

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 15 October 1980

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

## TOWN PLANNING

### *Institutions for Intellectually Handicapped: Petition*

MR CRANE (Moore) [2.17 p.m.]: I have a petition which reads as follows—

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled:

We, the undersigned residents in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will amend the Town Planning Regulations, 1967, of the Town Planning and Development Act 1928-1975 so as to allow the intellectually handicapped of this State to live in the Community on the same conditions as their more fortunate fellow citizens.

We believe that it is fundamentally and morally wrong that a house in which the intellectually handicapped live should be automatically classed as an institution, and that re-zoning is subsequently required to allow the intellectually handicapped to live in a residential area.

We also believe that the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning should as soon as possible take action to amend the definition of "Institutional Building" as contained in the above mentioned Regulations, and to add other such definitions of houses as may be required to allow small groups of intellectually handicapped people to live as family units within the community without having to obtain special permission to do so.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that you will give this matter earnest consideration and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

The petition bears 55 signatures, and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 27.)

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION

### *Incapacitated Persons: Grievance*

MR T. H. JONES (Collie) [2.21 p.m.]: Members of the House are aware that initially the Workers' Compensation Act was introduced so that workers who were off work due to injuries sustained at work could receive certain payments in lieu of their wages.

My complaint today is about the way in which the Government is using section 12B of the Workers' Compensation Act, and I would like to refer to the case of a worker who lives at Yarloop—a constituent of the member for Wellington.

This man was employed by the Public Works Department at Harvey for over 30 years. He suffered a heart attack at work, and initially the State Government Insurance Office declined to accept liability. This man approached me, as a friend, about his problem. After a great deal of argument and many specialist consultations, the SGIO admitted liability.

Mr Tonkin: Did he not think he would get a fair go from his own member?

MR T. H. JONES: I do not know about that. In the beginning he was paid workers' compensation of \$197.30 a fortnight. The SGIO then referred him to an independent specialist and that doctor's assessment was that he was fit for light work. Under the provisions of section 12B of the Workers' Compensation Act, the SGIO indicated it would reduce his payments from \$197.30 to \$65 a fortnight.

Of course, section 12B of the Act contains the right of appeal. The worker came to see me when he received the notification, and I wrote to the Minister for Works asking that the worker be given a light job in the Harvey district. The request I made on behalf of the worker was declined by the Minister, who informed me no light work was available for the man concerned—and this after he had given 30 years' service to the Public Works Department in Harvey.

Mr O'Connor: How old is the person?

MR T. H. JONES: He is in his late 50s. I then got in touch with Mr Joe Isherwood of the Australian Workers' Union. Members must appreciate that many members of that union come to me because the union has no full-time executives in the area. Mr Joe Isherwood knew I was handling the case on behalf of his member, and after I received notification that the person's

workers' compensation payments would be reduced, I got in touch with Mr Isherwood because he is the compensation officer for the Australian Workers' Union in Western Australia.

Mr Isherwood rang an official of the Public Works Department who informed him that it was departmental policy not to employ workers who were incapacitated to that extent. Mr Isherwood told me this policy is adopted also by the Mental Health Services, and that he experienced trouble in respect of a person in that area of work. He said also it is common within the State Energy Commission of Western Australia.

My complaint is that it is all very well to place a condition in the Workers' Compensation Act in this respect, but where do incapacitated men find light work if the department concerned will not find it for them after they have given 30 years' service?

How can we blame any other employer for not employing such a person after sighting a medical certificate saying that he had a certain level of incapacity? Of course we cannot blame employers for that; and I think the Minister himself would adopt the same policy. So many active men are looking for light work that employers will not take on a chap with an incapacity of 60 per cent, 50 per cent, or even less.

The man in question has an incapacity assessed at between 20 and 25 per cent, and apparently it is Government policy not to employ such persons on light work. Mr Joe Isherwood of the Australian Workers' Union has asked me to make this statement in Parliament and to show that men who have given many years of service to Government departments are being thrown on the scrap heap if they are unfortunate enough to suffer a serious accident during their employment. They are told, "Thanks for your service, but there is no job available for you." That is a despicable and disgraceful set of circumstances.

I put it to members on the Government benches that if they were employed in a Government instrumentality and were unfortunate enough to meet with an accident—through no fault of their own; no-one wants to be injured—which left them with a certain level of incapacity, they would be most unhappy if they were told no light work would be found for them. I challenge the Minister to say this is not Government policy. I have firm information from Mr Joe Isherwood of the AWU that an officer of the Public Works Department informed him it is the policy of that department not to re-engage incapacitated men on light work. If that is the policy of the Government, all I can say is: Shame upon it.

How would any member or Minister opposite like to be in the position of the person to whom I am referring? It is all very well for the State Government Insurance Office to say "Under the provisions of section 12B we have been informed by a specialist that the worker has only a 60 per cent incapacity, so he can go somewhere else and find a light job." The problem is that light jobs are just not available. The Minister is well aware that a person must have an 85 per cent incapacity before he is eligible to qualify for an invalid pension.

Where it is found that a Government instrumentality cannot supply light work, the Government should ensure that the person concerned is returned to full workers' compensation payments. Is there anything unreasonable in that suggestion? If workers in this situation are not returned to full payments, their long service leave and other entitlements under the provisions of their awards are affected.

I put it to the Minister: How would he like to be in the position of this man? Another man went to see Mr Joe Isherwood this morning. He is a Mr Fraser who works with the water supply branch in Collie.

Mr O'Connor: Malcolm?

Mr T. H. JONES: Thank goodness, no! If he was he certainly would not come to me.

Mr Fraser is in a similar position, and it is apparent the Government is invoking this section of the Workers' Compensation Act more and more, and this is unfair to the persons concerned. I am sure the Minister knows what I am talking about; a man with say four or five children has his payments reduced from \$197 to \$65 a fortnight, and he is told to go and find light work. He is told, "You have given us 30 years' service. We don't want you now, so get a job with someone else who will take on an incapacitated worker." What a shocking set of circumstances.

I appeal to the Minister that where Government departments cannot find light work for these unfortunate persons, the provisions of section 12B of the Act should not apply to them.

Mr O'Connor: Does he not receive social service benefit?

Mr T. H. JONES: No, he does not qualify. The gentleman from Yarloop has an incapacity level of 20 to 25 per cent, and the Minister would know a person must have an incapacity of 85 per cent to qualify for an invalid pension. I appeal to the Government to let us have some decency in this situation. I wonder what the Minister would do if he was in that situation and had four children to

support; I wonder whether he would still consider this is the right way to interpret section 12B.

The Government is using this provision more than ever before, and all I am asking for is a little sanity, reasonableness, and satisfaction for a man who has given his whole working life to a Government instrumentality and who is told it is the end of the road when he suffers an incapacity in his employment.

It is shameful! That is all I can say.

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Labour and Industry) [2.30 p.m.]: I listened with interest to the comments of the member for Collie. As the Minister for Labour and Industry, and Minister in charge of the State Government Insurance Office, I do not recollect his having brought this matter back to me at all. I would have thought if he were terribly concerned about the matter, he would have followed it up.

**Mr Tonkin**: He has just done that.

**Mr O'CONNOR**: Even now he has not mentioned the man's name.

**Mr Tonkin**: He has done it in the appropriate place.

**Mr T. H. Jones**: I have raised the matter with the Minister for Works.

**Mr Tonkin**: He has done it in the Parliament. What better place could he do it?

**Mr O'CONNOR**: I mentioned that I was Minister for Labour and Industry, and Minister in charge of the SGIO and, as such, I was the Minister to whom the matter should have been referred. Had the member for Collie brought this matter to me, I would have followed it up in an endeavour to do something to help the individual concerned. The member for Collie mentioned this man had three or four children. If he were on social services, he would receive at least \$90 a week, plus other benefits.

**Mr T. H. Jones**: He does not want social services. He does not want to go on the dole. He wants to work. He has only a 20 per cent incapacity.

**Mr O'CONNOR**: I ask the member for Collie: If this man were on social services, would he not get at least \$90 a week? Of course he would; in fact, probably he would receive more.

**Mr T. H. Jones**: He does not want to go on the dole; he wants to work.

**Mr O'CONNOR**: Social service benefits are there for the benefit of the individuals involved. I ask the member for Collie to let me have the details of this case and I will follow the matter up

to see whether anything further can be done to help the person concerned.

**Mr T. H. Jones**: I have a number of similar cases, not just one. Will you look at them all?

**Mr Tonkin**: It is happening every day. It is the Government's policy.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! There are far too many interjections. I refer particularly to the member for Morley, who has interjected continually during the first minute of the Minister's reply. It is one thing for the member for Collie—who has just expressed his grievance—to interject on the Minister, and to have that interjection taken up; however, it is quite another thing for the member for Morley or any other member not directly concerned with the grievance under debate to come out with a whole series of interjections. I will not tolerate such a situation. It is not appropriate for members to indulge in a general discussion on this matter.

**Mr O'CONNOR**: I say again that I am quite happy to listen to any of these cases the member for Collie or any other member may put before me.

**Mr T. H. Jones**: We will give you plenty of cases.

**Mr O'CONNOR**: If we on this side can help individuals who are in unfortunate circumstances, we would be happy to do so.

**Mr T. H. Jones**: The Minister for Works would not do anything.

**Mr Barnett**: What has brought about this change of attitude?

**Mr O'CONNOR**: Mr Deputy Speaker, as I said last night, it is obvious that members opposite are not willing to let members on this side be heard. I appreciate that you tried to do something about this situation a moment ago. Members opposite act in a very un-Australian way by trying to prevent an individual from having a fair go and a fair say. We have seen a great deal of this practice recently.

I go on further to indicate the Government's general view regarding this matter. Last year, we appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into workers' compensation. One of the recommendations of Judge Dunne, supported by Sir George Bedbrook, the surgeon involved with quadriplegics and the like, was that legislation should be introduced to give individuals who are partially incapacitated the opportunity to occupy a portion of their time with employment, with the remainder being made up with workers' compensation. I hope that if this legislation is introduced, the member for Collie will support it.

Mr T. H. Jones: If it is progressive legislation, I will support it.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am glad to have that commitment from the member for Collie. We on this side have sympathy for people who are genuinely injured or incapacitated, or who have genuine hardships. I can assure the member for Collie that if he provides me with the details of this and other cases, I will follow them up to see whether anything can be done to help the individuals concerned.

### CONSUMER AFFAIRS: FOOD PACKAGES

#### *Date Marking: Grievance*

MR SODEMAN (Pilbara) [2.34 p.m.]: My comments this afternoon are directed to the Minister for Health. The subject I wish to discuss is the effect on consumable retail goods of the regulations relating to date marking of packaged foods. I have no doubt the regulations have been structured and promulgated with the best of intent, and that the one year lead time before enforcement is commendable.

However, this afternoon I do not wish to talk about the intent or the mechanics of the regulations. I am advised that already, similar regulations abound in New South Wales and South Australia. We are all aware that due to the imbalance of population between the Eastern States and Western Australia of something like 11.5:1, we naturally have an interstate trade imbalance between imports and exports of something like 5.5:1.

Therefore, it follows that most of our manufactured goods come from the Eastern States. At times, in the interests of uniformity and standardisation Western Australia pays dearly. I am told that in March this year, the consumer affairs authorities throughout Australia met in Canberra with representatives of the National Health and Medical Research Council in order to inject a proper perspective into some of these regulations. I am sure a great deal was achieved at that meeting.

However, I do not believe the problems confronting people in the remote areas of Western Australia have been overcome, nor do I think they have been thoroughly researched. Regulations of this nature can considerably disadvantage people in the Pilbara, Kimberley and Gascoyne. If the net gain were to be improved public health and more satisfied retail customers, the inconvenience and additional costs involved in conforming with the regulations would be worth while.

However, for the people in the remote areas of the State, the cure may be worse than the assumed illness. The Bureau of Consumer Affairs informs me it has received few, if any complaints in this State concerning the quality of consumable retail items. I believe in this instance we could have an "overkill" situation on our hands.

A good example of this happening previously is the application of vehicle engine emission controls, which were foisted on Western Australia by the Eastern States, and the impact that has had on the remote country areas of this State. Whilst on that note, it is rather disappointing to see that the New South Wales Labor Government has decided to go it alone with the next stage of emission control, regardless of the adverse impact its stance will have on country areas.

Mr Tonkin: Are you not concerned for your children's health?

Mr Hodge: Are you not worried about the lead content in the atmosphere?

Mr SODEMAN: If the member for Morley asked people in the Pilbara, Kimberley and Gascoyne about the effect vehicle emissions may have on their children, perhaps he would receive the appropriate answer.

Mr H. D. Evans: Have you asked people in Sydney?

Mr SODEMAN: I was asked by someone in the Bureau of Consumer Affairs how many consumable items were affected by these regulations. I telephoned one of the major retail proprietors in the Pilbara and asked him to provide me with an estimated list. Some of the consumable retail goods affected by regulations gazetted in this State on 16 May this year, and which will come into force in May 1981, are as follows—

- Biscuits
- Cake mixes
- Coconut
- Cornflour
- Frozen foods
- Powdered milks
- Potato chips
- Packet soups
- Bread crumbs
- Chocolate
- Coffee
- Custard powders
- Flour
- Mixed and dried fruits
- Dried vegetables
- Breakfast foods
- Confectionery
- Cordials

Cheeses  
Milks  
Pastry mixes  
Puddings

The retailer then went on to say that the effect of the regulations on the retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers would be quite major. He states as follows—

Retailers will be stocking fewer lines  
Wholesalers will be stocking fewer lines  
Manufacturers will be reducing varieties  
Retailers will be "out of stock" more often—they will not carry back-up supplies  
Cadbury have already deleted about 30 lines  
Consumers will suffer, as there will be a reduction in the choice of goods and prices will increase to cover the disposal of out of date stock.

He goes on to make the following very interesting point—

As most of our products are manufactured in the Eastern States, the time involved in transporting the goods to Perth, warehousing, holding, despatch and transport of the stock to remote areas in the State, will drastically reduce the shelf life of the respective items.

In some instances the "use by" date could coincide with the time that the item is put on the shelf. There could be no shelf life whatsoever.

One does not need to go into a great deal of detail about the effect this would have on the small corner stores. An article appeared in *Foodweek* of 8 April 1980, quoting an executive of Woolworths. I quote this, because it sums up the situation—

Date-stamping would fail to achieve its purpose unless there was better consumer education on its meaning and use, Bob Pankhurst, merchandise manager for Woolworths in Queensland, told a consumer seminar in Brisbane last week. He exemplified the case of the small town of Gove in the Northern Territory, accessible only by sea or air. "In the five years Woolworths has been the town's only supermarket, nobody thought they were eating stale food. Suddenly, because the pack says use by a certain date, they think they are. There is no room on the pack to say the date is the optimum quality period; nor is there room to say the date only applies if the product is kept in a medium temperature condition; nor to explain that, once you freeze the product, all the rules are altered and the use-by date no longer applies...."

He went on to suggest that the whole matter should be considered on a far broader base, and that perhaps consumers should ask themselves whether in 30 years, or whatever, of consumer buying they have bought something that has been bad or had weevils in it; and, on the odd occasion that they have done so, how often the retailer has refused replacement of the item.

It appears we are embarking on an exercise for the sake of standardisation and uniformity. That is good in itself if it achieves something for the betterment of this State, and particularly for the betterment of the people in remote areas.

My suggestion to the Minister for Health is that we in Western Australia, as the Government, should take a closer look at the whole matter. Perhaps the Minister, in conjunction with his colleague the Minister for Consumer Affairs, could assess the overall impact throughout the State, not only on the retailer and the retail outlets, but also on the consumers. They should consider that there will be shortages and that prices will be increased and, in short, the cost and standard of living could be adversely affected, more so in this State than in other States.

Unfortunately, the 10 minutes allocated to me does not enable me to go into greater detail. I would be happy to discuss the matter more fully with the Minister at his convenience.

**MR YOUNG** (Scarborough—Minister for Health) [2.43 p.m.]: I will be very brief in my reply to the member for Pilbara because he has raised a number of questions which certainly seem to be fairly relevant and pertinent to the question of date marking, and I do not have the answer to them at my fingertips.

I do know that the National Health and Medical Research Council, on which this State is represented, did a lot of work on the date-marking regulations; and the various Health Ministers have agreed on uniformity of legislation. That was an attempt at general protection of the consumers throughout Australia so that the person travelling from State to State would be aware of the regulations applying throughout the country. I think the point the member made about the dangers of uniformity are fairly pertinent. I can understand the problems associated with far-flung populations being miles from anywhere and having to conform with the fume emission controls on motor vehicles, because the amount of pollution from the vehicles driven in country areas would be negligible in the environment in which they live.

I point out that the regulations will not come into effect until May 1981. If there are any

unresolved problems such as those raised by the member for Pilbara, or which might be raised by other people who have a similar concern about them, I will certainly take those submissions into consideration; and amendments could be considered prior to the regulations coming into effect finally.

Therefore, I will undertake to accept the submissions of the member for Pilbara on this grievance debate, and I will report to him in due course.

## HOSPITALS

### *Royal Perth and Swan District: Grievance*

**MR SKIDMORE** (Swan) [2.45 p.m.]: Most reluctantly I send the second barrel off towards the Minister for Health. I am sure he will be able to answer me, or at least settle some of my fears in relation to the disastrous position regarding the lack of facilities at the Swan District Hospital.

I point out that if one looks at the question raised most consistently in this House by the member for Subiaco (Dr Dadour), who is surely the person qualified to make the statement that "big is not beautiful" when it refers particularly to the Sir Charles Gairdner and Royal Perth Hospitals, there is concern at the lack of facilities available to the public in the casualty sections at those hospitals. People have virtually to queue up to have a leg set, or queue up to see a doctor because of an accident. Surely we must become alarmed at the fact that no longer can either of those hospitals take care of the injuries and the accidents, and the casualty patients who seek help.

I suppose one could just look at the concrete jungle that exists with the development of Royal Perth Hospital, and which has been at a standstill for quite some time. One could lay the blame for that at the feet of the Federal Government, so one would hope that something will be done in the very near future, certainly after the Australian Government changes hands on 18 October to the betterment of the hospitals of this State.

**Mr Young:** That is five.

**Mr Blaikie:** You are being provocative.

**MR SKIDMORE:** I am not being provocative. The member can take his own political inferences from what I have said. I note the inability of the Royal Perth Hospital to cope with the very easy matter of parking for patients. If one has to take in a patient with a broken leg, or an elderly person who has suffered a fall—it might be one's mother or father, brother or sister—one has a devil of a job trying to move close to the casualty

section to deposit the patient for treatment; and when one arrives at the casualty section one pushes the patient onto the footpath and says, "Get into the casualty section as best you can with your broken leg, while I park the car." If one leaves the car, one is given a parking ticket.

That is just one example. I am not setting it up as the main reason for concern. There are more pertinent reasons than that.

I want to deal particularly with the people who live in the catchment area of the Swan District Hospital, which extends to Morley, Dianella, Lockridge, Bassendean, Guildford, Ashfield, Bayswater, cutting across into Maida Vale, Helena Valley, Swan View, right through to Swan Valley, Herne Hill, and back to Bassendean. There is no reason for our not considering the Swan District Hospital as a hospital able to cater for casualty patients.

I was informed recently that the member for Mundaring took a deputation of people who were concerned about the matter to see the Minister. That deputation included representatives of the Swan Shire, doctors from the hospital, and other interested people. I assume the deputation was regarding the Swan District Hospital. They pointed out, in a manner which I believe is quite correct and proper, that the disadvantaged people in the Swan District Hospital's catchment area were suffering from the lack of facilities for casualty patients at that hospital.

More importantly, the bed occupancy in that hospital has almost reached saturation point. The latest figure given to me by a doctor who services the hospital is that bed occupancy is running at a rate of 85 to 90 per cent. It will be seen readily that the ability to cope with anything other than normal medical cases is remote.

It is time something was done to make sure extensions to the Swan District Hospital are carried out, particularly with respect to the availability of beds and the establishment of a casualty department to take care of the catchment area I have mentioned. As I see it, there is a twofold need. We could save costs, because I believe the amount of money needed to provide sufficient beds in district hospitals is such that this proposition would far outweigh the cost of providing beds in regional hospitals.

To realise this is true, one has only to consider what is involved in the construction of monoliths such as Royal Perth Hospital where we have a multi-storied building with problems involved in providing a service to the patients and in providing lifts and stair wells which create difficulties in moving patients easily from bed to

bed or from floor to floor. However, in district hospitals, where normally there is just ground floor accommodation, things are simplified. One would not need to be a builder tendering for a job to realise the costs could be kept lower if the work involved was not such as that for the Royal Perth or Sir Charles Gairdner Hospitals, although that seems to be the great wont of the department.

The costs of medical attention in Australia have risen by 65 per cent from June 1977 to March of this year. I quoted these figures in the House the other night—they were Australian Bureau of Statistics' figures. When we consider this increase in costs, surely it is unreasonable that further costs should be loaded onto patients in the catchment area of the Swan District Hospital, and I refer to costs such as travelling expenses.

If an ambulance is needed a charge of \$50 is involved. If one is a member of the St. John Ambulance Association it costs something like 87c a kilometre. In a recent letter I received, an example was given indicating that if a person had an accident in front of the GPO and was taken by St. John Ambulance to the Royal Perth Hospital, it would cost \$52.85.

If a casualty department were to be built at the Swan District Hospital there would be less distance for many people to travel, and it would save overcrowding at the Royal Perth Hospital, and perhaps the Sir Charles Gairdner and Fremantle Hospitals. At the moment, if a person cannot be admitted to the Royal Perth Hospital he has to go to the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, or perhaps the Fremantle Hospital.

When a person has suffered an injury, or a member of someone's family has been injured, it is of paramount importance to get him or her to hospital, and with the cost of medical attention having increased by 65 per cent from June 1977 to March this year, it is important that cost savings are implemented. This can be achieved by the provision of beds at ground floor level rather than in multi-storied hospitals. Surely this is a reasonable and valid argument for at long last upgrading the Swan District Hospital in the manner I have proposed.

**MR YOUNG** (Scarborough—Minister for Health) [2.54 p.m.]: One of the greatest problems about our hospital system is that a speech like the one just made by the member for Swan does—unless one delves into the system and obtains experience as I have done, both as a member of the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, of which the member for Swan was also a member, and then as Minister for

Health—on the surface, appear to be perfectly logical and reasonable.

Given ideal circumstances and given that we were able to apply any amount of resources to the development of hospitals as and when we wanted to, it would be a reasonable proposition. Unfortunately, when we examine what might happen in respect of the Swan District Hospital as compared with other hospitals, the idea becomes a little gray.

There is a major difference between the services which can be performed at the Swan District Hospital and those which can be performed by the teaching hospitals. I will deal firstly with casualty services. I understand that the member for Swan was not talking about outpatients or ordinary elective type visiting.

**Mr Skidmore:** That is right.

**Mr YOUNG:** A person taken into casualty is invariably picked up by ambulance and rushed to hospital in an emergency situation. Diagnosis has to be made of the degree of injury or sickness from which that person is suffering. If a person is within a reasonable distance of a teaching hospital—such as Royal Perth, Sir Charles Gairdner or, in the case of children, Princess Margaret—the most logical thing to do, accepting the fact that there will be many times when it may not have been necessary to do so, is to take that person direct to a teaching hospital with the most back-up services available. If a person taken unconscious to the Swan District Hospital is found to be suffering from a massive haemorrhage of the brain, he will need to be transferred to the Royal Perth or Sir Charles Gairdner Hospitals and have immediate surgery performed. He will have to go to a hospital with the necessary back-up facilities available to perform that sort of work.

If we are in the metropolitan area, the cost benefit analysis does not allow the medical service to provide complete casualty services at places like the Armadale-Kelmscott Hospital or the Swan District Hospital.

**Mr Skidmore:** I believe they could. You could provide them on the basis of the need at the time. That need could be assessed by a medical officer who would determine whether or not a patient needed more intensive care. I see no great disadvantages.

**Mr YOUNG:** The point I am making is that if someone is taken into a hospital such as the Swan District Hospital when he should more properly have been taken to the Royal Perth Hospital where the services are provided for sophisticated procedures, it could well cost that person his life.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr YOUNG: I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I understand the situation, there is no need for the Minister to do that. I will now suspend the sitting of the House in order that members may attend the annual general meeting of the Joint House Committee. The House will resume at the completion of that meeting.

