides?
- (4) Will not this process encourage the employment of untrained aides rather than trained aides, because of the possible and apparent reduction in real wage rates for these employees?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (4) The answer to the last part of the question is "No." With the supply of people who are available it ought to be obvious such a situation will not in fact occur.

I am increasingly becoming concerned about the very misleading assertions being made and presented to parents regarding this matter, particularly by some of the people associated with it. As the member must acknowledge, I have given him some information already, but not all of it, because he has not asked me for it specifically. I provided the member with some information the other day which included the difference between the staff provided for 36-children groups and that provided for 25-children groups.

I would be happy to answer the question if the member puts it on notice on

Tuesday or, if he prefers, I am prepared to give him the answer by letter. However, I would prefer to give him a studied answer.

In the process I should like to make public the very misleading assertions which are being made in relation to this matter. For example, the assertion has been made that there will be no trained person in a centre which has 25 children. I received a letter to this effect a couple of days ago. The children were told by their teacher that there would be no trained teacher in a centre which has 25 children. The member has received information from me, so he knows that is not the correct situation.

## MINING

*State Battery: Marvel Loch*

6. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the Minister been informed that the Marvel Loch mine is to be reopened?
- (2) If so, what is the date on which it is likely to be reopened?
- (3) What is the expected capital expenditure associated with the re-opening?
- (4) How many men are likely to be employed?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) to (4) No official information is available, because that is not required under the provisions of the Mining Act. I have received unofficial information which included the company's report which was reported widely in the Press. I cannot give the member the figures involved offhand, but he has access to the information contained in the company's report.