*Sitting suspended from 2.59 to 3.43 p.m.*

Mr YOUNG: In continuing my remarks in reply to the member for Swan, I want to move away from the situation in regard to casualty and onto some of the other general remarks he made in respect of hospitals as far as outpatient and inpatient numbers are concerned.

I want to make two points. The first is that under the Commonwealth-State hospital arrangements, whereby we are obliged to comply with the arrangements entered into with the Commonwealth quite a number of years ago, the original concept of Medibank and the subsequent amendments to the original Hayden proposals by the Fraser Government have virtually pushed the demand in the public hospitals to the point where the money supply just cannot cope. That applies both to running costs and capital costs.

We have a situation in which people are demanding more and more of the public hospital system. I must say I was never enamoured of the Hayden Medibank concept. Neither have I been particularly enamoured of the amendments made to it by the Fraser Government.

However, I can say that the commission of inquiry into hospital management and efficiency which has been entered into by the Fraser Government, in conjunction with the States, will at least go some way towards indicating what may be done about the over-demand on the public hospital system. While that over-demand remains, complaints like the one made by the member for Swan, and those made by many other members of this Parliament, both privately and publicly, will continue. After all, there is a limit to the amount of money and resources the Australian taxpayer can afford to provide.

I would like to remind the House of the original free medical system which was introduced in the United Kingdom immediately after World War II by Aneurin Bevan, who said that the £40 million sterling per annum which was, at that time, to be invested in the health system would be an investment well made. He said that, because of such a "massive" input of money, the health of the people of Britain would be infinitely better

looked after and, therefore, the demand on medical services would decrease to the point where the expenditure virtually would be negligible.

The £9 000 million sterling which was spent in 1976-77 bears testimony to the laws of supply and demand, when supply happens to be free.

The second point I want to make is that, if I have anything to do with it, there will be a swing away from centralisation of hospital services in the major teaching hospitals in this State.

As far as I am concerned, the building programmes to which we are committed already are virtually the end of the line for the teaching hospitals in the metropolitan area, because not only will they have outstripped the physical area in which they can practice, but they will also have been outstripped by the immediate population they can serve.

In a period of time in the not-too-distant future, I should like to see specialised services available in the peripheral hospitals. To some extent we are doing this on a regional basis now. Obviously, at this stage, we cannot do it completely on a regional basis; but we are doing it to some extent in places like Bunbury, where we have already a very sophisticated team of surgeons both in general surgery, orthopaedic and other aspects of surgical procedures. The services available to the people in the Bunbury region are first class by any standards in the world.

I would hope to see a regionalisation of specialist medical services and then I would hope to see the peripheral hospitals taking more of the minor surgery out of the teaching hospitals so that, for all time, the major teaching hospitals in the central area of the metropolitan area of Perth will have adequate facilities and staff, but will not continue to expand at the rate at which they have expanded over the last two decades.

That is my aim and I hope it will continue to be the aim of successive Ministers for Health who take my place, because if that aim is changed, it will be very easy to slip back into the situation in which someone says, "We only need another wing here" and we are on our way again.

With the completion of the building work at Royal Perth Hospital, Princess Margaret Hospital, Fremantle Hospital, and Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, the needs of the metropolitan area should be served for many years to come.



**FUEL: PETROL AND DIESEL***State Levy: Grievance*

**MR COWAN** (Merredin) [3.50 p.m.]: My grievance is directed to the Minister for Transport and it relates to the State fuel levy which was introduced some time ago. We in the National Party have been making the claim that 48 per cent of the State fuel levy has been paid by rural consumers. During a debate in this House the Minister asked me—by way of interjection—to provide the figures relating to that matter.

I made the claim that 20 per cent of the population in the rural areas was paying 48 per cent of the State fuel levy. Consequently, the Minister wrote to me and corrected me on one point. He said that we had made an error in our interpretation of the population figures by taking the urban population of Western Australia rather than the population of the Perth statistical division.

I would agree that 29 per cent of the Western Australian population is in rural areas, but I cannot agree with some of the rather extraordinary rationale the Minister has used to make the claim that country consumers do not contribute 48 per cent of the State's fuel levy.

The rationale the Minister has used has placed very serious doubt in my mind as to whether or not the Minister has an understanding of some of the freight problems which beset rural people. It is bad to have the Minister for Transport using such rationale as contained in the letter he wrote to me on 9 October.

The National Party attempted to establish the population figures for the rural areas and the fuel usage in metropolitan and rural areas. By doing this we were able to establish that the percentage of petrol used in the metropolitan area represented a total cost of \$7.5 million. On the basis that 25 per cent of the vehicles in country areas are garaged in the metropolitan area the Minister added a further 25 per cent of the total petrol levy to the metropolitan area as opposed to the country area.

I cannot for the life of me see how where a vehicle is garaged has anything to do with fuel usage. I will read to the House the pertinent part of the Minister's letter. It says—

Similarly, your petrol sales figures have to be interpreted with care. They show where the petrol was bought but they do not show who bought it. Estimates made using the Australian Bureau of Statistics 1976 Vehicle Usage Survey indicate that about 25 per cent of petrol sold in country areas is purchased

for use in vehicles normally garaged in the metropolitan area. On the other hand, only about 4 per cent of petrol sold in the metropolitan area is purchased for use in vehicles normally garaged in the country. Taking that into account your figure of \$7.55594M, for payment by metropolitan residents of the fee of 0.9 cents/litre on petrol, becomes about \$8.5 million (from metropolitan sales, less the 4 per cent of metropolitan sales purchased for country vehicles, plus 25 per cent of country sales, which are purchased for metropolitan vehicles).

In an earlier paragraph the Minister spoke about the cost of travelling and the cost of freight being passed on to consumers. One would assume that no matter where a vehicle was garaged—unless there are a few holiday-makers in the rural areas—people would be attending the country areas on business and for that reason the cost of travelling would be passed on to the country consumer.

Therefore, we believe there is absolutely no rationale at all behind the statement that because a car happens to be garaged in Perth, that cost should be related to the metropolitan area.

I will continue quoting from this letter because this is a critical situation and it demonstrates the lack of understanding the Minister has of transport and freight matters as they relate to rural areas.

In talking about diesel fuel the Minister said—

The figures for diesel fuel use need to be interpreted with care. The split between country and metropolitan use is based on the comparative distances travelled by diesel powered vehicles in the country and in the city (the distances being obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 1976 Motor Vehicle Usage Survey). These estimates relate to where the fuel was used, not to where it was bought or to who paid for it. The most important question in this context is who pays for the fuel. We estimate that in the region of one quarter of the country tonne/kilometres undertaken by diesel trucks is involved with transporting goods to the metropolitan area, where the transport costs will ultimately be borne by metropolitan residents purchasing the produce.

The Minister should know that that is not true. All produce transported to the metropolitan area is paid for by the producer. If the Minister does not understand that basic element of our

transport system, he does not deserve to hold his portfolio.

Mr Bryce: Hear, hear!

Mr COWAN: I would like the Minister to try to explain to me the rationale behind the comments in his letter to me. Surely it must be accepted that the producer pays the cost of transporting goods to the metropolitan area. If that fact is not accepted then why is the Minister arguing with grain producers about the grain freight rates? Why is he not arguing with flourmillers and metropolitan consumers? The producer pays because he pays the freight for goods which are transported to the metropolitan area. It is not the consumer who pays.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [3.56 p.m.]: In response to the claims made by the member for Merredin I regret I do not have with me the comments he made to me which were totally out of context and biased.

To make the member's own point, he has already accepted that some of the propositions put forward were not valid. From memory he was putting together the country towns' population figures and the city population figures, to make a biased judgment.

I have a copy of the letter I wrote to the member for Merredin and I will read it because it will put into context the points he raised. The letter reads as follows—

Thank you for sending me the figures you used as the basis for your statement that the rural population, which you put at 20 per cent of the State's population, pays for 48 per cent of the monies collected through the State Fuel Wholesale Licence Fee.

I would first take issue with you on your interpretation of the population figures. Your metropolitan figure relates to the total urban population in the State rather than to the population of the metropolitan area as such. You have included the populations of the country towns in your figure. The comparison should instead be between the population of the Perth Statistical Division, 806 000 in the 1976 census, and the population of the rest of the State, 336 000 in the 1976 census. That puts the non-metropolitan population at 29.5 per cent of the State population, which is a less extreme figure than the one you used.

The figures for diesel fuel use need to be interpreted with care. The split between country and metropolitan use is based on the comparative distances travelled by diesel powered vehicles in the country and in the

city (the distances being obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics 1976 Motor Vehicle Usage Survey). These estimates relate to where the fuel was used, not to where it was bought or to who paid for it. The most important question in this context is who pays for the fuel.

We estimate that in the region of one quarter of the country tonne/kilometres undertaken by diesel trucks is involved with transporting goods to the metropolitan area, where the transport costs will ultimately be borne by metropolitan residents purchasing the produce. The remaining country tonne/kilometres relates to country users and the metropolitan tonne/kilometres relate to metropolitan users. On that basis your figure of \$1.71M for the fees payable by metropolitan residents on diesel rises to about \$2.7M and the corresponding country figure of \$3.96M is reduced by a quarter to about \$3M.

Similarly, your petrol sales figures have to be interpreted with care. They show where the petrol was bought but they do not show who bought it. Estimates made using the Australian Bureau of Statistics 1976 Vehicle Usage Survey indicate that about 25 per cent of petrol sold in country areas is purchased for use in vehicles normally garaged in the metropolitan area. On the other hand, only about 4 per cent of petrol sold in the metropolitan area is purchased for use in vehicles normally garaged in the country. Taking that into account your figure of \$7.55594 million, for payment by metropolitan residents of the fee of 0.9 cents/litre on petrol, becomes about \$8.5 million (from metropolitan sales, less the 4 per cent of metropolitan sales purchased for country vehicles, plus 25 per cent of country sales, which are purchased for metropolitan vehicles). Similarly, your country petrol revenue of \$4.911444 million reduces to about \$4 million.

The population, diesel and petrol figures revised as above indicate that some 30 per cent of the population (country residents) pay some 36 per cent of the charges. This is a much more moderate situation than the one you were portraying.

I think that letter indicates the distorted version which the member for Merredin put to me earlier. I have carried out some research and I have answered his distorted version of the position. The attitude he has portrayed does not do him great

credit in his position as a representative of country people.

The SPEAKER: Grievances noted.

### RAILWAYS: GRAIN FREIGHT RATES

*Amendment: As to Motion*

MR McPHARLIN (Mt. Marshall) [4.02 p.m.]: Mr Speaker—

#### *Point of Order*

Mr RUSHTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Mt. Marshall has given notice that he will move to disallow amendments to that part of Westrail's goods rates book relating to freight on grain.

However it has been brought to my attention that the goods rates book is not a by-law as defined in the Interpretation Act and, I am advised, would not be subject to disallowance by Parliament.

Section 22 of the Government Railways Act prescribes that rates shall be fixed by the commission, with the approval of the Minister, by publication in the *Government Gazette*.

In view of the advice which has been given to me, I would appreciate your advice as to whether the motion should be allowed to proceed.

The SPEAKER: I certainly would need much more time to give consideration to the point raised by the Minister for Transport than I sensibly could do by leaving the Chair until the ringing of the bells. Therefore, I propose to undertake to consider the point of order, and to give a ruling at some future time—probably tomorrow. It may be later, but in the meantime I direct that this matter be placed at the bottom of the notice paper.

### RAILWAY: FREMANTLE-PERTH

*Reinstatement of Passenger Service: Motion*

Debate resumed from 8 October.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [4.05 p.m.]: In continuing my remarks to this motion, I will say at the outset that the charade put forward last week by the Opposition in its claim that it had not had sufficient time to debate the issue has been exposed as a trick which did not work. Members of the Opposition took too much time in presenting their case, and they left very little time for the Government to reply.

It has been stated that I spoke for a period of 1½ hours whereas, in actual fact, it will be found that the member for Avon spoke for one hour and

20 minutes, the member for Fremantle spoke for 34 minutes, and I spoke for one hour and six minutes. Those times demonstrate the distortion perpetrated in the Press.

Mr Pearce: It depends on how much you said during your one hour and six minutes.

Mr RUSHTON: It is unfortunate, of course, that the situation should have been distorted.

Mr Pearce: It was the same six-minute speech 11 times.

Mr RUSHTON: That is the type of comment we expect from the member for Gosnells, and it shows very little dignity.

Last week the member for Ascot put on a turn, but his argument was found wanting. During the debate he caused the loss of a considerable amount of time as a result of raising points of order.

Mr Davies: Speak up, we cannot hear you.

Mr RUSHTON: Prior to the tea suspension last week the member for Ascot took a number of points of order which took some time to determine. During the tea suspension the member for Ascot woke up to the fact that time was being lost, but his trick had back-fired.

Mr Davies: Who are you talking about?

Mr Bryce: I wish you would speak up.

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Fremantle put together a few words, and it eventuated that very little time was left for the Government to respond to the motion. Because of the break in the debate I have had an opportunity to put together some answers to which I will now refer, and I will then present a case for members to consider which will relate to the factual position.

The member for Avon made a number of positive statements. He said that the population along the Fremantle-Perth corridor would treble. The fact is that the population along that corridor fell by 9 per cent between 1971 and 1975. In essence, no change has been indicated. The local authorities in the Fremantle-Perth corridor have not changed their minds.

I will touch on these matters briefly because they were canvassed by members opposite, and it is my intention to answer the points raised by the member for Avon.

The member for Avon hinted at the shortage of fuel. One does not have to consider the situation for very long to realise that 2.2 per cent of the fuel used in the metropolitan area is used in the passenger transport system of the metropolitan area. We have a long way to go before we reach the dire straits projected by the member opposite.

The matter of handicapped people was mentioned, and that point was covered fully.

The next claim by the member for Avon was that the passengers who formerly travelled by train between Fremantle and Perth did not now travel by bus, but were using their own motor vehicles. That claim has been refuted and destroyed by the General Manager of the MTT in his report which shows that some 85 per cent of the former train passengers are using the combined bus services. The number of people attracted to the bus services since that time are similar in number to those who travelled by public transport previously.

The next item he raised was that the volume of motor vehicle traffic between Fremantle and Perth had doubled. Of course, a review by the Main Roads Department since this took place—

Mr McIver: I said the Fremantle-Perth traffic had doubled.

Mr RUSHTON: The honourable member said the volume of motor traffic from Fremantle to Perth had doubled.

Mr McIver: You are getting mixed up with Armadale-Perth.

Mr RUSHTON: No. I will take the honourable member's point, but on my reading he said the traffic had doubled.

Mr McIver: I emphasised Perth-Armadale. I said there were now 65 000 cars a day and the road was designed for 35 000. I do not think I made any reference to Perth-Fremantle. I think you may have misconstrued that point, because I have no knowledge of the volume of traffic from Perth to Fremantle.

Mr RUSHTON: I am suggesting in fact the volume has decreased.

Mr McIver: I think you will find it was the Armadale-Perth corridor.

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Avon's argument was based on the fact that the traffic had increased.

Mr McIver: It was based on fact, I agree with that.

Mr RUSHTON: He was making the case that traffic had increased in this corridor since the closing of the line. The facts refute that situation, and I will be happy to give the honourable member more detail of that. He also made the statement that we had not saved a cent since the line was closed. I was able to report to him that there had been a saving of about \$500 000 and a capital cost saving of \$2.7 million and that we had projected more into a five-year period.

The member for Avon also made the point that the majority of the people of Western Australia wanted the train service returned. There has been some discussion of it in the media in recent times, and I suggest the people who count most are those who use public transport. We have had regard for all the people of Western Australia and we are having a three-year trial period. I do not think that ever before has there been a Government which was so conscious of public opinion or which approached such an important matter in that way.

The only other point made by the member for Avon which I should cover before I return to my own presentation is his reference to people stating that the railway line to Armadale would be closed. I can tell the House that blatant untruths were told at election time about the future of the Armadale station and the service itself, and we see the same untruths being projected in the media at the present time.

As far as I am concerned, the line will be extended to Mundijong as soon as it is practicable to do so. It will be based on patronage and the economics of extending the line. We need to be very conscious of that fact. It is unfortunate that men dressed up as railwaymen, who I have no doubt had been given some misleading information, were telling the people using the service that the Armadale station would be closed and the line would go only as far as Kelmscott. Also, an MTT driver was reported to me as having made the same statement. Those extremes do nobody any credit, and certainly do the Opposition no credit, if they are the sorts of tactics it uses, even at election time. One should have integrity and regard for the truth.

Mr McIver: On many occasions the Government said the line from Fremantle to Perth would not close under any circumstances.

Mr RUSHTON: People are continuing to present a distorted and untrue situation in relation to the closure of that line. The freights going to Bunbury—

Mr McIver: I am talking about the service. On many occasions you, the Premier, and your predecessor said the Fremantle-Perth service would not be closed.

Mr RUSHTON: If the member for Avon reads the statements again, he will find it was the reserve which we said would not be closed.

Mr McIver: The Premier made a statement at Westrail Centre that the service would not be taken away.

Mr RUSHTON: Let us get back to the facts. Untruths have been presented in relation to the matter. I was talking about the Armadale-Perth

line, and the member for Avon indicated that he thought the service would not close, but would continue.

Mr McIver: Until I see that new bridge I will never be convinced, either.

Mr RUSHTON: I was giving the member for Avon some credit for being factual. Now he is bringing doubt into the matter. That is the last point I need to make in relation to his speech. It was not one which contained any proof or any positive grounds for the return of the Fremantle-Perth railway service. He mentioned handicapped people, and his argument in that regard was weak. He gave no good reasons or solid grounds for the return of the service, as I would have expected if the Opposition wanted to gain support. The honourable member also said 2 000 people were marching on Parliament House, but 700 is something different.

Mr McIver: You know it was closer to 1 200.

Mr RUSHTON: Distortions can be accepted, but not—

Mr McIver: You are the last people who should be talking about distortions. What about your advertisements this week in relation to pork chops, and so on?

Mr RUSHTON: Last week was a political rort, and everyone acknowledges—

#### *Point of Order*

Mr DAVIES: Mr Speaker, I take exception to the word "rort". The Minister said "Last week was a political rort". Unless he is prepared to put it into some context, I have to take exception to that.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to desist from using that type of language.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: A little later I will present an advertisement which was said to have been inserted by the Friends of the Railways and which proves the statement I made.

There is not much to answer in the speech of the member for Avon. I have put together a summary of what I gleaned from it and have shown how inaccurate his presentation was.

The member for Fremantle was developing an argument until his time was cut short because he realised if he went on speaking he would use all the time available and there would not be time for the Government to present its case.

Mr McIver: Speak up.

Mr Bryce: Give the man a loud hailer. Are you so ashamed of your argument that you do not want us to hear it?

Mr RUSHTON: I am using the Opposition's time, so if members opposite want to make inane remarks they may do so. The member for Fremantle made some comments relating to losses and profits made on the line in the last 10 months. He referred to the actual loss to the combined services in 1978-79 of \$28.355 million, and the estimated loss in 1979-80 of \$35.386 million. The actual loss turned out to be \$35.96 million.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr SKIDMORE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt). I find it extremely difficult to hear the Minister. I realise that we have interjections, and conversations take place in the House, but surely to heaven the Minister ought to be conscious of the fact that members should be able to hear the debate instead of this mumbo-jumbo he gives us.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): There is no point of order. However, I ask the Minister to lift the level of his voice so that members can hear him. I would add that the responsibility for hearing the debate lies largely with members of the Opposition and with members of the House generally. All members should have regard for the level of their conversation.

Mr Davies: Hear, hear!

Mr Pearce: Perhaps the Minister could raise the standard of his speech also.

Mr Sodeman: Perhaps members opposite could keep their conversation down.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Swan has just raised a point of order. We have had numerous rulings from the Chair about members who interject. Sometimes these interjections occur even before a member can commence to make his speech. On this occasion the member for Gosnells and the member for Pilbara were having a cross-Chamber conversation before the Minister could commence. The Minister for Transport.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: I would like to give members a brief summary of the costs that have been saved. The members for Gosnells raised doubt about this matter, and so I will give the figures for the year ended 30 June 1980 supplied to me by the General Manager of the MTT. For the 10 months ended 30 June 1980 the final estimate of the total operating saving of the MTT was \$1.498

million, less the cost of replacement bus service, \$1.016 million. So the total operating cost saving for the MTT for the year 1979-80 was \$482 000. The cost saving to the public transport system was \$2.7 million, being the cost of 10 additional railcars which would have been needed had the line remained open, less the cost of new buses and associated works.

The member asked for that information when we debated this issue last week. I will return briefly to the points I made then. The closure of this railway line was a very serious decision, and I hope people take the matter seriously and look at the total issue before us. I trust the media take a deep interest in it, and do not simply generalise.

It can be proved that we, as a Government, acted responsibly. I have already indicated to the House the decision was made after numerous reports were prepared and recommendations received. In fact, one report that was prepared at the request of the Tonkin Government came to us shortly after we came to office. This report contained a recommendation that the Fremantle-Perth line be closed but that the other two lines remain open.

The Government is setting out in a very workmanlike way to promote public transport for the whole metropolitan area. It made its decision after careful consideration and much deliberation. One could ask any reasonable person: What Government would make such a decision lightly? The answer would have to be, "Not one."

The Government made its decision in good faith in an attempt to resolve a number of problems. Members should think about that for a moment. Would any Government make a decision in such a sensitive area without a great deal of thought? We know that many people become emotionally involved in their relationship with a train or a rail service. Many of us have used rail country passenger services, and in my youth I spent a great deal of time travelling from one town to another by rail. In my youth I spent many hours on the Northam Railway Station waiting for a connection through to the Wongan line. Certainly it is understandable that this has become an emotive issue, and nobody should criticise those who are expressing positive opinions about the railway line. Just as steam railways have been overtaken by diesels, so other changes occur. We must keep up with modern technological changes. That is what we are doing.

I do not think it could be said that the Government has not had full regard for public opinion on this matter. We know that the petition was said to have been signed by over 100 000

people. However, I have received telephone calls from parents who have said that their children signed the petition 40 times. We know that the petition contained some false names. Certainly we are aware that this type of thing goes on. For instance, people in Collie, Northam, and Merredin, were asked to sign the petition. Certainly the petition was not signed only by people living in the corridor concerned.

I cannot remember the actual form of the petition, but I daresay the same people who signed it would not have done so had it been worded as follows—

We would like the Perth-Fremantle railway line kept open, despite the fact that it will cost the taxpayers \$X a year to operate.

I will not dwell on that matter, because we can understand easily what would have happened.

The Government had regard for public opinion when it decided to review the situation after a three-year period. The Government made a commitment before the last State election. It said—

It is the Government's expressed intention to keep the railway line itself open until the end of 1982.

That related to the line itself. The Liberal policy for the eighties stated—

We will honour our promise to keep the Fremantle-Perth railway line intact during the three-year period of review ending in 1982:

We will complete the major assessment of transport options for the broad strip of land reserved for the line.

We will especially consider how part of the width can be used to take pressure off nearby suburban streets that carry heavy traffic.

No final decision will be made on the long-term future use of the railway-line until the review period has elapsed.

Those statements indicate very clearly that the Government has honourable intentions. One must remember that it is not just a rail service at stake; the Government must sort out the traffic needs of the total corridor and region.

Mr McIver: What are you going to do when you complete your loop line around Kwinana? Will the Fremantle line stay for three years?

Mr RUSHTON: Does the honourable member mean the freight service to go south of the river through to Leighton?

Mr McIver: Yes.

Mr RUSHTON: That can be accommodated in that situation.

Mr McIver: It is under construction now.

Mr RUSHTON: Not for the freight, Fremantle to Perth.

Mr McIver: But on the standard gauge, the line is under construction now.

Mr RUSHTON: But that is the standard gauge.

Mr McIver: That is right. Is the Fremantle line going to stay for the full three years then?

Mr RUSHTON: Yes.

Mr McIver: You will give that assurance will you?

Mr RUSHTON: I do not want to repeat myself, but the line is certainly staying down until September 1982. In regard to the freight service on it now, I would not anticipate that freight would be able to transfer at that time southward, so the line could be there for some time after that. I give a guarantee that nothing will happen there until September 1982. Of course, consideration is being given to transporting freight on that line, south of the river. This matter must be considered in any proposal to upgrade the line south of Fremantle.

I have already mentioned the Government's commitment and from that commitment members can readily see the major issues we face. One problem is the requirement to satisfy the needs of the people in that corridor. We have a responsibility to provide for the long-term future of this corridor, and for the technologies which will present various forms of transport in the future.

We also face the major problem of finding solutions to our regional transport problem. It is very easy for someone to write in the Press about Servetus Street or Davies Road. Many years ago, when the Stephenson plan was being prepared, there was provision for a regional road to go through Davies Road to Claremont Crescent and Curtin Avenue; in fact, that proposal is still in the current plan. The local councils concerned have made many representations as to how they believe the matter should be resolved. One does not need to go very far back to recall that when the present Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Environmental Protection and Minister for Town Planning, he referred this matter sideways to the environmentalists for a solution. However, he was not in the chair when it came to making a decision.

Mr H. D. Evans: Do you believe environmental considerations should be totally disregarded?

Mr RUSHTON: I am not saying that at all; the honourable member should not try to put those words into my mouth. It was a planning matter which should have been attended to. As a matter of fact, when I took over the portfolio of Urban Development and Town Planning, I found I had many major road problems to resolve. I instance Hackett Drive, Wanneroo Road, and Mullaloo Drive as only a few examples. These were planning matters which the Government tackled and on which decisions were made on the best possible advice.

I believe it was the consulting engineers, Scott & Furphy Pty. Ltd., which studied this problem and came up with some recommendations. It will be most interesting to hear the Opposition state publicly what it would do to resolve this vexed question of the impact of transport upon local roads.

Mr McIver: It is going to be difficult, because you are getting things in a bit of a mess.

Mr RUSHTON: It is a difficult problem. I believe it was the member for Cockburn—I do not recall in what capacity he was acting—who came up with a proposition that the Opposition would not use Servetus Street, but would extend the reserve along part of the railway and go out further towards Subiaco. However, time has gone by and it is about time the Opposition made a clear statement about what it would do to solve this problem.

One needs to go back only a few years to recall the deliberate decision to increase traffic movement in this area by the extension of the Fremantle bridge and the opening of the Stirling Bridge, which amounts to a total of eight lanes; in addition, there is provision for another four lanes. It does not take a genius to realise that to put that extra amount of traffic into Stirling Highway would create problems further down the line. This is the situation which needs to be accommodated, and it is a considerable task.

Members would know that the Government has had technical staff working on this problem over a long period. In recent times, local councils have joined with the MRPA in a steering committee to make recommendations as to the solution of this problem. It should not be too long before these recommendations come before the Government. I am sure the MRPA would be considering very seriously any proposals which are placed before it, and will give the Government the best possible advice.

When the Government was attempting to solve the transport needs of this area, it said to the planners, "The use of the railway reserve has not

been considered before. It is up to you planners to find better solutions to the problem of transport on local streets. Come up with some solutions, which could even involve the use of the railway reserve."

One would expect that the planners, having been given this opportunity—they did not receive such an opportunity from the previous Government—will be able to come up with some solutions to the question of the total regional transport needs for the Fremantle-Karrinyup corridor. For the first time, we will have submissions based on the use of all available reserves. I for one certainly am looking forward to receiving their recommendations, because I have put in many hours of work with my officers in an effort to find solutions to this vexed problem.

This matter is not helped by distortion and misleading and untruthful statements as to the Government's intentions such as we saw yesterday in the *Daily News*. These people should not mislead the public. It is not easy to find the right solutions and then present them to the public in such a way that the people clearly understand the issues at hand.

Many councils are involved in this corridor, and parochial matters are inclined to be raised. However, now the relevant councils have joined with the MRPA in a steering committee, I hope they will be able to come up with a practical solution. They certainly cannot give the excuse that they are not fully aware of the problem; it has been around for a long time. This is a good opportunity for the councils to co-operate with the Government and come up with solid recommendations.

If there are to be changes to the regional scheme, the proposed amendments would need to be presented to Parliament for consideration. The Government stands by its commitment to retain the rail for three years, and this is part of its policy.

Mr Pearce: Are you going for some sort of time record?

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Avon claimed that the public fully supported the reinstatement of the rail service between Perth and Fremantle. I do not intend to argue that point either one way or the other. However, there will be ample opportunity over the next two years for the public to make their opinion known. At the moment, the Government is conducting research into the entire public transport system for the Perth metropolitan area.

We expect the result of that research, which has been going on for a long while, to be available

in June next year. From that statistical base the director general should be able to provide recommendations for decisions to be taken on factual information.

The Government made a decision based on the advice of its specialists and the consultants' reports spread over many years. It made the decision in good faith. It will take the precaution of reviewing the matter and sampling the recommendations by holding off a final decision for another three years. Nothing could be fairer or more considerate of public opinion. Nothing is lost; it is a decision to enable us to sample the results of specialists' advice. We will make decisions when appropriate, based on factual information.

The member for Avon and the Leader of the Opposition were given some good advice in a letter to the Editor of *The West Australian* today in which the gentleman indicated that people would benefit from a trip on a linc bus which they would find to be more comfortable than a train trip.

Mr McIver: He was employed picking up papers around the station.

Mr RUSHTON: I do not think members can make a true comparison. Members cannot compare a train travelling on a railway line with a bus running a normal route on a road. A comparison would have to be made of a train on a railway with a bus on a busway. The advice to me at this stage is that, irrespective of the patronage involved, a quicker trip is obtained with buses travelling on a busway.

Mr McIver: They do that in South Africa.

Mr RUSHTON: I have not been able to study their system. My transport advisers tell me that our present express or ordinary rail services would be slower overall than buses running on a busway.

Mr Pearce: What would you be able to pass?

Mr RUSHTON: Even the member for Gosnells would know that a train runs on rails and that it cannot readily get around other trains.

Mr B. T. Burke: It cannot "readily"; it cannot at all!

Several members interjected.

Mr Pearce: How many trains try to pass other trains?

Mr RUSHTON: In England, the Leyland company is trying out a bus structure which can travel on rails.

Mr E. T. Evans: Tell us about it; you have plenty of time.

Mr RUSHTON: I might do that later on.



I want briefly to touch on the inconvenience suffered by the general public, a matter mentioned in the motion. The Fremantle-Perth line is 19 kilometres long.

Mr Davies: It was built in 1892.

Mr RUSHTON: Not quite then. It represents a very small percentage of the total metropolitan network of about 1 500 kilometres of public transport routes. It is a very significant but very small part of the total kilometres covered and one should have regard for this fact when discussing the issue of the inconvenience caused to handicapped people. We are tackling the problem of transport for physically handicapped people; we are considering producing a special mode of transport for them which could be called upon to carry people in wheelchairs and so on. At a seminar in Hamburg it was shown that we should not fall into the trap which the Americans did where they had buses for the disabled which were subject to break-downs. When the equipment installed to help the disabled broke down, the buses had to be put off the road. So it is better to provide a specialist service, and this was discussed last week.

The General Manager of the MTT has established a committee which will consider developing bus services for the disabled.

Mr McIver: Is this to be a special bus or special services?

Mr RUSHTON: It will be special buses to accommodate handicapped people, remembering that the rail component of public transport is relatively small in kilometres and that buses travel over an extensive area. We have to reserve our judgment before we are critical of the work done by the general manager and his team until the results of their work are known. We owe them that consideration.

I shall mention what has happened in the past. Under a Liberal Government in 1970 Commissioner Perts recommended busways. Under a Labor Government in 1972 Commissioner Perts again recommended busways. A 1971 decision by a Labor Government decided on the closure of the Leighton to Barrack Street line. A Labor Government in 1972 commissioned the Central City Underground Study which recommended a busway for the Fremantle-Perth corridor. It is my understanding that the recommendation was also for the retention of the Midland and Armadale lines. This is all history and something for which the Government had regard.

Without any ballyhoo, the Labor Government made a decision to have an underground rail

service. The Bureau of Transport Economics would not buy the idea. I cannot recall now whether it was during the time of the Whitlam Labor Government, but the bureau would not accept the idea, having regard for the few people we have to carry on our services.

This Government and previous Governments took decisions based on advice received, and the Tonkin Labor Government was not able to carry on with its intentions; it never got past getting its legislation through both Houses of Parliament and not having it proclaimed. It is my understanding that the unions stopped that Government from proceeding any further.

We have taken specialist advice and in a cautious way we are implementing the recommendations we have received, while still having regard for whatever people's reactions might be and whatever technology might develop in the years ahead. We are keeping our options open. What is very important is that we will have regard for the work of the steering committee, the responsibility for which is held by my colleague, the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning. The recommendations of that committee will help the Government in its final deliberations.

I reiterate and confirm that whatever the decision is the Government has made a commitment to retain a reserve for high capacity transport in this particular corridor so that if the people in the corridor change their habits—I have already mentioned that the population in this corridor has been falling and that the densities are not increasing—the right decision can be made. However, the councils involved have not shown that they are in favour of having a greater number of people to the hectare in this corridor. We have to have regard for those facts when making decisions.

Mr Pearce: Are you going to speak right through until tea-time or nine o'clock?

Mr RUSHTON: The main factor influencing the railway closure was the cost saving which would be involved. After 10 months had passed I indicated to the member for Fremantle that we did not save all that we had estimated. Something like \$0.7 million, or a little less was estimated to have been saved in direct costs. The minimum capital cost saving was \$2.7 million and the potential cost savings will be \$6.7 million over a five-year period.

Mr McIver: You have lost a lot more through the closure. Ticket sales were lost and that is just one.

Mr RUSHTON: The member is wrong. I would be happy to have a private discussion with the member about that.

Mr Skidmore: Why not tell us now?

Mr RUSHTON: The estimated operating saving is \$6.4 million. Members should realise that that figure accommodates the cost for new buses.

Looking at the matter with hindsight, we know the service could well have been rendered with an ordinary type of bus but the advice supplied to us by the specialists was that we should put in the special service with the linc buses. It was intended that there should be no doubt that the patronage would be well catered for. There is still a capacity within the linc bus service and the ordinary bus service to accommodate more passengers.

When we consider our commuters, we realise 45 per cent of the people in that corridor travelling to the city travel by public transport. Those figures reinforce the Government's decision.

When the Premier was Minister for Railways, he, along with the Commissioner of Railways at that time, looked at the prospect of generating higher density along that line with the objective of securing a better service as well as improving the public transport and train service in the area.

Of course that was not achieved because the people along the line did not wish to change their lifestyle. There were recommendations to "dezone" the area rather than increase the zones for higher density.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: We should also have regard for the opportunity to generate more patronage in the corridor when one realises that 25 per cent of the land along the line is vacant and that there is almost no new passenger potential. We should remember that 45 per cent of the commuter population in the corridor travel to work by public transport, and we can expect the rapid transport system in the corridor to handle up to 10 000 people in a peak hour and, in extreme circumstances, a maximum of 150 000 people.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: I would have expected members to take this subject more seriously. This is a time which allows us to debate the matter and examine it.

Mr Pearce: Because of the quite unfair restrictions, we were abused by you last week and presumably will be this week and next week. Private members' days are not provided for you to ramble on for two hours at a time.

Mr RUSHTON: I was indicating to the House the residential density of the area and the opportunity for attracting patronage in the Fremantle-Perth corridor. Questions have been asked as to why we should pick on this corridor and not the Armadale or the Midland one. A careful and intensive study was made by planning people to consider the future prospects of attracting patronage to the line. It was indicated that very little growth was expected but the Midland corridor was expected to increase by up to 40 000 people. It is believed that the growth will be generated by the development which will take place in that corridor. Something like 100 000 extra people are expected in the Armadale corridor.

Mr Pearce: Why don't you wind up?

Mr H. D. Evans: Dry up!

Mr RUSHTON: Those facts demonstrate the Government's decision is on the right track. The advice received by the present Government has proven to be correct and the Government is continuing to monitor the situation very carefully.

It is interesting to observe the various technologies which will introduce change. In recent times the Government—

Mr Pearce: Why don't you hand in the documents for us to read at our leisure?

Mr RUSHTON: —has brought in a demonstration model of an LPG-generated fuel-supplied bus and this bus is being tested now. Before I was Minister for Transport, the MTT tested a linc bus with the same fuel. The bus was not a linc bus as we know it today; it was a different model. This test was made on a bus travelling between Innaloo and Perth and enabled the MTT to make decisions based on factual information.

There have been some quite considerable results with the testing of the LPG-powered bus. It has been demonstrated that the noise and pollution are less and the power is greater. The importance of these tests should be accepted readily by members.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr BARNETT: May I have your ruling, Sir, on the Standing Order which relates to tedious repetition and the fact that the Minister has said the same thing in 100 different ways in the last hour?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): There is no point of order.

*Debate Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: I intend to take not one moment longer than I need. This is a serious matter and I have been involved in it for a long time and now I have an opportunity to relate to the House the facts.

Mr Pearce: The Acting Speaker has said we have unlimited time and it appears you will use it all.

Several members interjected.

Mr Sodeman: Who holds the record for the longest time on his feet? A Labor Party member!

Mr RUSHTON: I think it is good for members in this House to have before them the main road transport problems we could have to accommodate in our public transport in the future. The Director General of Transport and his officers have obtained for me an evaluation of the various forms of transport and their economic justification for the sort of patronage which could be accommodated. This is so that we can make decisions for the future based on the best economics and forms of transport most needed to transport the patronage.

On the Fremantle-Perth route we carried something like 600 people one way in the peak hour. The linc bus, using either diesel or LPG fuel, on an ordinary road can carry up to 3 000 people in the peak hour. That is a long way from 600 people as at present. The economic justification for a linc bus, diesel or LPG, is 1 500 to 5 000 people per peak hour. So, we have a lot of capacity with a linc bus, especially on a busway, but the capacity of the linc bus on the ordinary road is five times the demand at the present time.

Mr McIver: It would be great if we could own them and did not have to lease them.

Mr RUSHTON: That is something I am working on. I would like to see a greater grant and I am taking direct steps to win that situation by making representations to the Federal Minister for Transport for a greater grant under State entitlement. I believe the honourable member would support me in my representations to have at least a similar grant to that of South Australia for public transport.

Another mode with either bus wheels or train wheels is high rail with a capacity of something like 2 000 to 3 000 people per peak hour. For the O-bahn guided bus which South Australia has now decided upon for a short section—a busway with a guide rail—the economic justification is patronage of 2 000 to 4 000 in a peak hour. Then we move to an electric bus on a busway, 2 500 to

(5)

5 000 persons per peak hour capacity, with some overhead power plus batteries. It is a very attractive form of transport as far as I can see. It allows a bus to move on a fixed route, and at the end move off, pick people up, and return to the busway, for the return journey. It is best if passengers are not required to transfer during the trip.

The next option is the light rail rapid transport. The LRT could be electric powered and the capacity in a peak hour on an economic justification basis is more than 6 000 people, which is many times the number we carry today. That gives members an idea of what we must have regard for in the use of the most suitable technology we can have for the transport task. On electric railway the capacity could be more than 10 000.

Mr Davies: Ten thousand what?

Mr RUSHTON: Ten thousand people.

Mr Davies: You have been talking about 2 500, 5 000, and so on, but you have not mentioned people for 20 minutes.

Mr RUSHTON: If the Leader of the Opposition would listen—

Mr Davies: We have been trying to but it is very painful.

Mr RUSHTON: The very important and serious aspect of the task which the Government has set itself is the sorting out of the transport needs within this corridor, as I said earlier. I have advised the House that with the capacity of the bridges at Fremantle increased to 12 lanes there obviously will be a bottleneck along Stirling Highway unless greater provision is made for vehicles to travel from Fremantle through to Karrinyup.

These are questions which the Government has tackled seriously. They have been around for a long time. The 1963 Stephenson regional plan laid down a basis for it but it has been questioned by the councils in that area. It is being given attention at the present time and I am looking forward to the results of that research. In the *Weekend News* last Saturday a reporter made a considerable number of false statements regarding a grand highway and made all sorts of suppositions and propositions which were inaccurate. The fact is the Government has tackled the problem and has had a tremendous amount of research and technical work carried out.

Mr McIver: Was the author a journalist?

Mr RUSHTON: Yes. I have a copy of the article if the honourable member would like it.

The journalist made claims about a link-up between the railway reserve and a road which would go north. As far as I am concerned, from all the reports I have read, this was totally inaccurate and untrue.

Mr Parker: It would be helpful if you would tell the public exactly what will happen.

Mr RUSHTON: The Government has informed the public of its work in this regard, and the work is progressing. The findings will be presented in the near future. The Opposition does not say what it would do. It makes all sorts of claims and relies on the FOR to make its pace. It does not have a direct policy and gives no indications of its intentions in this regard.

Mr Parker: That is not true. We have a comprehensive policy.

Mr RUSHTON: I want to ensure members are aware of the magnitude of the work in public transport which will be going on in the next five years, amounting to about \$68 million in actual value. Some of it will be taken up in leasing arrangements for equipment because we will not be able to generate that capital. That is the magnitude of the plans for improving public transport in the next five years, so nobody could say positive steps were not being taken by the Government to present a meaningful programme to accommodate all the expected needs of the public in the time ahead.

An interesting study which is taking place is the central city transport terminal study. I feel strongly about it. The extensive work being carried out in Melbourne by the operating bodies called MURLA—that is, the underground tunnels and the loop line under Melbourne—will cost in excess of \$400 million. We do not want to find ourselves in a similar position in the years ahead.

My transport advisers and I have emphasised that we must find solutions to those problems in the near future. I am delighted to see the progress which has been made in regard to Forrest Place, which will give us opportunities, subject to detailed work being carried out, for integrated transport facilities in the vicinity of the original Perth Railway Station. People might say that is a bit far away, but we can install conveyor footpaths to take people from the transfer station past Boans, right through to Allendale Square and down to the Esplanade. At the same time, we have the "Clipper" service which accommodates the people very well at the present time.

Looking at the long term, we must ensure the needs of the future are provided for. I would think the member for Welshpool, when he had

responsibility in this regard, saw the underground railway as the means which would accommodate future needs. Subsequent advice has been that this would not be necessary and would involve over-spending and over-providing. It comes back to the point that members on both sides do not see Perth developing to a very high-rise city; we see it growing gradually and retaining its present beauty and attractions. Governments of both persuasions have committed themselves to the corridor plan which provides for the generation of employment in the regional communities at the ends of the corridors. It gives the answer that we do not want a high capacity transport system to accommodate a low density population. Everyone should have that message by now.

Mr Pearce: Tedious repetition.

Mr RUSHTON: We do not have expectations of a city of eight million like New York or London. We will have gradual growth which our transport system will accommodate. The special work being carried out on the provision of public transport in our city is necessary, because we should be setting aside at the present time the reservations which will be needed.

Mr Pearce: Two hours 15 minutes. Come on, wind up!

Mr RUSHTON: Research into the future transport need is continuing. All sorts of studies were initiated such as PERTS to see what our transport requirements should be. Statistics had been gathered before I took over this responsibility, and I have given increased emphasis to this task because I believe we must make decisions now to provide for the needs of the public and the transport they want in the city for the next 20 years. At this very time we expect the results of this work to be presented about the middle of next year. The studies and work have been directed to a number of items, such as the energy crisis and its consequences for public transport. As I have already said, public transport uses something like 2.2 per cent of transport fuel, so it is not a huge item.

Mr Barnett: Is it essential to go over these things time and time again?

Mr RUSHTON: We must have regard for transport technology, changes in communications allowing more work to be done at home, changes in levels of employment, changes in attendance at schools and universities, the duration of the working day, living habits, and density of population. Those matters are crucial to the future of the Fremantle-Perth railway and the patronage we can generate in that corridor and the whole metropolitan area. We must also have

regard for changes in the average age of the population and changes in family groups, whether they will be larger or smaller families. I have given some indication of the matters involved in the work being led by the Director General of Transport.

When this research is completed and a report is produced, it is expected there will be interaction with the public in relation to the statistical findings of the research. I think everyone in the House will welcome that work because it will allow decisions for the future to be based on facts. The timing of the Government's review is excellent, in that it will be a year or so ahead of the necessity to make decisions on the Perth-Fremantle railway and we will have information based on facts.

Mr Pearce: Is this the politics of boredom?

Mr RUSHTON: The honourable member's attitude is very unthoughtful of people generally, and I want to ensure—

Mr Pearce: Any Tuesday or Thursday we would be only too happy to listen to you for three or four hours, but you are wasting private members' time.

Mr Blaikie: Don't be so unfair.

Mr RUSHTON: I want to take the opportunity to destroy the myth held by some people regarding the future of railways and urban public transport. I said last week that the other States are firmly of the opinion that heavy rail is not the answer to urban public transport, and that light rail, or some other form of transport will provide the answer. Perhaps it could be a tram-like carriage, or a bus service.

I read the other day an editorial in the journal *Transportation*. This is a world authority on transport, and this is what it had to say in its editorial—

Given all this intense activity, one would think that any doubts concerning rail transit would have been long ago resolved. However, such is not the case. Indeed, the debate about rail transit has never been more intense. New questions are being raised about the role of rail transit in a contemporary city, and consensus is dwindling—if there ever was one—about its effectiveness to achieve urban goals.

The debate tends to run at two levels. At one level the discussion centers on the choice between "heavy" and "light" rail technology. While conventional rapid transit of the "heavy rail" variety has dominated the urban transit scene for most of its history,

and still remains the preferred choice of the transit engineering profession, the concept of light rail has been steadily gaining new converts. Given its significantly lower capital cost and much greater flexibility in implementation and operation, light rail technology is likely to continue gaining in popularity throughout the world, and to assume a dominant position in the calculations of transportation planners and urban policy makers in the nineteen eighties.

The more heated debate, however, concerns not the competing forms of rail technology but the role of rail transit in the urban future. A growing legion of critics, especially in the United States, have begun to question the continued validity of rail transit in the light of prevailing urban trends. They argue that most contemporary metropolitan areas are built at densities too low to be served efficiently by rail transit and to attract enough riders to keep operating deficits within reason.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: On a point of order, I would ask that the Minister table the documents from which he is quoting—preferably in advance.

Mr RUSHTON: Most are notes which I will not table, but I have just quoted from a document which I will table.

Mr PEARCE: I take exception to the Minister—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Order! The Minister has explained that he is referring mostly to notes which, as precedent has established, are not required to be tabled; however, he has indicated that the document from which he has quoted will be tabled.

Mr PEARCE: I am not asking the Minister to table notes, but—particularly in view of the lengthy ramblings we have had from him—I would draw your attention, Sir, to the Standing Orders which prevent him from reading a speech.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is in no way reading his speech. He is simply reading from a document, and he has indicated his willingness to table it.

Mr Grayden: It is a most interesting speech, too.

Mr Parker: You have been here for only five minutes of it.

Mr Pearce: By your standards, that is probably true.

Mr RUSHTON: Mr Acting Speaker, I will hand over the document so that it may lie on the Table of the House.

### *Debate Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: Members opposite constantly say that other States are introducing new rail services. Recently a report appeared in *The Age*—

Mr Davies: A Gallup poll for Saturday's election?

Mr RUSHTON: —relating to a recommendation in respect of reduced services in Melbourne, a number of which would be directed to the new underground route. That gives the lie to the suggestion that heavy rail, in particular, is attractive for future urban public transport services.

Mr E. T. Evans: Which State is that?

Mr RUSHTON: Victoria, and changes are to take place in New South Wales as well. It is quite clear, of course, that we must have some regard for the economics of public transport, and we must have regard for the people who use the services. We must make our decisions accordingly.

I would draw to the notice of members a number of other points. Firstly, this motion was moved by the Opposition for obvious political reasons in an attempt to raise emotions for the Federal election. Members of the Opposition are in liaison with members of the National Party in an attempt to embarrass the Government.

Mr Davies: Are you people still liaising with the Country Party, or don't you talk to its members now?

Mr RUSHTON: I am saying that we have no—

Mr Davies: We heard of a lot of talk between the Government and a fractious member of the National Country Party within the last week.

Mr RUSHTON: This is an attack by the Opposition and the National Party in an attempt to embarrass the Government.

Mr Cowan: You are the greatest embarrassment the Government has.

Mr Davies: How can we embarrass the Government when it has you?

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

Mr RUSHTON: This issue has demonstrated the paucity of thought amongst members of the Opposition and the National Party in respect of transport. In fact, members of the National Party

have been making protestations regarding their feeling for railways; yet they are prepared to take action to destroy the railways. That is a feeling held by railway people.

Mr Cowan: Rubbish!

Mr RUSHTON: They are recommending decisions which are not in the best interests of Western Australia, on the pretext of showing concern for the public. Members of the National Party are joining with members of the Labor Party on this issue—as they do frequently.

Mr T. H. Jones: What is wrong with that?

Mr RUSHTON: They are doing this in an attempt to embarrass the Government. However, when one has regard for the facts, one does not have to look any further to find that the Government is most concerned for people. For that very reason it is taking advice, and it is introducing the changes over a lengthy period. Nobody can say otherwise.

We have not had one in-depth submission from the Opposition in regard to this motion.

Mr Davies: We haven't had a chance.

Mr RUSHTON: We have not had one creditable submission in support of accepting the motion, and no data has been presented nor reasons given.

Mr McIver: Come on!

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Avon did not give any reasons, and I have easily refuted the points he made.

Mr Davies: Have you?

Mr Pearce: All you have done is tediously repeat yourself.

Mr RUSHTON: The Labor Party and the National Party are making a great issue of this in an attempt to show they have concern for the public.

Mr Davies: Hear, hear!

Mr RUSHTON: However, members opposite never carry out anything, so how could they show concern for people? If they were in Government we would have fewer services, greater losses, and more inconvenience to the public. That would be the result of their decisions. Yet here we see members of the Labor Party joining with the National Party in an attempt to deny the people of Western Australia the advancement of public transport in the metropolitan area. As far as I am concerned, that is degrading; and certainly it is a very insincere action on their part to attempt to have a motion such as this passed. They nominated 1 October for the starting date; that

shows how much thought members opposite gave to it.

Mr Davies: We brought it in in July.

Mr RUSHTON: Members opposite are now talking about having such a service on 31 December.

The Opposition has no regard for the public on this issue; it is ready to take away services from people on the Midland and Armadale lines, and it is quite willing to incur greater costs by using more linc buses and restoring the Fremantle-Perth service. The Opposition would reduce the services people are already enjoying.

Mr McIver: We will be doing it properly.

Mr Cowan: Sit down and give us a chance to do it.

Mr RUSHTON: Members opposite have not got solutions to the needs, and I am sure members of the National Party have not got answers to the problems because they do not even know what this is all about. They should be ashamed of themselves for trying to take advantage of the public by demonstrating that they have concern for them. That is a lot of rot as far as I am concerned.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr RUSHTON: The fact is that the Government is acting in the best interests of the public. It has had regard for recommendations which the Labor Party did not have the capacity to implement. The Labor Government passed legislation through this House and the upper House but did not proclaim it. That Government did the base work and demonstrated its intention—

Mr McIver: I will cut that to pieces when I reply. You have been told time and time again of the real essence of that, and you hang on to it as though it is a coathanger.

Mr RUSHTON: It is not a bad one to hang on to.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 142 which deals with tedious repetition, and point out that this area has been canvassed by the Minister three times already in this debate today and at page 2056 of *Hansard* for last week. The Opposition has been fairly patient with the Minister. As I am able to point out where this matter has been discussed and reported in this House, I ask that you give the Minister an opportunity to submit himself to a vote of the House regarding whether he should continue.

The SPEAKER: It is not unusual in this place for members to repeat the points they want to make and, in particular, they tend to repeat the points they have made during the debate when they make their final summing up. It is my assessment that the Minister for Transport is summing up.

Several members interjected.

Mr Parker: Can you guarantee that?

The SPEAKER: The only guarantee I can give the member for Fremantle is that if he interjects whilst I am on my feet I will warn him; and if he does it again I will warn him a second time; and if he does it a third time I will name him.

In my view the Minister in summing up his speech is simply reiterating points he has made.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: As a matter of fact, the member for Avon nearly provoked me into giving a recitation of all transport activities over the last few years, which I really should have done because he said the other day that nothing is happening in transport. I would be pleased to tell members opposite what has been done.

Mr McIver: Is what you have been doing to our advantage?

Mr RUSHTON: I will tell the member.

Several members interjected.

Mr T. H. Jones: Tell us on Sunday, not now.

Mr RUSHTON: This is a serious matter, and I would hope that members opposite would have regard for it, because it touches on everybody's life. Transport is probably the most vital issue in our community, because it affects everyone; and it relates to the costs people will pay and to the environment in which they live.

I was going to indicate to the House why in respect of its policy the Government has moved for the introduction of a new freight policy, which would do away with regulations of 50 years' standing.

Mr McIver: You are causing a revolution amongst the farmers.

Mr RUSHTON: No, we are not.

Mr H. D. Evans: Why don't you follow the good advice of the National Party?

Mr RUSHTON: Members of the National Party will have egg on their faces before this is over.

The Government is considering the matter of restructuring the Transport portfolio to see whether it can—

Mr Pearce: Get somebody else.

Mr RUSHTON: —be made more efficient. It is implementing the Transport 2000 study which is considering amongst other claims technological changes for which we must have regard in respect of future urban public transport. The Government is looking in depth at matters such as automotive emission controls and conservation of energy. These are matters to which we have been attending very closely. We have been upgrading the State's railway network, and at present the 503 kilometres of railway line between Kwinana and Koolyanobbing is being rehabilitated. Most members would be aware of that, and as the work gets closer to Forrestfield I would like members to join with me in seeing the work progress, because I think this work is most interesting to members and is invaluable to this State. We are assessing the feasibility of an extension of the line from Perth to the Pilbara.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr PARKER: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: I can anticipate your point of order. Indeed, I was about to rise to my feet to say that whilst the matter the Minister is introducing now is probably in reply to an interjection or a request made by the member for Avon, I believe it is not strictly associated with the question before the Chair. I ask the Minister to confine his remarks more strictly to the matter before the Chair.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: Thank you for that indication, Sir. I will not proceed with the presentation of all that has been happening in transport although challenged by the member for Avon to do so. Those matters relate to the ports, to intrastate air services, and to the roads. Initiatives are being taken and I wanted to demonstrate, particularly to the member for Avon, the magnitude of improvements in transport. I will take the opportunity at another time to give further advice in that regard.

Mr Pearce: Not on private members' day!

Mr RUSHTON: I would like to summarise my remarks relating to the motion before us. Firstly, it was claimed that the public were clamouring for the reintroduction of the Fremantle-Perth rail service. The second claim was that handicapped people were being disadvantaged.

In relation to the first matter, in his address the member for Avon presented three letters which were basically—

Mr Pearce: You covered all this last week. You have forgotten.

Mr RUSHTON: As I have said, the greatest demonstration of support for a service is to be found in the people who use it. I have been able to inform the House, based on the report made by the General Manager of the MTT—

Mr Pearce: This is all on page 2056 of last week's *Hansard*.

Mr RUSHTON: The people who were using the rail and bus are now using the combined bus service; so that has been successful so far.

Mr Parker: They do not have any option.

Mr RUSHTON: The other issue that I have put before the House, which is of great importance, is the one of resolving the problems for regional transport between Perth and Fremantle. It will be most interesting to hear the Opposition and the National Party making their comments in this regard. I would like to hear their solutions to the problems of urban public transport, especially the economic way of serving our population densities, and certainly relating to the regional transport routes in this corridor between Fremantle and Karrinyup.

As far as I am concerned, this motion has been prompted by people who are politically oriented. It is a long time since they were connected with the sincere people who were motivated for the restoration of this service. In the main, the Labor Party has now taken on this role, and raises the question of the Perth-Fremantle line each time there is an election. Before the State election, all sorts of false and totally irrational statements were made. Now we have a Federal election coming, and the subject has been raised again.

There has not been a case made out for the Government to agree to the motion before the House. Each part of the argument has been refuted, and I reject it.

There is a lot more information which could be presented to the House, which would confirm the points I have made. We are doing the logical thing, based on advice from consultants and transport advisers. We are doing it in such a way to consider public opinion. We are doing it with great sensitivity when one has regard for the three-year review period and the fact that we are monitoring the results of the recommendations put before us. At the same time, we are buying new equipment. There are 10 new railcars on order, which demonstrates the fact—

Mr T. H. Jones: You are paying pretty dearly for the fuel oil.



Mr RUSHTON: No. As a matter of fact, we are saving 500 000 litres because of the closure of the Fremantle service. We have a demonstration model bus being tested for the use of liquid petroleum gas; and we will do the same with an electric bus when technology has advanced far enough.

I conclude—

Mr Pearce: Hooray! Ecstasy! I never thought I would hear the words.

Mr RUSHTON: I certainly expected that response.

I have made out a case which cannot be refuted by the Opposition. We have implemented an examination of the urban public transport needs for the next 20 years for metropolitan Perth, linked with the decision to cease the Fremantle-Perth railway service for the time being but to keep the rail intact so that we can make a judgment on it in due course. We must remember that decisions are being taken in conjunction with the councils in the rail corridor; and those decisions relate to transport for the region. When one takes into account the world opinion supporting us in what we are doing, members would realise that we are acting in the right way.

As I said a little earlier, we have taken advice, and roughly a year has passed since the closure of the service. The results of our review so far confirm the advice of the advisers. We stand ready to receive further advice and to act on results of the further monitoring.

What is proposed by the Opposition certainly does not advance the cause of public transport in this State. I ask members to oppose the motion.

Mr Pearce: At last, the sound of silence!

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [5.36 p.m.]: It is not very often I rise to my feet to speak—

Mr Pearce: You did not think you were going to make it today, either!

Dr DADOUR: I thought I would miss out again, and all the time would have been wasted.

I am rather ashamed of what has just happened. I believe there has been a blatant waste of time. There has been continuous repetition. I am not at all proud of what has happened so far.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the member for Subiaco to withdraw the reflection on the Chair which he has made. In all the time during this debate that I have been in the Chair, I have satisfied myself that the debate has been strictly in accordance with the Standing Orders. I

have sufficient confidence in the capacities of my deputies to know that they would have done likewise. I believe it is improper for any member to make such a slur on the Chair; and I would ask the member for Subiaco to withdraw the statement.

Dr DADOUR: I withdraw. I apologise. I was not meaning it in the sense that it was an error on the part of the chair; I was meaning it in a different sense altogether.

Mr Pearce: It was an error by the Minister. Quite right, too.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Dr DADOUR: I support the motion. I support it for the simple reason that my electorate wants me to support it. That makes me a little different from most members. I support what my electorate wants.

My electorate is made up of Subiaco, Shenton Park, Daglish, Jolimont, West Leederville, and Wembley. All these areas about the railway line. The people there are most aggrieved that the passenger service was withdrawn.

I believe this Government made its greatest mistake in deciding to remove or cease the passenger service, even if it is supposed to be for a trial period of three years only. The decision was made in January 1979, when there were no party meetings and when I had no say, although I had written to the Premier, to the present Deputy Premier, to the Minister for Local Government, and to the Minister for Transport asking that, if a decision was to be made concerning the passenger service from Perth to Fremantle, it be a party decision. I was assured by those people that it would be a party decision; but it was not a party decision.

The decision was made on 15 or 16 January 1979, when we were virtually on vacation. Only the Cabinet was meeting. I have a good idea why the decision was made then. The decision was made then, and I will state the reason. I opposed the Mining Bill right through 1978; and this was my pay-off. I was given no chance to say a word because I had the tenacity or the temerity to oppose the Mining Bill, with all its ramifications; and this was my reward. I have no doubt that was the case. I do not say the decision was my reward; I say that the fact I had no say was my reward.

The people in my electorate in the suburbs bounding the railway line are waiting for the passenger service to be resumed. They are starting to lose faith. They believe that once the Government does something, it is a *fait accompli*,

and nothing will ever alter. However, I believe the position will alter because of public opinion.

The Minister derided the petition signed by more than 100 000 persons. Somebody had signed 20 times or 40 times; but the fact remains that the petition was signed by over 100 000 people. Those people were concerned that the railway passenger service should be retained. However, that was not to be; and even now the Minister derides that petition.

There are a number of reasons given for the closure of the line. One of the reasons was that it was costing too much, and so it would have to stop. That is laughable, because when one looks at the priorities and the costing, it was not costing as much as the Armadale-Perth line. That is the line which goes to the Minister's own electorate. However, it was the passenger service on the Fremantle-Perth line which was closed. It is hard to believe that the decision was taken, because a great number of people had relied upon that line.

Let us look at the situation. The Fremantle-Perth corridor is not a drainage corridor, but it is a through corridor. It passes from the port to the city. That is how I view the line. If there was adequate parking for cars at the stations, people would go to Perth by rail. It is a very quick transit service—much quicker than in one's own car. It takes 20 minutes to go from Fremantle to Perth by train, yet by car it takes about 35 minutes, provided one does not speed. However, that time does not take into consideration the rapid transit system and the alternative energy supply which comes with electrification in the long term or steam in the short term. We could return to steam. There is something romantic about the word, but I do not think there is anything emotive about it. In the days of steam, one could build up a great deal of pressure by superheating the steam. I would have expected that to occur; but, no, the alternative was to change to oil; and the problem is becoming more and more acute.

Another factor leading to the cessation of the passenger service was the utilisation of that corridor for some other purpose. I believe that other purpose is a six-lane highway replacing the rail line. I can tell the House that the decision of the Servetus Street steering committee has been to accept or recommend option 10A.

I should like to relate to the House option 10A of the recommendations of the committee.

#### *Leave to Continue Speech*

Dr DADOUR: However, in view of the time, I move—

That I be given leave to continue my speech at a later stage of the sitting.

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned until a later stage of the sitting.

*(Continued on this page)*

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

### RAILWAYS: FREMANTLE-PERTH

#### *Reinstatement of Passenger Service: Motion*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [5.47 p.m.]: I shall refer now to option 10A. I should like to inform the House of the recommendations made by the steering committee in that option.

Option 10 contains the following description—

Servetus Street with the connection to Stephenson Highway would become the main regional route.

There would also be a connection to West Coast Highway for local traffic.

The existing railway tracks would be maintained.

The regional traffic requirements are—

- (1) Widening of Curtin Avenue and Servetus Street
- (2) The construction of the Stephenson Highway.

Advantages—

- (1) Solve the long-term regional road problems.
- (2) Connection of Servetus Street to West Coast Highway would function in the short term.

Disadvantages—

- (1) Requires acquisition of 45 houses in Servetus Street.
- (2) Increased severance and visual intrusion for local residents.
- (3) Increased noise, pollution, and safety problems.
- (4) Some problems in highway geometry and treatment of cross traffic in Servetus Street area.
- (5) Environmental problems in crossing Bold Park and Wembley golf course.
- (6) Severs Wembley golf course.

Option 10A is the recommendation which has been put forward and it advocates the removal of the tracks. In terms of land requirements, option 10A is the same as option 10, which I have just read.

Again, no improvements would be shown east of Claremont Crescent, although short-term improvements would be feasible under option 10A. This option would also indicate the feasibility of retaining a single, narrow-gauge track north from Leighton to service the Cottesloe flourmill. A passing loop of adequate length to reverse the locomotive would also be required in the Cottesloe area.

That is the recommendation which has been made. It seems the railway reserve is being utilised already in one way or another.

When I spoke on this matter last year I said the Servetus Street people would be disadvantaged, and it is inevitable that would occur.

Another option which was not accepted by the committee was option 14 under which the railway track would be removed and there would be provision for a fast transit, six-lane highway where feasible. Obviously there would not be a six-lane highway all the way along the railway reserve, because it is narrow in places and there would be space for a four-lane highway only.

As far as I am concerned, the decision to stop the passenger service was basically wrong. From what I can ascertain, the people feel it is basically wrong also. The Government, with its vicious, single-minded thinking, has made a mistake and it does not know how to remedy that error. That is the tragedy of the situation. The people in my electorate still want a rail passenger service. They do not like travelling by the linc buses. The buses are not as quick as the trains and they are not acceptable to the people.

The changeover from a rail service to a bus service has been totally wrong. The decision was made when I was unable to do anything about it. I am a member of the Government and I should have been given an opportunity to influence the decision. This is the first occasion of which I am aware that a member of the Government who has requested a party discussion or decision on any point has been refused that request. It was granted to me on paper, but not in reality. I was singled out and disadvantaged.

During the last election campaign I argued in favour of the reintroduction of the Fremantle-Perth passenger service, because I knew my electors wanted it. My majority remained the same as it was after the previous election, in spite of the fact that there was a 5 per cent drop in

support for the Government in most metropolitan electorates.

Mr MacKinnon: That did not happen in all electorates.

Dr DADOUR: I am not saying the Honorary Minister did not retain his majority; but I retained mine despite the fact that I was disadvantaged.

I shall stand by what I have said in the past and continue to do all I can in order that the Fremantle-Perth railway service be reintroduced.

Last week the member for Moore told me about a motion he intended to move. I felt it was such a good motion that I should move it as an amendment to the motion under discussion.

#### *Amendment to Motion*

Dr DADOUR: I move an amendment—

That all words after the passage "31st December 1980" be deleted with a view to substituting the following paragraphs—

on a trial basis for eighteen months with feeder buses and improved station parking, and the return of the express rail service between Perth and Claremont which was discontinued in March 1976.

Direct Westrail to conduct an immediate feasibility study to extend the suburban passenger railway service from Perth to Wanneroo with regard to further possible extensions through Yanchep/Two Rocks to the Moore River as and when required.

The study is to include costing for the options of electrification based on the new Brisbane 25kV electrification system and standard gauge for Perth/Midland and Perth/Wanneroo.

Present diesel rail cars to be used between Armadale, Perth and Fremantle.

The study to be completed within six months.

I hope the member for Moore will continue to support this amendment. He has it within his grasp to become a local hero; indeed, he could become the most feted man in Perth.

Mr Parker: I will buy him a bottle of champagne!

Dr DADOUR: If the member for Moore does not support my amendment, he will lose much credibility. To my knowledge nobody requested him to move a motion. He did it of his own

volition, and, if that is the case, he should support the amendment.

The member for Moore has the opportunity to stand by his convictions and it is to be hoped he does so. However, the decision is up to him. I am hopeful that two rams will emerge from the wethers' paddock—I refer to the back bench of the Government—and vote together for the retention of the Fremantle-Perth railway service. In the hope that we would win, I wore a light-coloured suit so that I would not appear to be in mourning.

The amendment has a great deal of merit. It is far-sighted, in that it proposes the railway service should extend north of Perth.

This country has two assets—they are, agricultural products, and minerals. They are the only two assets we have. Our secondary industry produces only a small number of goods and is adequate for local needs only. We talk about industrial development, but we are very limited in that area and cannot compete in world markets as a result of our wage structure. I believe we, as a country, should be concentrating on making the most of our agricultural and mineral resources.

To do this we need water and a fast, cheap transport system. We would be far richer if a cheap transport system were utilised. Members should think about how much better off we would be if we had a rail service running along the coast to Darwin. However, that is not to be at the present time.

This State has a future and it is tied up with an efficient railway service. Although we talk about industrial development, it is clear that we cannot compete with the Eastern States, let alone overseas markets. Fifty years ago, Sydney had a population of approximately 800 000, which is similar to the size of Perth's population today. At that time, it was decided to proceed with an extensive rail system and the construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. That decision has paid off in the long run, because Sydney is now a metropolis with a population of approximately two million. Perth will be a metropolis one day and its population could increase to one million or even two million. We should be looking to the future. We should be looking at alternative energy sources and the possibility of an underground transport system.

As far as I can determine, the present plans in regard to the Fremantle-Perth railway are that it should be replaced by a six-lane highway. If we do not do something about this, it could easily become a *fait accompli*. We should think seriously about reintroducing the Fremantle-Perth railway.

As at December this year it will be almost 18 months since the closure of that railway line.

The amendment which I have moved will allow for an 18-month trial period during which the passenger service will be reinstated. The people will be able to drive to the railway stations where they will be able to have a fast transport system available to them to travel to the metropolitan area or to Fremantle.

Surely there is a great deal of merit in the Government allowing a trial period. There has been a trial period with no passenger service at all. It would be better to have an alternate trial than to continue with the present situation.

I repeat: My electors want the passenger rail service returned to normal. If my amendment is passed, the Government will be obliged morally to fulfil the two requirements of the motion.

I think I have said enough, and it is only fair I should give other members an opportunity to offer their support to my amendment.

Mr STEPHENS: I second the amendment.

MR COWAN (Merredin) [6.01 p.m.]: Ever since this matter caused some controversy within Western Australia, and ever since the decision was taken by the Government to discontinue the Fremantle-Perth passenger service, it has been the consistent aim of National Party policy to support the reinstatement of the service.

We have some very strong feelings regarding this matter. Whilst the particular service does not have a direct effect on the electors we represent, we have a policy which, contrary to the Minister's claim earlier, is strongly in favour of the retention of the railway system in Western Australia. We feel the railway system should operate at prices which are competitive, and that it should compete successfully with other modes of transport.

We believe we have seen in Western Australia an example of the Government placing all sorts of impediments in the path of Westrail—or the Western Australian Government Railways Commission, as it is known legally—to prevent it from operating on a competitive basis.

These obstacles have been raised in many ways. Perhaps the principal obstacle has been the method of funding which is available to Westrail today. Because Westrail is a revenue earning organisation there is no way at all whereby it can obtain moneys under a grants system, or on a grants basis as is the case with roads. Consequently, the road transport system has been able to compete successfully with Westrail in terms of freight and passenger transport.

In order to achieve National Party policy it is important for the words proposed to be deleted be deleted from the motion as it was moved originally by the Opposition spokesman for transport. The member for Subiaco will move to insert other words.

The motion, if amended, calls on the State Government to reinstate the Fremantle-Perth passenger service, and it will call also for the Government to carry out a feasibility survey of the transport needs of this State. I certainly hope the Government makes a better fist of the survey than it did of the SWATS report, which cost \$1 million. I very much doubt whether many people have seen any benefit from that study. All the recommendations which have been implemented have either increased prices to rural consumers, or reduced the services which previously existed.

The amendment to delete words, moved by the member for Subiaco, is in accord with National Party policy. The words which the member for Subiaco intends to substitute also are in accord with National Party policy. The people of the metropolitan area, like the rural people we represent, deserve a rail service. Consequently, we support the amendment.

**MR STEPHENS** (Stirling) [6.06 p.m.]: I indicate my support for the amendment. I was a little concerned earlier this afternoon when the Minister was replying to a grievance, and when he cast some aspersions on the National Party regarding our actions and our credibility. The Minister should be the last one to take such a stand, particularly after he failed to answer the grievance which was raised. The fact is he was way out in his statement about the letter, the subject of the grievance.

On 13 August 1979 the Minister released a Press statement in which he questioned the credibility of those engaged in a vendetta against the Government over the discontinuance of the Fremantle-Perth rail passenger service. In that Press statement the Minister said—

Fourthly, they have quite falsely and unfairly claimed that I was censured in the Parliament over the issue when in fact the vote was 18 for and 27 against, including National Party Independent votes—

I do not know what he means by "independent". To continue—

—which effectively means parliamentary support, not censure.

That Press statement was issued on 13 August 1979. If we refer to *Hansard* of 17 May 1979—three months prior to the issue of that statement—on page 1555 the Leader of the

Opposition moved for the suspension of Standing Orders so that the issue of the Fremantle-Perth line could be debated. The motion was as follows—

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable this House to consider a motion "that in the opinion of this House the Government should appoint a select committee to inquire into and report upon the document 'An Analysis of Rail and Bus Policies for the Perth-Fremantle Corridor', as released by the Friends of the Railways, and the document released by the Government detailing its rail and bus policies."

That motion was debated. The National Party members supported the motion and if members care to refer to *Hansard* it can be seen that we voted for it. So, I cannot understand how the Minister can claim three months later that the National Party supported him. That was what was indicated in the Press statement.

It ill-behoves the Minister to reflect upon the credibility of anyone when his own credibility is questionable.

The advisers to the Government, and even a previous Minister of the Government, made statements supporting the retention of rail transport. On 10 April 1969 the following appeared in *The West Australian*—

**Knox Urges Retention Of Railway.**

Mr Knox referred to the cost of replacing the rail access in the future, the need to "allow for the long-range possibility of electrification and standard gauge", the need to "increase the population density along the lines", and the need for more facilities to integrate cars and buses with train travel. Mr Knox also stated that "for comfort, travel by car was the best and by train the next best".

On 13 April 1969 it was reported in *The Sunday Times* that the then Minister for Transport—who happens to be the Deputy Premier now—stated—

Mr O'Connor affirmed the vital role that rail services would have to play as the costs of car usage rose. "We know of no city in the world that is surrendering rail rights of way for other purposes, and we also know of no city . . . over about a million people that isn't actively installing or planning to install initial or additional rail facilities."

I know that was in 1969 and it can be argued that circumstances change, but in 1980 the circumstances have changed to the point where it is even more important to consider the role of the

railways. Therefore, I am exceedingly surprised by the Government's move not to continue with the rail service to Fremantle.

Some people may try to argue: What concern is the city transport system to the National Party, because most of its support comes from country areas? The operations of this State are of vital importance to everyone living in the State. If an ungodly mess is made of the transport system in the metropolitan area the taxpayers of the whole of Western Australia will have to meet the cost. We in the National Party represent taxpayers living outside the metropolitan area so we are vitally concerned with the transport system, the importance of its efficiency, and that the costs be kept to a minimum.

In supporting this amendment—and I trust it will be carried—I would like to indicate that if it is carried I will take it a little further to ensure that we include plans to retain the Albany-Perth passenger rail service on the basis of three services a week.

The member for Albany would be aware of the fact that there is a great deal of concern about the economic future of Albany. We must maximise the development of the resources we have in that area. I mentioned the fishing industry recently and I might add that the tourist industry also is a great resource. It is one which Albany is capable of expanding to a great extent.

One factor which is essential, to enable this expansion, is a cheap transport system to that area. If we had a good, efficient, reliable train service to Albany that would assist the development of tourism and help to maximise the use of the resources in the area.

I feel this amendment provides an opportunity for the member for Moore to put his words into action. We all know that his words have been great; he has said that if he had been in the House the other night he would have voted for the motion. The motion was along the lines of the retention of the Fremantle-Perth train service.

As the member for Subiaco has indicated, the amendment before the House is one which was framed by the member for Moore. I believe the member for Moore has given notice of another motion but on examination it is clearly indicated that there is no reference in it to a trial basis for 18 months with feeder bus services and improved station parking.

If the member for Moore wishes to be true to his word, he will have to support the amendment moved by the member for Subiaco.

Mr B. T. Burke: You are in for a disappointment.

Mr STEPHENS: On many occasions the member for Moore has told me of the emphasis he places on keeping one's word. In a short time we will no doubt witness the member for Moore speaking in support or voting in support of this amendment.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr STEPHENS: Before the tea suspension I said that the House looked forward with interest to the speech and/or the actions of the member for Moore when dealing with the amendment before the House. I would like also to look forward to support for this amendment from the member for Albany. As I have indicated already, if this amendment is carried, it is my intention to move a further amendment seeking the restoration of the Albany passenger train service. I am sure this is something the member for Albany would like to support, in view of the situation in that town. Such a move would help the economy by bringing tourists to the town, and the member will miss out on that opportunity unless he supports the amendment before us.

Mr Watt: Of course it has a whole lot to do with Albany!

Mr STEPHENS: With those remarks I support the amendment.

MR CRANE (Moore) [7.32 p.m.]: I believe I should make my contribution. It will be constructive to this debate because the House knows my views on the matter of railways in general and the Fremantle railway service in particular. Therefore, I am sure members are waiting "with bated breath" to hear me speak—one might say and "whispering humbleness".

Mr Cowan: We are not interested in what you say, we are waiting to see what you are going to do.

Mr CRANE: I preface my remarks by saying I believe, and I will always believe, we should have an adequate public transport service for the metropolitan area. I make no apology for saying I believe this because it is true. However, I must express, firstly, some concern at the remarks which have been made—some directed at me in this Chamber, and some directed at me outside the Chamber. I will refer also to an advertisement which appeared in the Press and which was drawn to my attention last week when we were discussing this matter. The advertisement is headed "Friends of the Railways".

I was led to believe, and being a fairly believing sort of person, I accepted it, that the protest and the march last week was for the restoration of the Fremantle-Perth railway service. I was rather

staggered then to read what this advertisement stated. I agree with the first part which says—

The closure of the Fremantle Railway and the Government's blatant disregard for public opinion . . .

Possibly there has been some disregard for public opinion on the part of the Government, but the adjective "blatant" is a matter of opinion.

I would like to refer to this advertisement again. It goes on to state—

The recent steep increases in Water and Council Rates, S.E.C. charges, M.T.T. fares, car licences and fuel prices . . .

Perhaps I am just plain dumb, but I do not see that those things have anything to do with the return of the Fremantle-Perth passenger service.

Mr Old: Nor has the Albany line.

Mr CRANE: Therefore, I believe I should suggest it is distinctly possible there may be some credence in the remarks made by the Minister for Transport when he said that this whole affair—which I sincerely believed in—was nothing more than a Federal election gimmick.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr CRANE: If it were not, why were those remarks in the advertisement? I have read the words of the advertisement, and if anyone wishes to refute them, I can show him this piece of paper.

Mr H. D. Evans: They are not in the amendment though, are they? They are not contained in the amendment you are debating now.

Mr CRANE: They concern the closure of the Fremantle-Perth railway line, and this is a matter we are discussing. I believe the amendment is concerned with the return of this railway line and I believed that return was being supported supposedly by the exhibition of a march of approximately 700 people last Wednesday.

I was very interested to note the words of the member for Subiaco, and I agree entirely with him when he said, "I am supporting this motion simply because the people of my electorate wish me to do so." They may not be his exact words, but when we read the *Hansard* report of today's proceedings, I think we will find he used words very close to those.

I must also say I was very impressed, and flattered in fact, by the remarks of the member for Merredin when he spoke to the amendment before the Chair. He gave me the full credit I deserve—

Mr Cowan: I did not mention you.

Mr CRANE: —for the framing of such an amendment. For the first time in two years both the member for Merredin and the member for Stirling gave me some credibility.

Mr Cowan: I did not even mention you—that is how much credibility I gave you.

Mr CRANE: It was tremendous.

Mr McIver: Vote for this amendment and they will give you more.

Mr CRANE: For two years I have not been able to put one foot right—

Mr Stephens: You are admitting it.

Mr CRANE: —according to them. I should perhaps make the House aware of the fact—certainly it is no secret—that I was and still am—and that might surprise some members—in support of the return of the Fremantle-Perth railway line.

Mr McIver: Are you going to vote for the Amendment? Tell us that.

Mr CRANE: I said the other night that I would choose my own battleground. I will leave that announcement for a climax. I have said, and I repeat, that I support the return of the Fremantle-Perth railway line.

Mr Tonkin: Words are cheap.

Mr Cowan: This is not a battleground. We are talking about the reinstitution of the railway line—not battlegrounds.

Mr CRANE: Does the honourable member want me to carry on or just sit down?

Mr Cowan: I do not want you to carry on.

An Opposition member: You are carrying on.

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

Mr CRANE: I really should make one other point about the member for Stirling.

Mr Tonkin: Why don't you talk about the railway?

Mr CRANE: Last Wednesday, when it was apparent that I would move an amendment to the motion which the member for Avon had moved, the member for Stirling asked me whether I would include in any amendment I was moving a call for the return of Albany-Perth railway service which he mentioned tonight. I said I was not prepared to do that. It rather surprised me that the member for Stirling approached me because, as I said earlier, he has berated me in this Chamber, and his actions in suddenly coming and asking me for something were reminiscent of Shylock's remarks to Antonio. Shylock said—

Go to them, you come to me and you say,  
 "Shylock, we would have moneys;" you say  
 so;

You, that did void your rheum upon my  
 beard.

And foot me as you spurn a strange cur o'er  
 your threshold

What should I say to you?

Should I not say—

Several members interjected.

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

Mr H. D. Evans: Academy awards in this!

Mr CRANE: To continue—

Hath a dog money? is it possible?

A cur can lend three thousand ducats?

#### *Point of Order*

Mr COWAN: On a point of order, Sir, I would  
 like to ask the relevance of a quotation from  
 Shakespeare to the amendment before the House.

Mr Old: I thought you might ask him to table  
 it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Having been a private  
 member of this House who once resorted to verse  
 to make my point, I want to say—

An Opposition member: Was it good enough?

Mr B. T. Burke: It was not Shakespeare.

The SPEAKER: No, it was Thompson. I see  
 absolutely nothing wrong with the quoting of  
 Shakespeare in this place. In fact, I prefer it to a  
 lot of the other material that has been quoted  
 here.

Mr T. H. Jones: It is not even relevant.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr CRANE: I will repeat Shylock's remarks as  
 follows—

Should I not say—

Hath a dog money? is it possible?

A cur can lend three thousand ducats?

I will not go on, although I could. I hope I have  
 made my point. Suddenly Antonio needs my help.  
 It seems I must continue—

... many a time and oft

In the Rialto you have rated me

About my moneys and my usances.

Still have I borne it with a patient shrug,

For suffrance is the badge of all our tribe.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRANE: I have made my point that the  
 honourable member now wants my help.

Mr Stephens: I did not ask for your help. I was  
 giving you the opportunity to do something  
 sensible.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come  
 to order! The level of interjections and the casual  
 conversation in the Chamber are totally  
 unacceptable.

Mr CRANE: Thank you, Sir. I will leave  
 Shakespeare now.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member had no  
 sooner risen when three people interjected  
 simultaneously. That is unacceptable. The  
 member for Moore.

Mr CRANE: We will leave Shakespeare alone,  
 but be careful—I can come back to him easily; he  
 is a great friend of mine.

Mr Bryce: You have thoroughly exhausted your  
 knowledge.

Mr CRANE: There is a saying that sometimes  
 boxers are saved by the bell. Maybe last week I  
 was saved by the bell, because it was my  
 intention, when I framed that amendment, that I  
 would move it in this Chamber, and then private  
 members' business lapsed because the Minister  
 for Transport gave us a very informative address  
 until 9.00 p.m.

Several members interjected.

Mr Bryce: And he extended it for another 2½  
 hours tonight.

Mr CRANE: When we reached 9.00 p.m., the  
 debate was adjourned.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come  
 to order! I ask members to have some regard for  
 the dignity of the House. I would ask them also to  
 have some regard for our *Hansard* reporter who is  
 making a valiant effort to take the speech.

Mr CRANE: As I said, last week the debate  
 was adjourned and the House carried on with its  
 other business.

On the Friday I attended the school sports at  
 Watheroo, and I spoke to a few people there.

Several members interjected.

Mr CRANE: I believe I am allowed to explain  
 why I came to my conclusion.

Mr B. T. Burke: I think you should.

Mr CRANE: I think I have always accorded  
 the member for Balcatta the respect he should  
 have in this House, and everybody will recognise I  
 have done that. I am only asking others for what I  
 have always given them.



Mr B. T. Burke: Humbug!

Mr CRANE: Oh no, that is from *A Christmas Carol*.

Mr B. T. Burke: A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Mr CRANE: After the sports at Watheroo were over, I was talking with some people about the affairs of the House and it was brought to my attention that a television announcement had been made that I was probably going to be the star figure in this act.

Mr E. T. Evans: You are.

Mr CRANE: The people of Watheroo then expressed their concern about matters other than the railways, and a major concern was about the regulated area for the transport of beer. The cost of transporting a tonne of beer to Moora is \$11, and yet it is \$29 a tonne to Watheroo—25 miles further on. It was the opinion of these people that I should be concentrating my efforts more on such problems in my electorate, rather than problems outside it. I did not agree entirely, but I did not disagree entirely either.

I would like to read further from this advertisement entitled "Friends of the Railways". It tells us some points to watch for in our members of Parliament.

The FOR advertisement continues—

Will he stick up for the people of his Electorate or does he represent vested interests?

My electorate stretches from Gnangara Road, Wanneroo, to just north of Jurien Bay and almost across to Dalwallinu and Wongan Hills. It is distinctly possible that very few, if any, of my constituents would ever use the Fremantle-Perth railway, yet the FOR is asking me to support the people of my electorate. What do they want? They are asking me to support my constituents and, at the same time, are asking me to support the Fremantle-Perth railway line.

Mr Parker: Why can't you do both?

Mr CRANE: I am supporting it, but in another way; I believe I have explained that fairly well.

This brings me to the notice of motion I placed on the notice paper. There is a very important point to remember here—

Mr Cowan: That is what the Government is going to let you have.

Mr CRANE: The National Party reminds me of a kangaroo dog on a chain. It yaps and yaps, but never catches any kangaroos!

Mr T. H. Jones: They were your friends once; do not talk about them like that now.

Mr CRANE: With friends like that, who needs enemies? I refer to the notice of motion I placed on the notice paper yesterday.

Mr Cowan: That is what the Government is going to let you have.

Mr CRANE: I do not know that the Government will let me have it; I have yet to convince the Government, and it is not easy to convince. However, at least I will receive an intelligent hearing.

When framing my notice of motion, I felt the important issue involved was the return of the Fremantle-Perth railway if it was at all possible and justified. I have felt some concern of late because of the feelings of my electorate. I have my instructions clearly in black and white from the FOR to consider the people of my electorate. Therefore, in deference to my constituents I must give them some consideration. At the same time, I do not want to lose sight of the fact that I believe the Fremantle-Perth railway service could be returned in the future, to the advantage of Western Australia.

Mr E. T. Evans: You are having two bob each way.

Mr CRANE: So, I have a notice of motion on the notice paper which, if agreed to, will enable a properly conducted survey to be carried out, a survey to which all interested parties can make a contribution. I hope the Government will agree to my motion, and that the Opposition will agree to help me.

Mr E. T. Evans: Yes, the Opposition is bound to, the way you are helping us!

Mr CRANE: We could perhaps even reach a situation where the railway could be extended to areas of my electorate about which I feel a great deal of concern. I refer to Wanneroo, the fastest-growing area in Western Australia and, possibly, Australia, where transport services should be increased and improved. This point was included in my motion.

I am also concerned at the fact that sometimes this place could be described as running first hot and then cold. A short while ago, the member for Subiaco said I would be a great person if I supported his amendment. Yet yesterday, when being interviewed by a television representative, the member for Subiaco called me a "bloody old bastard". I am sorry Mr Speaker, but that is what he called me.

Mr B. T. Burke: Take a point of order! That is filth!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr H. D. Evans: He is not old at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order! I submit to the member for Moore that we can do without that type of language.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr CRANE: I agree entirely, Mr Speaker. Could I put it a nicer way: My parents, God bless them, were married 12 months before they started a family, and I was the youngest of seven children. So, I do not think there is any doubt about my parentage. Therefore, I do not object to being referred to as an illegitimate, but I most sincerely object to being called old; I am only 57 years of age. That is the sort of thing one gets used to around this place.

#### *Point of Order*

Dr DADOUR: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Subiaco will resume his seat. So that I may hear the point of order the member for Subiaco wishes to raise, the House will come to order!

Dr DADOUR: I object! The member for Moore is misquoting me. That is only half of what I called him.

The SPEAKER: Order! Knowing as I do the vocabulary of the member for Subiaco, I ask him not to tell us the other half! The honourable member can be very humorous at times.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr CRANE: Mr Speaker, I feel I have been deprived of most of my time tonight. I suppose I could ask for an extension of time, but perhaps I had better not try my luck too far. I think I have made my point.

Mr B. T. Burke: You have not said anything!

Mr CRANE: I have a motion on the notice paper which, if carried, will allow a proper study to be made into whether or not the rail service should be reinstated.

Mr Cowan: You wrote this amendment, yet you are not prepared to support it.

Mr CRANE: There is the kangaroo dog again! The member for Merredin is like a dog who chases a car; if he ever caught up with it, he would not know what to do with it.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr CRANE: For the reasons I have given, I believe that whilst I do not intend to support the amendment and we will lose this battle, the

actions I have taken will mean we will eventually win the war.

Opposition members: God save the Queen!

Mr Nanovich: Mr Speaker!

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Avon.

Mr Nanovich: Mr Speaker, I wish to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Whitford will resume his seat. The honourable member may not have been in the House last week when the member for Swan expressed the belief that I was showing favouritism by giving the call to a member who, quite clearly, was not first to his feet. The clear duty of the Presiding Officer is to try to present to the House a balanced debate. There has been one speaker from my right and I believe it appropriate that if there be a speaker from my left, I should call him, notwithstanding the fact that I agree the member for Whitford was first to his feet. I reiterate my comments of last week: I do not reward athletic ability here; as far as is reasonably practicable, I try to provide a balanced debate.

MR McIVER (Avon) [7.53 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, I seek your guidance. I am speaking now to the amendment, and I understand that this will not preclude me from closing the debate on the motion at a later stage.

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

Mr McIVER: Due to the seriousness of the motion which is the subject of an amendment moved by the member for Subiaco, it is imperative we return to a sense of order in this Parliament, and discuss the motion and the amendment as responsible members of Parliament. We should not continue with the nonsense we have just heard in the last 20 minutes from the member for Moore.

The Opposition is in full agreement with the amendment which I understand was framed by the member for Moore, although it was moved by the member for Subiaco. I commend the member for Moore for his amendment, because it has a great deal of merit. The Opposition particularly supports the following part of the amendment—

... on a trial basis for eighteen months with feeder buses and improved station parking, and the return of the express rail service between Perth and Claremont which was discontinued in March 1976.

Mr Crane: I will explain all that in the debate on my motion on the notice paper.

Mr McIVER: The member for Moore had his 20 minutes; he should give me a chance.

Mr Crane: Members from your side interjected continually on me; be fair.

Mr McIVER: In essence, that part of the amendment, if passed, means that the Fremantle-Perth railway service will return on an 18 months' trial. In the member for Moore, we have a member of Parliament who has obviously taken the time to conduct some research and to frame an amendment which has obvious merit.

Mr Crane: I would have explained the research I undertook if you had given me the opportunity; however, you did not.

Mr McIVER: However, the Opposition strongly condemns the member for Moore for not referring to the amendment when he just spoke; he did not refer to even one syllable of the amendment which he was responsible for framing. His speech ranged from a lesson in Shakespeare to the carting of beer to Watheroo. Perhaps if the people of Watheroo were to examine Westrail's new freight charges, they would get a surprise. Whenever one hears people in country areas screaming about Westrail charges, they are always referring to beer—never spirits. Private enterprise never wants to carry spirits. In other words, they want to cart only the cream of the freight.

Mr Speaker, I do not wish to be sidetracked; I wish to confine my remarks to the amendment before the Chair. I am sure my colleagues were as astounded as I was to hear such a discourse from the member for Moore. I can say only that I hope the honourable member's wheat crop produces a greater yield than the essence of his speech here tonight. I know the honourable member personally and he is capable of far greater things than that. We on this side are not concerned with the faction fighting going on between the National Party and the National Country Party. That is a matter which they must thrash out themselves; certainly, the Legislative Assembly Chamber is not the place to do it.

Mr Cowan: Hear, hear!

Mr McIVER: The Opposition also supports that part of the amendment which states as follows—

The study is to include costing for the options of electrification based on the new Brisbane 25Kv electrification system and standard gauge for Perth/Midland and Perth/Wanneroo.

I repeat: The Opposition strongly supports that concept. Mr Speaker, you would know that ever since the Tonkin Government was defeated in 1974, we on this side have never missed an opportunity to put forward the policy of

electrification of rail. We have strongly condemned the Government's policy in relation to Westrail generally and for allowing Westrail's services to run down to its present condition.

Mr Rushton: What a lot of rubbish!

Mr McIVER: We heard the Minister for Transport for about four hours today; he should let me have a go now.

Mr Rushton: You are exaggerating again.

Mr McIVER: Westrail is low not only in rolling stock and locomotives, but also in morale. I have indicated in this place on many previous occasions that a Government instrumentality will never function effectively unless the Minister and his departmental heads have the morale of the men behind them. The Minister certainly does not have that at present. However, Mr Speaker, I will not dwell on that point because I know you will not allow me to proceed.

It would not be feasible to use the present diesel cars between Armadale, Perth, and Fremantle; the Government does not have enough railcars to run its daily services now. At peak periods the Government has to use "X"-class locomotives with old carriages which the average man would not allow his mother-in-law to travel on because the underframes of those carriages, as members know from answers to questions I have asked, date back to the 1800s. This is a point the Government never seems to be able to grasp. The Government must produce something in which the people can travel in comfort; it has to provide modern railcars. When the Government obtains the railcars about which it is making so much fuss it will not gain anything because the old railcars will have to be removed from service—that is, if they do not fall apart before then.

I rose to indicate that the Opposition was in full agreement with the amendment moved by the member for Subiaco. I understand the amendment was framed by the member for Moore. I believe the way the member for Moore spoke tonight was one of the most shocking exhibitions I have witnessed in my 14 years as a member of Parliament; he is deserving of no credit for his contribution. I trust the member for Moore will give greater consideration to the remarks I make when replying to the motion I moved, irrespective of the fact that certain Liberal Party members took him out in the corridor last week and lectured him. I trust that he will not be like Judas with the 40 pieces of silver. If the member for Moore is dinkum and honest he will support my motion. If he did he would receive greater support from his electorate. He should remember that he is not representing

only the people in the electorate of Moore but also all the people of Western Australia.

Mr Crane: I intend to support my motion.

Mr McIVER: I think I have made it clear that the Opposition supports the amendment in its entirety. I trust Government members will have a change of heart.

MR NANOVICH (Whitford) [8.02 p.m.]: I want to join in this debate and give you, Mr Speaker, my assurance—

Several members interjected.

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

Mr NANOVICH: I assure members that I will not take up the time of the House for very long. I am disappointed with the argument put forward by members of the Opposition, members of the National Party, and the member for Subiaco for the reinstatement of the Fremantle-Perth railway line. Last week when the member for Avon was making his contribution he based his entire argument for the reinstatement of this line on one letter which appeared in the *Daily News*. He said that the sole purpose of the Government in wanting to close the line was to upgrade and improve the Armadale-Perth line.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Whitford to resume his seat. I have listened fairly closely to his comments thus far, and it appears he has neglected to take into account the question before the Chair. There is a specific motion before the Chair dealing with something related to but quite different from the closure of the Fremantle-Perth railway line. Unless he intends deviating from his current remarks I may have to take action because he seems to have misunderstood the question before the Chair. The question relates to a feasibility study of a railway line to Wanneroo. The member for Whitford.

Mr NANOVICH: I am well aware of the motion, but I was trying to support my argument by indicating that I would not support the amendment because of the previous work done and studies which were carried out. In fact, next week I will be supporting a motion for a feasibility study to be made to consider the means of transport necessary to cater for areas north, through Whitford and Wanneroo.

Mr H. D. Evans: Was not the \$2 million paid for the SWATS report sufficient?

Mr NANOVICH: I can assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the money was spent very wisely. I am sure the reports received by the Minister were very closely perused.

Mr H. D. Evans: Name one thing that has come out of the report.

Mr NANOVICH: There are many things. The member should get to his feet later and name some areas which were not affected.

Mr O'Connor: What about going to road in certain areas where necessary at a later stage?

Mr H. D. Evans: Name one specific point that has changed the system now.

Mr NANOVICH: I cannot support the amendment before the House. I had notes prepared to speak to the motion which was moved by the Opposition last week. I was quite impressed with the summary the Minister presented to the House of the areas affected by cutting out one service to use the money to upgrade the total transport system throughout the rest of the metropolitan area and those areas on the fringes of the metropolitan boundary.

We have heard the members of the National Party commit themselves to a certain course. They have shown a great deal of interest in the closure of the Fremantle-Perth railway line. If they continue to ride on issues as they are doing now in an endeavour to gain ground electorally they will find themselves grasping a greasy pole; they will keep slipping back. I can recall when I was the member for Toodyay and from time to time the Deputy Premier, who was then the Minister for Railways, and then the Hon. David Wordsworth, would inform members that certain lines were to be closed because of a lack of patronage. Those lines were dead wood. There was not a great deal of objection to the closure of those lines; there was not a great deal of objection to the correctness of those decisions; they were well received.

The Fremantle-Perth line involved the closure of 19 kilometres of railway of which 25 per cent was practically bare. It had no future possibility of attracting patronage. It carried about 0.43 per cent of the total passenger component of the metropolitan transport routes. I cannot see how the closure could have affected our transport system very much, considering how few people commuted on this line.

The present transport system between Fremantle and Perth is far more effective and economical, which shows that the Government was fully justified in closing the line. As the member for Whitford, I will continue to push this Government for continued upgrading of the transport system.

Mr T. H. Jones: Oh yes! You will do what your Premier tells you.

Mr NANOVIK: At least I do not jump when Caucus tells me to jump.

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

Mr NANOVIK: It is apparent that I have hit a soft spot. I would like to make a few brief comments on the background—

The SPEAKER: I thought you were going to say, "On the motion"!

Mr NANOVIK: Perhaps I have wandered a little from the question before the Chair. Originally I had intended to speak to the motion moved by the member for Avon; the amendment has caught me a little off balance.

Mr T. H. Jones: Obviously.

Mr McIver: You have derailed the train.

Mr NANOVIK: The amendment before the House proves nothing. It is a further attempt to have the Fremantle-Perth line reinstated. Those members who have asked that the line be reinstated have given no reasons to indicate that this House should support the amendment. As I indicated earlier, I will be seconding a motion next week which the member for Moore will be submitting to the House. I cannot support this amendment and I am rather surprised that, on such a very important issue, certain members are prepared to get up and speak merely to gain publicity without doing anything of value for their constituents, the people of the State and, more particularly, the people who are vitally affected in this particular case.

MR WILLIAMS (Clontarf) [8.12 p.m.]: I rise—

Several members interjected.

Mr Nanovich: Why don't you pump a bit more coal into your ears!

Mr T. H. Jones: I didn't say anything.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr T. H. Jones: I'll have to name him.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr NANOVIK: I thought the member for Collie made a remark directed at me. If he did not, I will believe him and apologise. Instead, I will condemn the member for Maylands.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise—

Mr Harman: The second act in the circus.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is a damned good act and I bet the honourable member could not follow it!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections and there is far too much casual conversation. The member for Clontarf.

Mr WILLIAMS: Again, I endeavour to inform the House of a matter which is of importance and which was mentioned by the member for Avon. He passed a remark that made great play of the fact that at certain times of the day the railways had to use diesel locomotives and carriages.

Mr Tonkin interjected.

Mr WILLIAMS: They have given the member for Morley his third needle for the night!

From time immemorial—when the Midland Workshops were first put into operation—the workers there have been carried to and from that workshop by locomotion free of charge.

Mr Cowan: What has this to do with the amendment.

Mr WILLIAMS: That is the position because there are sufficient numbers to require a diesel locomotive and carriages to carry those workers.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr SKIDMORE: Mr Speaker, I fail to see the relevance of the remarks made by the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: The member has been speaking for less than two minutes and I am sure members will agree that I allow a certain amount of time for a speaker to develop his speech before I make a judgment as to whether or not he is addressing his remarks to the Chair. I would simply counsel the member for Clontarf to read the amendment and then continue his remarks.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr WILLIAMS: With respect Sir, I am simply bringing to the notice of the House the point raised by the member for Avon in his remarks to the motion.

Mr McIver: I was talking about what occurred in 1908.

Mr WILLIAMS: The member for Avon was talking about the time when locomotives and carriages were used to carry workers from the Midland Workshops to their place of employment, free of charge, but the return journey was used as a commercial project to make money. And why should it not be so? That was the reason for its use so members of the Opposition should not try to tell untruths in this House. The trains have been in operation from time immemorial.

Mr McIver: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr WILLIAMS: I have known that fact for 30 years. There have been three trains out of Midland every afternoon. They have been operating free of charge to those workers. The member for Avon raised this matter. I will explain to the House—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order! I see little relevance between what is being raised now by the member for Clontarf and the amendment which is before the Chair. I am addressing my remarks to the member for Clontarf and it seems appropriate that he should be interested even if others are not. It would be more appropriate for the member to make the remarks he seeks to make on the motion once we have dealt with the amendment which is before the Chair.

Mr WILLIAMS: With respect Sir, I believe I have made my point. I have pointed out to the House that the situation is not as the member for Avon suggested. These locomotives were used for a specific purpose. I have made my point.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Minister for Transport) [8.19 p.m.]: Visitors to this Parliament must be appalled by the lack of substance in the arguments put forward by members of the Labor Party, the National Party, and the member for Subiaco when addressing themselves to the debate on this amendment.

Mr Harman: The member for Subiaco is your colleague.

Mr RUSHTON: I am not proud of the fact that the member for Subiaco connived with the Opposition and the National Party to influence members against the Government. He is not entitled to influence them in that way.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: The member for Subiaco will resume his seat. The remarks made by the Minister for Transport are inflammatory and they are unbecoming of a Minister of the Crown. I ask the Minister to refrain from using that type of language when referring to colleagues, regardless of the side of the House on which they may sit.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr COWAN: I am very grateful you have asked the Minister to refrain from making those remarks, Mr Speaker. I find the remarks made by the Minister to be offensive to me. I consider them inflammatory and I ask that he withdraw them.

The SPEAKER: I agree with the point raised by the member for Merredin. I ask the Minister to withdraw.

Mr RUSHTON: At your request Sir, I withdraw whatever remarks to which you may object.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: I do not know how one could explain to this House or demonstrate what has been done by members who have been trying to influence people to do some things which I find quite despicable. That is the point I am making. I made that remark in that way because I thought it was factual.

Those people I have mentioned have been trying to influence others. They have not been just casting their own vote, they have been trying to influence others to destroy the Government. That fact has been obvious to the media because they have observed this occurrence day after day. It is something to consider when we study this amendment.

The contributions made by the member for Moore and the member for Whitford were constructive and they are obviously in support of a motion which has been flagged to appear at a later time. All members should be constructive when debating the matter of urban public transport. All those listening to this performance tonight must be appalled at the lack of substance in the presentations of the National Party and the member for Subiaco.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Avon said that he was in support of this amendment and the reason for his support was that the proposal would be on a trial basis for 18 months with feeder services into Claremont. That line has been on a trial basis for 100 years and is being tested now by transport experts and consultants. That proves the point that the Government has total regard for public opinion and has acted wisely. Not one speaker has addressed himself to the real problem. The problem is an economic one.

Mr McIver: I will do that at the end of the debate.

Mr RUSHTON: It would be about time. The honourable member has been speaking about this matter for a long time.

The member for Avon spoke about a trial period and a transfer station at Claremont with a feeder service. Transport experts have advised that that is not workable.

As far as I am concerned, we have trials in other areas, and they are Midland and Kelmscott.

One could quite easily be appalled at the lack of regard members have for their own electors when one hears the presentation of the members of the National Party. They made great play of their concern—as the member for Subiaco did also—about having a cheap transport system. Of course the Government is considering just that fact. The Government is moving towards the economic running of a public transport system. However, those members did not mention funds or money.

Mr Cowan: That shows how much you listen, I spoke about money in my speech.

Mr RUSHTON: All those members were worried about was the influencing of a vote to embarrass the Government and myself.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: They do not have any regard for the real facts and do not have any regard for the need for an economic urban public transport system.

Their greatest disregard for the people was when they waved aside the fact that \$0.5 million has been saved this year with the change to the present system.

Mr McIver: Money has been wasted elsewhere.

Mr RUSHTON: No it has not. Not one point has been made about capital investment and the saving of something like \$2.7 million this year and the lead to a potential cost saving—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr Harman: The Minister won't explain—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. I think it is reasonable to expect that members allow me at least to resume my seat before they commence interjections. I think they ought to refrain from interjecting at least until the Minister has commenced speaking.

Mr RUSHTON: The members of the Labor Party and the National Party have had no regard for the potential capital cost saving of \$6.7 million over a period of five years. There will also be an operation cost saving of \$6.9 million up to 1983-84.

It is a hypocritical stance to take. They claim that they are mindful of the position of the people in the country areas and the economy. Then they come to this place and attempt to tell people how to run public transport. In other words they are

advising us when they cannot look after their own problems.

Mr Cowan: You created them.

Mr RUSHTON: Members are aware that some provision has been made for a future LRT system into Wanneroo. Of course this matter will receive great emphasis in the research work being done at the present time. I will be pleased to respond to the motion which is to be moved by the member for Moore. I am sure he will be most constructive and the motion will be something for which the Government could have every regard.

Perhaps we should refer to the time when Professor Stephenson was working with the Town Planning Commission. He had the responsibility of sorting out the transport needs for the area towards Wanneroo.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: Members of the Opposition should listen—they may be a little embarrassed but they should listen—to what I have to say. In 1958 the Hawke Government received a proposition that there should be a rail transport system from Perth to the northern suburbs. The member for Balcatta at the time presented the proposition to the Cabinet. The Cabinet decided that this area should be served by road transport. Now, we have the same party claiming it has a great interest in rail.

Mr Harman: That was 22 years ago.

Mr RUSHTON: The line was to be from Bayswater to North Beach and from Shenton Park to Whitford, linking at North Beach.

The Hawke Government did not make the necessary reservations. That Government said the transport should be by road.

Mr Harman: Why did it say that?

Mr RUSHTON: Because it made its evaluations and made its judgments.

Mr Harman: But why?

Mr RUSHTON: What does the member think? Because economics were involved.

We have made provision for a future rail system to Wanneroo from the city.

Several members interjected.

Mr RUSHTON: Premier Hawke would not have a bar of such a system operating into the northern suburbs. The hypocrites of today are not honouring their colleagues' decisions of the past.

Mr McIver: Two wrongs won't make a right.

Mr RUSHTON: It is interesting to note that Labor people who would not have a bar of making reservations for a rail system in 1958, moved in

this House to close the rail system from Leighton to Barrack Street. The same people are saying we should not try out the Fremantle-Perth recommendation. The specialists on transport matters relating to the Fremantle-Perth rail have provided us with expert advice and I am very happy to say that we are doing something positive.

The member for Avon said we were letting Westrail run down. This is closely related to my interests and the future of Westrail.

Mr McIver: Haven't you had any deputations lately from the respective railway organisations?

Mr RUSHTON: In a few sentences I will tell the honourable member what is happening and he will eat his words. He does not know what is going on. A sum of \$300 million is to be spent between 1980-81 and 1984-85 on upgrading the State's railway network. That includes the \$121 million on the Kwinana-Koolyanobbing line. Work and studies are going on in relation to the extension—

#### *Point of Order*

Mr McIVER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, we heard all this before the tea suspension when the Minister had the opportunity to speak to the general debate, and I draw attention to the fact that in no way is this matter relevant to the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport has, up till a couple of seconds ago when my attention was drawn to a note which was put before me, been addressing his remarks to the question which is before the Chair. Indeed, he was referring to the proposed route going through to Wanneroo and to a proposal by a previous Government and Administration, and he was relating it to the subject before the Chair. I find that the Minister is in fact addressing his remarks to the question before the Chair.

Mr McIVER: I concede that point. The point I am making is that the \$300 million upgrading of the Kwinana-Koolyanobbing railway has nothing to do with the amendment before the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I qualified my statement by saying "up till my attention was distracted". The Minister is now talking about the Kwinana-Koolyanobbing railway line, and that obviously has little relevance to the question before the Chair.

#### *Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed*

Mr RUSHTON: I was answering the member for Avon's challenge that Westrail was being run

down. I mentioned the Kwinana-Koolyanobbing railway and the \$5.2 million being put into the Midland Workshops, and that the electrification of the system to Bunbury will follow. I have a special interest in promoting historic trains, and I hope steam trains will be running shortly on an increased number of lines.

I also have come back to the point that the member for Avon, on behalf of the Opposition, and the speakers for the National Party have made no attempt to prove their argument. They have not made one factual, in-depth presentation which would persuade members to support this amendment. I found the way this situation has been dealt with by those members to be quite despicable. It must be quite obvious, from the Press Gallery, what has been going on for days and what they have been trying to do. They have not been addressing themselves to the issue of the Fremantle-Perth railway or the need for transport to Wanneroo. They have been playing ducks and drakes. The National Party and the Opposition have been shown up for what they are. They are very shallow, and they certainly have not addressed themselves to the matter or made any telling points. I certainly support the remarks made by the member for Moore and the member for Whitford—

Mr Cowan: Who said nothing.

Mr RUSHTON: The remarks of the speakers for the Opposition and the National Party were very shallow. Unfortunately, the media pick up that sort of thing; that is what they address themselves to. It is a shame. It has been proved here tonight that those who are backing this motion have taken a very shallow approach in their attempt to belittle the Government's serious effort to advance public transport. The Government has allowed a trial period, having regard for public opinion and to enable people to understand the issues better. This indicates to the people, generally, that the Government is in line and on target in what it proposes to do, and it has undertaken to review the future of this service in another two years.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following results—

Ayes 21

Mr Barnett	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bertram	Mr McIver
Mr Bryce	Mr McPharlin
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Parker
Mr Carr	Mr Skidmore
Mr Cowan	Mr Stephens
Dr. Dadour	Mr Taylor
Mr E. T. Evans	Mr Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Wilson
Mr Harman	Mr Bateman
Mr Hodge	

(Teller)



## Noes 21

Mr Clarko	Mr Old
Mrs Craig	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grayden	Mr Spriggs
Mr Grewar	Mr Trethowan
Mr Hassell	Mr Tubby
Mr Herzfeld	Mr Watt
Mr MacKinnon	Mr Williams
Mr Mensaros	Mr Young
Mr Nanovich	Mr Blaikie
Mr O'Connor	

(Teller)

## Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Grill	Sir Charles Court
Mr Bridge	Mr P. V. Jones
Mr Pearce	Mr Coyne
Mr Jamieson	Mr Shalders
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr Sibson
Mr Davies	Mr Laurance

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed*

MR HERZFELD (Mundaring) [8.39 p.m.]: I welcome the fact that we have now arrived at a point where we can resume discussion of the main points at issue in the question before the House. Today and tonight the House has spent its time considering matters which are quite irrelevant to the question before the House. We have seen politicking, some of it of the most scurrilous type, which has absolutely no relevance to the issue we are supposed to be debating.

The issue itself is one which has been before the House on a number of occasions. I do not intend to take any notice of the snipers from the National Party sitting in front of me, who are trying to distract me from my speech. I have plenty of time. I am quite happy to stay here until they keep quiet and let me get on with my speech.

The SPEAKER: I suggest if there is any form of conversation which tends to distract the honourable member, in all fairness it should cease. The member for Mundaring.

Mr HERZFELD: As I was saying, I welcome the opportunity to come back to debating the motion and to looking at the real points at issue. Because it is such a long time since we last dealt with the motion today, I propose to read it to the House so that members know what it is all about; and I will then address my remarks to it.

Mr B. T. Burke: The day of the Minister for Water Supplies will come.

Mr HERZFELD: The motion reads as follows—

That in the opinion of this House, the Perth-Fremantle rail service should be

reinstated by 1 October 1980. The reinstatement of the service is justified on the following grounds—

- (1) public opinion strongly supports the reopening;
- (2) the inconvenience suffered by the general public as a result of the closure, especially aged persons, mothers with young families and handicapped people.

Mr McIver: You have got the wrong motion.

Mr HERZFELD: Those are the points we should be discussing. I said that the motion brought forward by the Opposition was one which had been debated over a lengthy period in this place. On each of those occasions the Government and the Minister, in particular, have stated again and again the reasons the Government took the action it did in January 1979 to close the Fremantle-Perth railway line. Had members opposite bothered to listen to those arguments they would have found them very cogent, real, and convincing. Again tonight, the Minister went point by point through the various reasons that the Government took the action it did, and he outlined Government action and detailed the initiatives the Government had taken to ensure Perth would have a future urban transport system of which it could be justly proud.

In saying that, I do not in any way detract from the standard of urban transport which we have in this city at this point in time. In fact, earlier this year I was overseas and had the opportunity to travel on public transport in a number of countries in Europe and in America. From my experience, I believe the people of Perth have an urban public transport system which is not only extremely good by comparison with the systems in those countries but which caters their own special needs.

Mr Wilson: Does that apply to the outer suburbs?

Mr HERZFELD: In addition to that, I believe Perth's urban transport system is one which is run reasonably economically by comparison with those in other countries; and the question of economics cannot be emphasised sufficiently. The Minister, of course, has made that point again and again, yet the Opposition is determined not to take any notice. The reason is simple: members opposite have detected that there are some votes to be gained in the question of this railway line and they have played up the politics to the hilt from the very moment that they could. In fact, they have been doing so ever since.

We had a situation in the election campaign last year in which members opposite tried to use

the members of the Friends of the Railways group to benefit the ALP electorally. I do not doubt that many members of that group are genuinely concerned about this railway line, but there is no point in denying that the group was politically based because its convener was a candidate for the ALP in the last State election. Then we saw the organisation that went into bringing this motion before the House last week, when politics were played purely and simply—

Mr B. T. Burke: This is Parliament, you know.

Mr HERZFELD: If it was a matter of politics being played for State purposes, I would say that was fair enough.

Mr B. T. Burke: You never heard your Premier go on about Whitlam, you dope.

Mr HERZFELD: However, of course, that was not the case at all and well do members opposite know it. It so happens we are in the middle of a Federal election campaign.

Mr T. J. Burke: And you are losing, too.

Mr HERZFELD: Despite the fact that, on the admission of the Opposition spokesman, the motion had been mooted since some time in July, the Opposition chose to leave it on the notice paper until last week.

Mr T. J. Burke: Until the Address-in-Reply was finished.

Several members interjected.

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

Mr HERZFELD: Why did the Opposition do that?

Mr Cowan interjected.

Mr HERZFELD: For the benefit of the Leader of the National Party, who has been here longer than I have—

Mr McIver: And he will be here a lot longer than you will be, too.

Mr HERZFELD: —the fact of the matter is that if the issue was so urgent the Opposition could have raised it as an urgency debate, or it could have moved for the suspension of Standing Orders to discuss the matter.

Mr McIver: Before the Address-in-Reply was finished? Don't make a fool of yourself.

Mr HERZFELD: That is what the Opposition did in respect of another issue only a day or so ago. So let us not have any of that sort of nonsense. Politics is what it is all about; the Federal election is what it is all about.

Last week a march was organised, and we have already heard other members now say it was organised by the Friends of the Railways.

Mr McIver: It was a very good one, too.

Mr HERZFELD: To get people to attend they had to advertise; and when they advertised they listed a whole string of grievances, real or imaginary, that people might have. Perhaps if we compared the 700, 800, or even 1 200 people who may have been in the march last week with the people we have in the gallery tonight, we would find the difference is that the people who marched did so because they were unhappy about increases in water rates, local authority rates, SEC charges, MTT bus fares, car licences, road widening schemes, environmental issues, and Government secrecy as listed in the FOR advertisement. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that at least three quarters of those people joined the march for those other reasons and not because they wished to have any influence on the State Government on the railway issue. They joined because they thought it might provide a demonstration against the Liberal coalition Government which is facing an election.

I will further emphasise that point by saying that it is my custom during the tea suspension to walk for exercise instead of eating; and on that Wednesday evening I happened to be in St George's Terrace by some chance just as the marchers were coming down the road.

Mr Barnett: It is a pity you weren't right in front of them.

Mr HERZFELD: As I stood there watching, the front row of marchers had not even passed me when someone dashed across and handed me a pamphlet. Mr Speaker, what do you think was on that pamphlet? It said, "March against Fraser."

Mr McIver: Good advice, too. You couldn't get better advice than that.

Mr HERZFELD: So are members opposite going to tell me that those people were marching to try to restore the railway? What a lot of nonsense and rot!

Mr McIver: Come on! Stick to the motion.

Mr Sodeman: Headline hunters—what a sham!

Mr B. T. Burke: That still does not make the Minister for Water Supplies tell the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HERZFELD: I feel sorry for those genuine people who marched because they have a desire to have the railway service reinstated, but they were conned by the Labor activists to take part in a march for political purposes.

Mr T. H. Jones: It is a wonder you haven't called them communists.

Mr HERZFELD: There may well have been some communists amongst them. In fact, I saw one gentleman who is a well known communist, and there may well have been others. I do not know, because I do not mix in those circles.

Mr T. J. Burke: It was a very democratic march.

Mr Melver: Was Mr Whitlam in it?

Mr HERZFELD: I do not think I would have recognised him if he was, because he is a forgotten person.

Mr B. T. Burke: I don't think he would recognise you either, brother.

Mr HERZFELD: I think it is absolutely scurrilous that genuine, decent people should be deceived into demonstrating for something for which they have a genuine feeling, and used as pawns for political gain for another purpose. That is the real point at issue, and that is the reason this motion was brought to the Chamber at this time.

Mr Young: Dial a crowd!

Mr HERZFELD: Before I move on to some of the more positive and cogent reasons that all members of this House and, indeed, all the people of Western Australia should support the action of the Government in closing this railway service, let me refer briefly to some of the other comments that have been made tonight. Members of the Opposition made great capital about the fact that the member for Moore voted in the way he felt he should vote.

Mr E. T. Evans: Against his own amendment!

Mr HERZFELD: Then members opposite lauded the member for Subiaco for apparently kicking the great Liberal machine in the middle of the body.

Mr Barnett: And knocking three Liberal members unconscious.

Mr HERZFELD: They lauded the member for Subiaco as though that was a wonderful thing to do. I remind members of the pledge that members opposite must sign before they become members of their party. They are committed to toe the party line. It is a credit to our side of politics—and it is something that should be lauded and recognised by the Opposition—that the member for Subiaco was able to vote according to his conscience.

Mr T. H. Jones: Don't say he has not been lined up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr T. H. Jones: He has been lined up by his party, and you know it. Tell the truth.

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

Mr HERZFELD: Despite the fact that I do not agree with the position taken by the member for Subiaco—

Mr E. T. Evans: You don't even talk to him.

Mr HERZFELD: —I applaud his right to exercise his choice to vote in the way he wants to. I would remind members of the Chamber and the people in the gallery that this is the difference, the gulf, that lies between members opposite and members on this side.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr E. T. Evans: What about when the Minister had to withdraw his remarks? Was he applauding him?

Mr HERZFELD: Of course, I am reminded by the Minister that three members are sitting on this side of the House who should not be here, but who should rightly be on the other side of the House because that is where their allegiance lies.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr COWAN: I would like the member for Mundaring to name the members to whom he is referring. If he is referring to the National Party, I seek a withdrawal of that remark.

The SPEAKER: The only requirement I have in respect of the withdrawal of remarks is that if it is my view the remarks made are unparliamentary I must order their withdrawal. I cannot accept that any remark recently made by the member for Mundaring transgresses Standing Orders.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr HERZFELD: All I can say is this: If the cap fits, wear it.

Let me continue with the matter under discussion. As I said, the member for Subiaco exercised his right to vote in the way he thought fit. I do not happen to agree with his point of view, and I want to dwell for a moment on the reasons he gave for adopting the stance he took. Firstly, he said that his constituents wanted him to vote that way, but at no time did he ever give us any evidence as to what—

Mr Cowan: Have a look at his vote!

Mr HERZFELD: Well, look at my vote. I was against the railway, and so were other members on this side of the House; but they are still here.

Mr Cowan interjected.

Mr HERZFELD: What rubbish! The member for Merredin well knows that I increased my vote at the last election. I am jolly proud of the people of Mundaring that they have confidence in me.

Mr Cowan interjected.

Dr Dadour: You leave me well alone. Okay?

Mr HERZFELD: The member for Subiaco provided no evidence that in fact the majority of his electors felt the way he did about the railway issue. If he had put the question to the 200, 300, 500, or even 1 000 of his constituents who might have used the railway service when it was in existence, "Would you still support the service if I asked you to pay the difference between the cost of transporting you by bus and transporting you by rail?", I wonder whether their answer would have been the same. I am not sure it would have been.

Let me remind members that the subsidy paid by the taxpayer for every passenger who travels on an MTT bus is 27c; at least that is what it was when I last saw it, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong.

Mr Rushton: It is more now.

Mr HERZFELD: So that subsidy has increased. I would assume that the subsidy paid for every passenger using the railways has also increased?

Mr Rushton: Yes.

Mr HERZFELD: The figures I recollect are a subsidy of 27c for bus and \$1.17 for rail—a difference of some 90c per passenger.

Mr Bateman: So what?

Mr HERZFELD: I would ask this question of the member for Subiaco—

Mr T. H. Jones: You don't worry about the millions that are wasted. What about the Kwinana power station? What about the \$37.9 million?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr T. H. Jones: You don't worry about money. What about that waste?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr T. H. Jones: Do not talk about waste.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order! It is now nine o'clock, and in accordance with the Sessional Order we are required to do one of three things. I can put the question; the member may seek leave of the House to continue

his remarks at a later stage of this sitting; or alternatively he could resume his seat and someone could move for the adjournment of the debate.

#### *Leave to Continue Speech*

Mr HERZFELD: I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage.

The SPEAKER: Of the sitting?

Mr HERZFELD: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mundaring seeks leave of the House to continue his remarks at a later stage of this sitting. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

#### *Sessional Orders Suspension*

MR O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Deputy Premier) [9.02 p.m.]: In accordance with an undertaking that I have given the Opposition, I move—

That Sessional Orders be suspended to permit private members' business to continue until 9.30 this evening.

Motion put and passed.

#### *Debate Resumed*

MR HERZFELD (Mundaring) [9.04 p.m.]: It is nice to be back again.

Mr T. J. Burke: You are the only one enjoying it.

Mr HERZFELD: Before I was interrupted, I was referring to the question of the subsidy that the taxpayer pays for the people who travel on bus and rail transport. I pointed out there was a vast difference between the subsidy paid for each passenger on the bus and each passenger travelling on rail. The latest figures I have in my head show that difference to be 90c per passenger. As I said, no doubt the Minister may have a figure that is more up to date than that, but I doubt whether the difference would be very much less. In fact, I would be surprised if it was not a great deal more.

I return to the point that I would be far more convinced about the argument of the member for Subiaco if he could convince me that his constituents wanted the railway between Perth and Fremantle so much that they were prepared to carry that additional burden of subsidy on their fares. This is a very important point, because not only has the member for Subiaco responsibility to his own constituents, but also he has a responsibility—

Dr Dadour: Far be it from you to tell me my responsibility.

Mr HERZFELD: He also has a responsibility—

Dr Dadour: You little worm.

#### *Withdrawal of Remark*

Mr HERZFELD: On a point of order—

Dr Dadour: You get onto another subject.

Mr HERZFELD: The member for Subiaco referred to me as a worm. I take exception to this, and I ask—

The SPEAKER: Order! I agree with the member for Mundaring that the term when applied to a member of this House is unacceptable. It is unparliamentary, and I would ask the member for Subiaco to withdraw it.

Dr DADOUR: I said "little worm"; but I will withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Subiaco has been in this House long enough to know that he has compounded his offence by repeating the offensive word. If he does that sort of thing again, I will have no alternative but to take the appropriate action.

I now ask the member for Subiaco to rise and apologise to the Chair for having compounded his offence.

Dr DADOUR: I apologise.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr HERZFELD: I return to the point I was making. The fare structure is such that the difference in fares between a passenger on the MTT and one on the railways means a greater subsidy on urban rail than there is on urban buses. The member for Subiaco has an equal responsibility to the people of Western Australia at large, as to his own constituents. Indeed, this applies to all members of this place as much as it applies to the member for Subiaco. I put the point that when he recognises this responsibility, he has to recognise also the injustice of imposing an additional tax burden on the people of Western Australia as against a subsidy for his own constituents. I believe that point has been made sufficiently.

I want to speak now about the positive aspects of the action that the Government took in January 1979. I believe these are important enough to be repeated, despite the fact they have been presented by the Minister on many occasions. The first aspect is that of responsible economic management of the taxpayers' money.

It is not said often enough that that is what government is all about. In contrast, of course, we have the very "liberal" policies of the Australian Labor Party when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money.

I would like to remind members of the catalogue of promises made by the Leader of the Opposition before the last State election, because they are relevant. I will list some of them, but not all. In the first place, there is the reduction of taxes. In the 1980 policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition we find that amongst many other promises there were promises to reduce a number of taxes. Pay-roll tax was to be reduced; there was to be a freeze on State fuel taxes; there was to be a reduction in or abolition of the metropolitan region improvement tax. The ALP was to review land tax; and judging by what its candidate was saying in my area at election time, it would abolish land tax. In addition, there was to be the reduction of water charges.

Then there was the expenditure side. I will deal with those items briefly, because they include very large expenditures on urban public transport. The Leader of the Opposition never told us how he was going to fund those. These promises are interesting in the light of the very difficult budgetary problems the Government has this year.

The first promise was to set up and fund a Western Australian development corporation. That was to develop resources in this State. The ALP was going to appoint overseas marketing representatives; expand the Mines Department to engage in exploration; inject more money into small business—\$3 million for a start—develop the regions; create a secondary industries assistance fund; provide country residential and industrial land at cost—cost to whom, one might well ask, and the answer would have to be to the cost of the taxpayer—use public funds to set up an electronics industry; begin labour-intensive capital works; optional early retirement for civil servants; extend concessions to pensioners for electricity and other facilities—

Mr Barnett: This has very little to do with the motion.

Mr HERZFELD: —create an industrial health and safety council; water charges were to be reduced—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HERZFELD: —and then we come to public transport.

The SPEAKER: I am glad you did, because you were trying my patience.

Mr HERZFELD: I am only trying to prove the point that the promises were made, with no indication of how the funding was to be met. It is all very well for the Opposition to tell us what we should be doing about urban public transport; but everything can be done provided one has a printing press to print money to meet the costs.

Now I come to the question of urban public transport. Here is where we move into the big league, the big money, because the ALP promised to electrify the whole of Perth's suburban railways by 1983. The estimate by the ALP of the cost of that was \$46 million.

We had experts on urban public transport to do the calculation exercise; and the answer they came up with was quite different. Their costing was \$102 million.

Mr Barnett: Then they changed their mind, and changed their mind again.

Mr HERZFELD: It is very interesting to go to the policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition when one seeks to find out how he was going to fund this. He said he would get the money from the Commonwealth Government; and if the Commonwealth Government did not have any money, he would find it any way he could. That is a very brave statement, to say the least, because \$100 million is not chicken feed, by any standard.

Mr Cowan: What is the difference between electrifying the urban rail system and the Kalgoorlie-Perth system?

Mr HERZFELD: There is a big difference, because when one has to spend huge sums of money in capital works, one seeks to do so wisely. One seeks to obtain some return for it.

The point that has been made again and again by the Minister for Transport is that the electrification of the urban transport system is not indicated economically. It is not warranted now. It would be a waste of scarce resources—

Mr Cowan interjected.

Mr HERZFELD:—resources that we could ill afford.

Mr Cowan interjected.

Mr Young: If you are going to interject, interject forward so the whole House can hear you. Do not lean over the back of your bench and have a private conversation.

Mr Williams: Intimidation of the speaker.

Mr Young: You could be saying anything.

Mr HERZFELD: I am not the slightest bit interested in carrying on a private conversation with this member who is not addressing his

remarks to the Chair. If anyone else can hear him—

#### *Point of Order*

Mr YOUNG: On a point of order: I know it is unparliamentary and improper to interject in any manner but the performance of the member for Merredin is disgusting. He is leaning over the back of his seat and having a tête-à-tête with the member on his feet. He ought to desist.

The SPEAKER: Order! I regard the member for Merredin as an extremely fair man, and I did appeal to his sense of fair play earlier this evening when I asked him to desist from conducting a conversation, or at least speaking, whilst the member for Mundaring was attempting to deliver his speech. I believe that the members of this House who are required to sit in those three seats adjacent to the member for Mundaring are at something of a disadvantage. It is totally unacceptable, and totally unfair, for a member who is required to address the House from that position to be subject to interjections at a level that is obviously too low for me to hear, or for anyone else to hear, but at such a level that they distract the person who is addressing the House.

I again appeal to the fairness and sense of fair play of the member for Merredin.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr HERZFELD: I simply make the point that the action taken by the Government in closing the Fremantle-Perth railway line was one of economics and sound management of the taxpayers' money.

The taxpayer is already subsidising the urban transport system to the tune of \$40 million. If this were the only State in which economic sense of this nature prevailed, the Government should receive double praise; but in fact this is not the case.

Mr Cowan: I should like the member for Mundaring to tell us the economic responsibility of trying to electrify the Perth-Kalgoorlie line as opposed to electrification of a suburban line.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HERZFELD: I am not the slightest bit interested in the interjection made by the member for Merredin. I want to point out this is not the only State in which constant review and forward planning of public transport takes place. I have a pamphlet in my hand which says, "Secret SRA plans uncovered". The letters "SRA" refer to the State Railway Authority. This pamphlet was

published by the State Railway Union and expresses concern about the action proposed by the New South Wales Government—a Labor Government, need I add—to rationalise some of its train services. That is what good, sound government is all about. It is necessary to take these sorts of actions and this is occurring in a State with a Labor Government, and I give due credit to that Government.

The proposals which have been explained to us again and again by the Minister for Transport are along exactly the same lines. The Government is planning for the future. It wants to save taxpayers' money and, therefore, members of this House should support wholeheartedly these sorts of plans. We should put behind us stupid motions which are introduced for political purposes and for no other reason.

Mr Nanovich: Mr Speaker—

Mr McIver: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: In these circumstances I will not give the call to the member for Avon, because clearly he would be closing the debate. Another member has indicated his desire to speak and I believe I have an obligation to allow that member to do so.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr H. D. EVANS: I was given to understand a situation had arisen between the spokesman handling this motion and the Deputy Premier, that the motion would be put to the vote this evening.

The SPEAKER: Order! That may well be the case. One of the difficulties I have in trying to preside over this House is my lack of information.

I take it there has been something of a private arrangement between the Deputy Premier and Opposition members. However, it seems to me that, not only have I not been informed of the details of that arrangement, but also the member for Whitford has not been informed, because he seeks to address the House.

In the circumstances, as Presiding Officer, I have no alternative but to give the call to the member for Whitford if he seeks to speak.

#### *Debate Resumed*

MR NANOVIICH (Whitford) [9.19 p.m.]: Very briefly, now that time for debate has almost expired—

Mr McIver: What a shambles!

Mr NANOVIICH: It is not a shambles. I should like to point out that the Fremantle-Perth railway line is a dead issue.

Mr McIver: That is the last time you will get co-operation from me.

Mr NANOVIICH: I will not repeat the details in regard to the march on Parliament last week which was advertised in the Press. The member for Mundaring has adequately provided the details contained in this advertisement.

In 1970 the Liberal Government commissioned the Perth Regional Transport Study to determine what the transport needs of Perth would be during the next 20 years. One of the recommendations of that study was as follows—

A busway to be located in the median of the Mitchell Freeway and replacement of the suburban railway system by a busway system, with a bus station located between William Street and Barrack Street on Railway land. A second bus station to be located on Mounts Bay Road on the Perth Technical College Site.

In 1971, a Labor Government asked that a further study be undertaken, as it considered the removal of railway lines to be wasteful. The new study with the title "PERTS 72", when completed, supported the conclusion of the Perth Regional Transport Study undertaken in 1970.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Deputy Premier makes a promise and the member for Whitford breaks it.

Mr Clarko: You be quiet.

Mr B. T. Burke: What do you know? You are the only member with a club foot for a mouth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Balcatta to desist from interjecting whilst I am on my feet.

Mr NANOVIICH: Before the Perth Regional Transport Study 1972 was completed, the Labor Government passed the Perth Regional Railway Act 1972, which permitted the discontinuance of that part of the Fremantle-Perth railway line between Leighton and Barrack Street Bridge.

In 1973 the then Labor Government appointed Wilbur Smith & Associates to investigate the feasibility of an underground rail system for Perth. One of the results of the study was a recommendation for a busway in the Fremantle-Perth corridor, this recommendation being the forerunner of the decision to close the railway.

The Government did not treat the matter lightly when it was considering that particular section of the railway line which is 19 kilometres in length. As indicated earlier, this represents only 1.25 per cent of the total length of public

transport routes in the urban area. In 1978-79 the Fremantle-Perth line carried only 4.1 per cent of total public transport passengers. Therefore, only 10 per cent of the general public used public transport, and this means the Fremantle-Perth line catered for only 0.41 per cent of the general public.

If one looks at the situation of the line which, as I have mentioned, is 19 kilometres in length, it can be seen 25 per cent of it is in an area which does not encourage future patronage of the rail system.

When making its decision, the Government took these matters into consideration. It considered future population trends in the area and there was no indication that there would be future population growth there. If in fact there is a population growth, it will be very slight.

The Government looked also at higher density zoning which meant considering vehement objections from the people residing in close proximity to the railway line and also from local authorities.

The Government had a detailed look at the matter before it made its final decision. Over the next 20 years we can anticipate a new growth in the Government's policy to upgrade and update public transport throughout the metropolitan area and, indeed, Statewide.

The Government did not take transport away from the people, because it has provided them with better means of transport, such as the bus system. Road transport is a far more effective and economical means of travel and results in a 50 per cent reduction in fuel costs.

The Fremantle-Perth line was a liability. It would have a deleterious effect on the development of better standards of transport throughout the State; therefore, the Government decided to close the line and I support that decision.

My colleague, the member for Mundaring, indicated the level of subsidies on both rail and road transport. I do not intend to deprive the Government of an opportunity to provide better means of transport to the general public.

With those few comments, I conclude my speech.

#### *Suspension of Sessional Orders*

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Deputy Premier) [9.24 p.m.]: I indicated to the member for Avon I would endeavour to ensure he had time to complete his remarks tonight. He has indicated

it will take him 10 to 15 minutes to do so. I move—

That the Sessional Orders be suspended to enable the member for Avon to reply to his motion.

Motion put and passed.

#### *Debate Resumed*

**MR McIVER** (Avon) [9.25 p.m.]: Mr Speaker—

Mr B. T. Burke: Take three hours, kid!

**Mr McIVER**: I appreciate the privilege extended to me on this occasion. The Government has indicated to the people of Western Australia just how insincere it is. Government members have been involved in a time-wasting exercise since this motion was introduced.

In view of the time factor, I will not direct my remarks to the various members who have spoken. I shall direct my remarks to the Minister for Transport.

I commend the National Party for its stand on the motion, because such a stand is consistent with its policy. I commend also the member for Subiaco (Dr Dadour) who stated quite categorically he would support a motion such as this. Therefore, the action he has taken tonight comes as no surprise.

The reason I argue in favour of the reintroduction of the 'Fremantle-Perth railway service is that the majority of the people of the metropolitan area desire this to occur. Government members have introduced red herrings when speaking against the motion. They have made a pathetic attempt to discredit it. The Minister for Transport made few constructive comments.

I do not want to belittle the member for Clontarf, but I should like to point out that, since the Midland Junction Workshops have been in operation, no worker has had a free ride on a suburban transport service. I should like to clarify that point on behalf of the thousands of workers at the Midland Junction Workshops who have travelled to Midland for a long time. The workers have been subsidised, but they have never travelled free of charge.

It is important that, when one speaks in this Parliament, especially on transport matters, one should carry out research and obtain facts. I should like to point out "X"-class locomotives should be used for pulling 800 tonnes of freight, not for pulling two or three carriages on the suburban railway service in order to subsidise the Minister for Transport's electorate of Dale and bring commuters to Perth. These locomotives



should be pulling freight in the agricultural areas, not operating in the city.

Another point I want to make is I believe this must be the only country in the world which has carriages with undercarriages constructed in the 1800s. Here we are in 1980 using trains with undercarriages constructed in 1890.

I do not believe it is necessary to comment on the other irrelevant and time-wasting comments made by members opposite.

Last week the Minister for Transport referred to a Bill introduced into the House by the Toknin Government. He said this Bill was designed to close the Leighton-Perth line.

The Minister has been informed repeatedly of the true situation in regard to this matter. He either cannot comprehend it or he does not want to do so. Instead, he uses this issue on every possible occasion as a political ploy and red herring to detract attention from the real issue of the motion which is the reinstatement of the Fremantle-Perth railway service.

The Bill to which the Minister referred was introduced initially by the member for Welshpool. He carried out the initial discussions with the unions involved. There was strong opposition to the legislation—

Mr Rushton: Why did you introduce it then?

Mr McIVER:—but, nevertheless, it was brought before this Parliament, after a settlement had been reached. That Bill was passed through this House and was dealt with in the other place. It contained a provision which the Minister did not care to indicate. The provision was that, following the Wilbur Smith & Associates transport study, which the Commonwealth Government offered to subsidise two-thirds/one-third, the Bill be brought back before the Parliament so that its feasibility could be examined. The proposal was that an underground railway system be constructed to connect with the northern spur and integrate the Fremantle-Perth, Armadale-Perth, and Midland-Perth railway lines.

Where is the essence of the Minister's statement in relation to the Fremantle-Perth, Armadale-Perth, and Midland-Perth systems, and their integration in the underground spur which would service the metropolitan area? The Minister's argument, which he took one hour to formulate and put forward, was nothing but a waste of time and absolute nonsense. Nowhere in this speech did he contradict my statements in relation to the economics of the Fremantle-Perth line and the loss of ticket sales at Claremont, Cottesloe, and Fremantle. Nowhere did he

contradict me in relation to the shambles whereby Westrail is paying agents 7c commission on each ticket. There is the rail centre at the Perth Central Station where everyone is able to go. Rent free accommodation is available there, but ticket sales will be at the Westrail Centre, and no-one will be interested in going there.

The Minister contradicted me strongly on my statement that former patrons of the Fremantle-Perth rail passenger service had changed over to motorcars. He said it was quite evident from a statement from the Chairman of the MTT that the patrons transferred to bus transport.

Mr Rushton: I said 85 per cent had transferred.

Mr McIVER: Let us examine this statement. New line buses were purchased to carry the passengers who previously travelled by train, and they are now carrying only 31 per cent of those passengers, on 1977 figures. The buses cost approximately \$2.2 million. Sixty-nine per cent of the patrons could not all go to bus transport.

Mr Rushton: What statement are you quoting?

Mr McIVER: These are my own notes—the result of the research I carried out.

Mr Rushton: Who authorised those figures.

Mr McIVER: I did. They are the result of my research.

Mr Rushton: You want to get your facts straight.

Mr McIVER: The Minister should quote figures to support the Government's view that people living in the vicinity of the railway have not changed over to motorcar transport. The Government's view is at variance with the trend experienced in every other country in the world, particularly the United Kingdom. I handed a book to the Minister which I would like him to study. Its contents are the very essence of my address, along with the economics and the lifestyle of the people of Western Australia which has been changed—I refer to those who live in close proximity to the Fremantle-Perth railway.

A member opposite quite falsely said that I spoke about one letter only which I had received. I do not rise to speak because I received one letter. Another member said that the letter was years old which, of course, was another red herring and clearly indicates the insincerity of the Government with regard to its approach to this motion.

The Government has to realise that it is not only the Opposition which seeks the reinstatement of this service; the people of Western Australia want it. If ever a Government took a retrograde

step, it was this Government when it closed the Fremantle-Perth passenger service.

I agree with one point which was raised tonight in regard to the closure by the Hawke Government of a line serving agricultural areas. In particular, I agree that the Mukinbudin-Bullfinch line should not have been closed. Since its closure the railways have lost millions of dollars in the transport of grain. Since the closure of the line farming in the area has flourished, and road transport has benefited. If that line had remained open our railways would be receiving the benefit of that freight.

The Government is not looking at the long-term situation with regard to the Fremantle-Perth passenger service. The member for Mundaring, and other members, talked a lot of hogwash about economics and subsidies. Again, their speeches were time-wasting, and they did not get to the real crux of the situation, wholly and solely because they do not know the situation.

Of course, the vote on this motion will be a Government decision. Never before have I been so disappointed and so let down as I have tonight by a man who I thought had some integrity and some courage. I think the credibility of the member for Moore has gone forever in this Parliament.

Mr Davies: Hear, hear. It went a long time ago.

Mr McIVER: I promised the Deputy Premier that I would conclude my speech within the time allowed. I could go on speaking until sunrise, but this motion will go to a vote and your casting vote, Mr Speaker, will go to the Government and the motion will be lost. Nevertheless, we came very close to having this motion passed. I am convinced that when the Fremantle-Perth rail passenger service is reintroduced it will not be under this Government. It is now 1980 and we have to wait only three more years because by that time a Labor Party Government will be returned in Western Australia, as it will be Federally on Saturday next. That is not only my view; it is also the view of every newspaper in Australia—even the *Daily News*.

Mr Davies: Even the Murdoch Press.

Mr McIVER: The people who have been so loyal to the Fremantle-Perth railway issue will have to wait. The Leader of the Opposition has stated that when the Labor Party becomes the Government the Fremantle-Perth rail passenger service will be reintroduced.

The Minister did not take up the matter of handicapped people. He avoided that issue. To me it does not matter if only six people receive some benefit. It is far better for them to be able to travel in comfort and enjoy that extra quality of

life, irrespective of whether it costs a couple of million dollars. The Minister talked about a sum of 90c. The Government has wasted millions of dollars since it has been in office. The member for Collie mentioned the procrastination with regard to the Muja power station when the Tonkin Government went out of office. What about the cost of that procrastination to the taxpayers of Western Australia? The cost was \$80 million.

The wharf at Bunbury involved another \$3 million, not a few dollars and not 90c. The Government quibbles about a loss of \$2.2 million which would accrue on the Fremantle-Perth line if the passenger service were reintroduced. What is more important—people or dollars and cents?

Of course, I have stated on many occasions that the only real reason for the closure of the Fremantle-Perth passenger service was to divert the railcars to the Armadale section of line because Westrail could not cope with the density of the area and could not handle the passengers. If the Government were honest and admitted to the people of Western Australia the real reason for the closure of the line, it would regain some of the credibility which it has lost since the closure of the Fremantle-Perth service.

In every country of the world, and throughout the length and breadth of Australia, rail services are expanding and being electrified—despite what the Minister quoted from an article tonight.

Mr Rushton: Not in Victoria, New South Wales, and several other places.

Mr McIVER: It is useless to prolong this argument. In conclusion, I want to make special mention of the Friends of the Railways. It is not the Opposition's viewpoint that they should be denigrated. I make special mention of Mr Darrald McCaskill, a former Chief Mechanical Engineer of Westrail. I honestly do not know his politics, and I do not think anyone else in this place would know his politics.

It was suggested this motion was politically motivated, and that the Friends of the Railways were behind the Labor Party because Ric Grounds was a Labor Party candidate for the seat of Cottesloe. No doubt, when he became involved he could see the injustices of the present Government, and he put his weight behind the Opposition on that one particular issue—to have the Fremantle-Perth passenger service reinstated. Is that not what democracy is all about? That is the prerogative of every citizen in Western Australia. I say in all sincerity that the Friends of the Railways, and all those gallant people who carried out research and assisted them, should be congratulated. I commend them very strongly.

I think I have made it quite plain we firmly believe the Fremantle-Perth rail service should be reintroduced. Its closure was one of the greatest political blunders ever made. I have already said that Governments, people, and leaders throughout the world make mistakes and live to regret them. All I can hope for is that in 1983 those people who have been so vocal in their support of the reintroduction of the passenger service will give their support to the Labor Party. I am sure that after 1983 those people will be able to sit back and rely on this particular service.

Question put and division taken with the following result—

## Ayes 21

Mr Barnett	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Bertram	Mr McIver
Mr Bryce	Mr McPharlin
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr Parker
Mr Carr	Mr Skidmore
Mr Cowan	Mr Stephens
Dr Dadour	Mr Taylor
Mr E. T. Evans	Mr Tonkin
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Wilson
Mr Harman	Mr Bateman
Mr Hodge	

(Teller)

Mr Clarko  
Mrs Craig  
Mr Crane  
Mr Grayden  
Mr Grewar  
Mr Hassell  
Mr Herzfeld  
Mr MacKinnon  
Mr Mensaros  
Mr Nanovich  
Mr O'Connor

## Ayes

Mr Grill  
Mr Bridge  
Mr Pearce  
Mr Jamieson  
Mr T. J. Burke  
Mr Davies

## Noes 21

Mr Old  
Mr Rushton  
Mr Sodeman  
Mr Spriggs  
Mr Trethowan  
Mr Tubby  
Mr Watt  
Mr Williams  
Mr Young  
Mr Blaikie

(Teller)

## Pairs

## Noes

Sir Charles Court  
Mr P. V. Jones  
Mr Coyne  
Mr Sibson  
Mr Shalders  
Mr Laurence

The SPEAKER: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Question thus negatived

Motion defeated.

**BILLS (2): RETURNED**

1. Murdoch University Amendment Bill.
2. Rural Relief Fund Act Repeal Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

*House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.*

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### MEAT

#### *Western Australian Meat Commission*

1060. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) (a) What were the total earnings of the Midland division of the Western Australian Meat Commission in the 1979-80 year;
- (b) what were the sources of these earnings, and how much was received from each of these sources?
- (2) (a) What was the total expenditure on the Midland division of the Western Australian Meat Commission in the 1979-80 year;
- (b) what were the amounts of each item of expenditure making up this total?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) The information sought by the member, when audited, will be tabled in due course as provided by section 23 of the Abattoirs Act.

### TOWN PLANNING

#### *Perth Railway Station*

1065. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) (a) Does a committee exist to consider and advise on planning and development in the Perth commercial business district in general or the Perth central railway station precincts in particular;
- (b) if so, what is the committee/s name/s, terms of reference and membership?
- (2) (a) What development or renovations are planned for the railway station and immediate environs;
- (b) is it proposed to remove the kiosks and outdoor advertising from the railway station building, retain the horseshoe bridge and modify pedestrian access to it;
- (c) what development is proposed between the railway tracks and Wellington Street east of the Beaufort Street bridge, and is it intended to retain the hoardings that are presently near the bridge?

- (3) (a) Which authorities—
  - (i) were consulted;
  - (ii) approved,
 the removal of the water tower near the Horseshoe Bridge and its replacement with an advertising tower;
- (b) who owns or controls the land on which the tower is built;
- (c) who owns the tower and who paid for its construction;
- (d) what functions is the tower—
  - (i) intended to serve;
  - (ii) presently serving.
- (e) to what extent is the Perth City Council required to be consulted in regard to the advertising material displayed on the tower?
- (4) (a) What consideration has been given to providing direct pedestrian links from Forrest Place to the Perth cultural centre, and across Wellington Street to the bus station;
- (b) what stage has planning reached in each case?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) Yes. In addition to the statutory functions of the Perth City Council and the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, a Central Area Technical Advisory Committee has been established to advise those authorities on planning and development of Perth central area matters referred to it.
- (b) See (1)(a). The members of the committee are—  
 Town Clerk, Perth City Council—Chairman.  
 Mr D. Silver, representing the Royal Australian Institute of Architects.  
 Mr P. Skitmore, representing the Director, Department of Conservation and Environment.  
 Mr R. Mofflin, representing the Commissioner of Main Roads.  
 Mr P. Woodward, representing the Town Planning Commissioner.  
 Mr N. Parkhurst, representing the Director General of Transport.  
 Mr G. Bingemann, Perth Chamber of Commerce.  
 Mr A. Machlin, City Engineer, Perth City Council.

Mr E. Sabin, City Planner, Perth City Council.

Mr K. Hunter, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation, Perth City Council.

In addition, the Principal Architect, Public Works Department, or his representative, and the Chief Civil Engineer, Westrail, or his representative, attend by invitation.

- (2) (a) The general concept is to improve the aesthetics of the station complex by redevelopment of the environs—forecourt, etc.—and refurbishing of the building and platforms—it will not be necessary to change the basic contours of the station building.

This upgrading work is in progress and will provide improved facilities for railway patrons, together with a better environment for Westrail staff in the station building.

- (b) The outdoor advertising has already been removed from the building and it is proposed to relocate the kiosks within the main structure.

The Horseshoe Bridge will be retained and a new staircase for pedestrians has recently been completed between the bridge and the rear of the station building.

- (c) Wellington Street will be widened and the area between the railway tracks and the street will be landscaped. A portion of the hoarding on the south side will be removed when Wellington Street is widened.

The future of the advertising hoardings on the north side of the bridge depends upon the outcome of an application currently being considered by the MRPA for the construction of a second advertising tower in the bridge street area.

- (3) (a) (i) and (ii) As part of the city station area upgrading, proposals for consolidation of advertising, which includes removal of the water tank and construction of a new tower were considered by the Central Area Technical Advisory Committee and subsequently the Perth City Council.

(b) Westrail.

(c) Australian Posters Pty. Ltd.

(d) (i) and (ii) An advertising medium.

(e) There is no legal requirement.

- (4) (a) and (b) The member is referred to the report on the future development of Forrest Place recently released for public information and comment, and now on display at the Perth GPO.

## GRAIN

### Rapeseed

1073. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the reason for the disparity between the amount which rapeseed growers received from the Grain Pool for seed delivered to the 1979-80 pool, and the amount which the Grain Pool received from customers to whom the seed was sold?
- (2) What was the amount of disparity per tonne between the two prices referred to above?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) The difference between the price paid by buyers for rapeseed purchased from the Grain Pool and the payment by the Grain Pool to growers who delivered seed to the pool can be attributed to the cost incurred in marketing, storing, handling, and transporting the seed plus the costs involved in financing growers' advance payments.

These estimated costs, for 1979-80, are as follows—

	per tonne
	\$
Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Charge for storing and outloading the seed from C.B.H. facilities in Esperance, Albany, Boyup Brook and Fremantle.....	14.30
Railage incurred in transporting seed from CBH facilities to buyers situated in the metropolitan area.....	10.40
Bank charges and overdraft expenses.....	6.85
Insurance costs.....	0.65
Grain Pool administration cost .....	1.30
Total .....	\$33.50

- (2) \$33.50 per tonne. See (1) above.

## ROADS

*Day-labour Work Force*

1081. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it fact that the Main Roads Department has put out to tender work which would previously have been done by its day-labour work force?
- (2) Is it also fact that tenders for this work have been submitted from within the Main Roads Department as well as by private enterprise?
- (3) Is it further fact that a number of those tenders—by Main Roads Department personnel—have been successful?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), what proportion of tenders submitted by them?
- (5) Is the reason that their prices have been cheaper than those from private enterprise?
- (6) If "No" to (5), what is the reason?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (6) The Main Roads Department has always endeavoured to maintain a balance in its work programme between contract and day-labour work. Tenders are not submitted by the department for its own work though it does prepare a cost estimate for jobs put out to tender as part of the requirements of evaluating tenders.

## EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

*Four-year-olds*

1082. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Have directives gone out to pre-school centres threatening closure of those centres which have four-year-olds enrolled?
- (2) If this is not the case, what directives have been sent out concerning the enrolment of four-year-olds in pre-school centres?
- (3) What is the reason for these directives being sent out at this time?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Additional four-year-old children may not be enrolled if this involves use of staff intended to provide for five-year olds in the centre or in other centres.

1083. *This question was postponed.*

## CHARITABLE ORGANISATIONS

*Inquiry*

1084. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Did the Government appoint a committee of inquiry to examine the Charitable Collections Act and the Welfare of Charity groups in Western Australia?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) What are the terms of reference of the inquiry?
- (4) Who are the members of the committee of inquiry?
- (5) Will charity groups and service clubs be invited to participate in the inquiry?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 9 June 1980.
- (3) To examine the Charitable Collections Act and report to me on suggested amendments.
- (4) Mr J. R. Mackay—Executive Director—YMCA.  
Mr G. Adams—Asst. Director (Subsidies—Dept of Social Security).  
Mr W. E. Aspinall—Member—Charitable Collections Advisory Committee.  
Mr V. McFarlane—Chief Secretary's Department.
- (5) Due to the withdrawal of Mr Aspinall and the necessity to replace the existing Charitable Collections Advisory Committee because of imminent retirements, examination of the Act has been deferred until the new committee is appointed. Consultation with charity groups will be undertaken.

# EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

## *Cannington*

1085. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware the Cannington Senior High School Parents and Citizens' Association has raised \$3 000 to purchase computer equipment for the school?
- (2) Is it a fact they raised this money on the understanding they would receive the dollar-for-dollar subsidy from the Education Department to assist with the purchase?
- (3) In view of the effort made by the high school parents and citizens' association in raising so much money, will he make the Department of Education's proportionate share available in order that the required material can be purchased?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) to (4) The budgetary allocation to the Education Department for subsidies for computing equipment for schools was raised from \$30 000 to \$45 000 for this year. Such is the demand from schools that this allocation has already been used in full. The Education Department will seek to assist Cannington Senior High School in this matter if it can.

# EDUCATION: SCHOOL

## *East Maddington*

1086. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of allegations that the East Maddington Primary School playgrounds are in a shocking condition?
- (2) Is he aware of the anxiety parents have for their children's safety whilst playing on this oval?
- (3) If "Yes", will he have the matter seen to immediately before a child is injured in any way?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) There are bare patches in the school oval and these are being watered by the school gardener to encourage growth of grass. The children are being kept away from these areas.
- (3) The oval was top-dressed recently and departmental officers will investigate whether further corrective action is needed.

# EDUCATION: SCHOOL

## *Donnybrook*

1087. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Education:

In view of the assurances given by the previous Minister to the effect that the new Donnybrook primary school will be operating at the commencement of the 1981 school term, will he please advise the reason for the delay in the construction of the new school and also when the school will be definitely operating?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

In response to the wishes of the local authority the Education Department considered locating the primary annexe on a difficult site. Costs relating to this site are far in excess of the allocation of funds. A review of the location must therefore be undertaken.

The buildings will be part of the existing school and students will be accommodated at the main site until new rooms are ready, as soon as possible in 1981.

# EDUCATION: SCHOOL

## *Donnybrook*

1088. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he inform me when tenders will be called for the construction of the new Donnybrook primary school?
- (2) Will he also name—
  - (a) the anticipated commencement date;
  - (b) completion date; and
  - (c) capital cost?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) There is no proposed new primary school at Donnybrook as the buildings to be erected will be an annexe of the district high school.  
If site difficulties can be solved immediately it is anticipated that tenders will be called in December, subject to approval of a modified provision.

### RAILWAY WAGONS

#### *Teutonic Bore Project*

1089. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has a contract been let for construction of 35 flat-top standard gauge wagons for the carting of concentrates from Selstrust's Teutonic Bore project?
- (2) If "Yes", who was granted the contract, and what is the cost involved?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

### TRANSPORT: BUSES

#### *Pioneer Travel Service*

1090. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Referring him to my question 2106 of 1979 re Pioneer Bus Services, how can he reconcile his answer to the statement in *The West Australian* of 1 October 1980 giving that an application has been lodged with the Transport Commission?
- (2) Has the application in fact been lodged, and if so on what terms?
- (3) Would not approval of the bus service have a detrimental effect on Westrail's bus operations?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) My reply to your question 2106 of 1979 was correct inasmuch that Ansett Pioneer had not lodged an application to compete with Westrail road bus services at the time of answering your question.  
The reference in *The West Australian* of 1 October 1980 relates to a letter submitted to the Commissioner of Transport by Greyhound (Southern) Pty. Ltd. to pick up and set down passengers between Perth and Kalgoorlie.  
A similar letter has been lodged with the Commissioner of Transport by Ansett Pioneer.
- (2) Subsequently, in February 1980 a letter was submitted by Ansett Pioneer to the Commissioner of Transport expressing general interest to be considered if there was further participation by bus operators over routes served by Westrail buses.
- (3) An investigation is underway and any decision will be made after taking into account various factors especially users' needs.

### ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD

#### *Revenue and Expenditure*

1091. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

Further to questions 295 and 297 of 1980 relevant to the Rottneest Island Board, would the Minister please provide a break-down of the Rottneest Island Board's income and expenditure for each of the years:

- (a) 1976-77;
- (b) 1977-78;
- (c) 1978-79;
- (d) 1979-80?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

### ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR 4 YEARS

INCOME	Year	Rents	Trading Under-Takings	Landing Fees	Hire Receipts	Sale of Water	All Other	TOTAL
Ending		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
30 June 1977	.....	576 165	155 471	81 032	19 194	11 870	37 378	881 110
30 June 1978	.....	867 969	168 239	91 793	15 406	7 978	71 140	1 222 525
30 June 1979	.....	983 606	166 222	91 475	20 048	8 958	83 913	1 354 222
30 June 1980	.....	Awaiting audit.						



**ROTTNEST ISLAND BOARD**  
**INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR 4 YEARS—continued.**

**EXPENDITURE:**

Year Ending	Loan Interest \$	Mainten- ance \$	Admini- stration \$	Works & Services \$	Depreci- ation \$	All Other \$	TOTAL \$
30 June 1977 .....	171 625	162 563	237 564	136 631	90 750	77 320	876 453
30 June 1978 .....	265 077	203 228	295 164	181 061	144 556	126 639	1 215 725
30 June 1979 .....	282 594	193 163	366 020	218 182	145 883	148 242	1 354 084
30 June 1980 .....	Awaiting audit.						

**PARKS AND RESERVES ACT***Boards*

1092. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Further to my question 327 of 1980 relevant to the constitution of certain boards, and the answers to parts (1) and (2) in which specific bodies are the following reserves vested, the date of vesting in each case and the section of the Land Act under which vesting orders were made—

- (a) Reserve No. 17495;  
 (b) Reserve No. 26628;  
 (c) Reserve No. 30626?

- (2) Are all these bodies therefore constituted as boards of management under the Parks and Reserves Act 1895 by virtue of the vesting of these reserves in them?  
 (3) If not, will the Minister please reconcile this situation with the information given to the House on 19 August 1980 in answer to question 327?  
 (4) As my question on 19 August referred to boards specifically constituted under the Parks and Reserves Act, rather than those covered by provisions of the Local Government Act, would the Minister please answer parts (1) and (2) of question 327 of 1980?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) Reserve 17495 comprising Nelson locations 12439 and 7202 is vested in the Shire of Manjimup under section 33 of the Land Act. Location 12439 was vested on 13 January 1961 and location 7202 on 3 February 1978.

(b) Reserve 26628 was vested in the National Parks Authority under section 33 of the Land Act on 28 October 1977.

(c) Reserve 30626 was vested in the Western Australian Wildlife Authority under section 33 of the Land Act on 21 April 1978.

- (2) Yes.  
 (3) Answered by (2).  
 (4) The situation as explained in my answer to parts (1) and (2) of question 327 is still applicable.

**CHARCOAL***Production*

1093. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Further to question 878 of 1980, relevant to charcoal production, does the charcoal iron industry at Wundowie pay a royalty or make some other form of payment for timber obtained from State forest, timber reserves, and Crown land?  
 (2) If so, what is the rate currently paid?  
 (3) From what source is the timber procured—for example, State forest, other—and does the Forests Department administer the supply?  
 (4) (a) What quantity of timber has the industry obtained in each of the past five years;  
 (b) approximately what proportion of this becomes sawn timber on the one hand and is used for producing charcoal on the other?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) The member is referred to the answer already given to him in part (2) (b) of question 1030 of 8 October 1980.

- (3) Wood for conversion to charcoal by Agnew Clough at Wundowie is obtained from State forests and timber reserves. The Forests Department controls the supply.

- (4) (a) Bush wood for conversion to charcoal—

1979-80	98 642 tonnes
1978-79	94 886 tonnes
1977-78	100 511 tonnes
1976-77	93 747 tonnes
1975-76	129 945 tonnes

Logs for conversion to sawn timber—

1977-78	9 606 cubic metres
1976-77	20 952 cubic metres
1975-76	20 709 cubic metres

Sawlog supply to Wundowie ceased in December 1977.

- (b) Sawn Timber Produced—

1977-78	3 442 cubic metres
1976-77	6 707 cubic metres
1975-76	6 251 cubic metres

Separate statistics are not available for charcoal production from bush wood and sawmill residues, but total production was as follows—

1979-80	26 675 tonnes
1978-79	26 526 tonnes
1977-78	27 161 tonnes
1976-77	41 927 tonnes
1975-76	42 987 tonnes

## CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

### *Conservation Reserves: Recommendations*

1094. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Has the Environmental Protection Authority or the Department of Conservation and Environment reviewed the implementation of the recommendations contained in the "Red Book" on conservation reserves for Western Australia?
- (2) If "No", is a review intended and who will undertake the review?
- (3) If "Yes", on what date was the review completed?

- (4) To what extent has this review been assessed?

- (5) In regard to the implementation of recommendations, what percentage of the "Red Book" recommendations has to the present time been—

- (a) fully implemented;
- (b) partially implemented;
- (c) not implemented?

- (6) Does the Environmental Protection Authority or the Department of Conservation and Environment intend to produce a summary of this review for public information?

- (7) If "Yes" to (6), when is it likely to be available?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) An ongoing review of the status of the recommendations is maintained by the Department of Conservation and Environment. A summary of the status of the recommendations as at 30 June 1980 is being prepared and should be available for public information by November 1980.
- (4) Answered by (3).
- (5) Data on the status of the recommendations as at the present time have not yet been collated. However, the summary of the status of the recommendations as at 30 June 1980 shows that approximately 61 per cent are fully implemented, 14 per cent partially implemented and 25 per cent not implemented. It is pointed out that the latter figure includes a number of recommendations on which action cannot be taken until some future time.
- (6) and (7) Answered by (3).

## HEALTH

### *Nurses: Dissemination of Information*

1095. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the Department of Health and Medical Services policy on allowing the dissemination of information within public hospitals by nurses, the Royal Australian Nursing Federation, or the Nurses Action Group on matters of concern to the nursing profession?

- (2) Is that policy binding on all public hospitals such as the Fremantle Hospital?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) The department's policy is to leave this to the discretion of the Director of Nursing concerned.
- (2) No, although I believe that this is the practice in Fremantle Hospital. Policy at that hospital is determined by the board.

#### HOSPITAL: FREMANTLE

##### *Staff, and Management Structure*

1096. Mr PARKER, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Will he detail, by classification, the numbers of staff members at the Fremantle Hospital?
- (2) Will he detail the management structure at that hospital?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) The numbers of staff at the Fremantle Hospital on a full time equivalent basis at 30 September 1980 were—

Nursing.....	646
Clerical .....	171
Medical support .....	167
Hotel services .....	380
General maintenance .....	80
Medical.....	120
	<hr/>
	1 564

- (2) The hospital is managed by a tripartite executive team comprising the administrator, Director of Nursing, and the medical superintendent and each is responsible directly to the board for his/her relevant areas of responsibility.

#### HOSPITAL: FREMANTLE

##### *Board*

1097. Mr. PARKER, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) (a) Who are the members of the Board of the Fremantle Hospital;
- (b) what are their qualifications for membership;

- (c) what are present occupations; and
- (d) what are any other relevant biographical details?

- (2) What is the role of this board in the running of the hospital?

- (3) How does it relate in areas of responsibility to the professional management of the hospital?

- (4) How does it relate in areas of responsibility to his department?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) (a) to (d) Chairman—Mr C. C. Bennett, former General Manager, WA Meat Export Works. Long-time resident of Fremantle, now retired.

Mr L. H. Brown, former business entrepreneur and long time resident of Fremantle, now retired.

Mr R. H. Christian, former Public Relations Officer, West Australian Newspapers, now retired.

Mr H. A. Fletcher, former member of the Legislative Assembly. One-time Officer of the State Energy Commission, now retired. Long-time resident of Fremantle.

Mr R. W. Walker, Manager, Russell Bros., a Fremantle meat exporting company.

Mr R. W. Porter, Managing Director, Porter Group of Companies, associated with the transport industry.

Mr C. J. Tamblyn, Manager, Bank of New South Wales, Fremantle.

Professor R. A. Joske, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Western Australia.

One position on the board is currently vacant. This will be filled by a nominee from the Fremantle Hospital Clinical Association.

- (2) The management and control of the Fremantle Hospital is exercised by the board of the hospital in accordance with the powers granted to it under the relevant provisions of the Hospitals Act.

- (3) The board has overall responsibility for the professional management of the hospital.

- (4) The board, in the exercise of its overall powers, is guided by Government policy. In this regard I have power to direct the board as to the exercise of its functions and the hospital board shall, in accordance with section 18 of the Hospitals Act, give effect to any directions given to it.

#### EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

##### *Needy Child Grants*

1098. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Can he confirm that it is now the policy of the Education Department to restrict needy child grants to one per pre-school centre per year?
- (2) If "Yes", what account does this policy take of the difficulties posed for teachers and committees in low-income areas in choosing one child from among many requiring additional assistance?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1), what account does this policy take of the difficulties which arise when more than one child from a family is attending a pre-school centre as in the case of twins?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) to (3) Information for the distribution of needy child grants is gathered three times a year and payment is made to the claimant centres once or twice a year. As the grant goes direct to the committee, services for children should not be affected by the payment system.

#### EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL CENTRE

##### *Burbridge*

1099. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will his department continue to provide a teacher and aide at the Burbridge Pre-school centre in Koondoola in 1981?
- (2) If "No", what are the reasons for the closure of this pre-school centre?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) See answer to (1).

#### WILDLIFE

##### *Lake Moore*

1100. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) In regard to question 233 relevant to the Lake Moore area, asked in the Legislative Council, 17 September 1980, has the biological survey of the Lake Moore area by the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife been completed yet?
- (2) What progress has been made to date in establishing boundaries for the Class "A" reserve in the area, as promised by the Government?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The biological survey has been completed. Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Report No. 30—"The Wildlife of the Proposed Karroun Hill Nature Reserve" is tabled.
- (2) Survey of boundaries has been completed.

*The paper was tabled (see paper No. 324).*

#### CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

##### *South Yilgarn*

1101. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Noting that the Conservation Through Reserves Committee reported on the lack of environmental information concerning the South Yilgarn area of System 11, and stressed that it was of considerable importance that greater biological knowledge of areas within the South Yilgarn be obtained—

- (a) what biological surveys of the South Yilgarn area have been carried out since 1974;
- (b) what biological surveys have been programmed for the next five years?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) The South Yilgarn area is part of the biological survey of the eastern goldfields being co-ordinated by the Biological Surveys Committee and being conducted by staff of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, the WA Museum, and the National Parks Authority. The survey commenced in 1978 and field work will conclude in 1982, with publication of the findings about one year later.
- (b) No other surveys are programmed.

## PASTORAL LEASES

### *Jennings Report*

1102. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) On what date did Cabinet approve a recommendation that established the Jennings committee to inquire into the pastoral industry?
- (2) (a) On what date was the report released for public information;
- (b) what was the nature of the advertising that the report was available; and
- (c) to whom were copies specifically sent?
- (3) (a) Was public comment solicited in regard to the report and its recommendations;
- (b) how was the public invited to make comment;
- (c) what deadline was given?
- (4) Did a member of the committee submit a minority report and was this also released for public information?
- (5) Could it be said that the contents of the report have assisted in the formulation of Government policy?
- (6) Was public input obtained by the committee during its inquiry into the pastoral industry?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) 20 September 1977.
- (2) and (3) As indicated in my reply to question 1256, the report was released on 14 August 1979. Copies were distributed to the Leader of the Opposition, including five additional copies on request to the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, parliamentary members whose electorates were in pastoral areas, and others upon request. In addition copies were distributed free of charge to all pastoral lessees in the State and numerous other interested organisations, departments and individuals with the request that the contents be examined and that criticisms and suggestions would be welcomed. Appropriate press announcements were made at that time and copies of the report have been available for sale at the Lands Department. No specific deadline was given for comments.
- (4) Yes. Reading of the report would find it bound within its content.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) Yes. Reading of the report would indicate the large extent to which the committee called and received public input. Questionnaires were also distributed to all pastoral lessees and the majority responded.

## DROUGHT

### *Areas, Relief, and Soil Erosion*

1103. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Which shire areas, whole or in part, have been declared drought areas in 1980?
- (2) What amounts have been paid out in drought relief to farmers in the years—
  - (a) 1977;
  - (b) 1978;
  - (c) 1979; and
  - (d) 1980,
 as—
  - (i) non-repayable grants;
  - (ii) loans;
  - (iii) other payments?
- (3) What action is being taken in regard to soil erosion being experienced in the Shire of Gnowangerup?

- (4) What other farming areas are currently suffering heavy soil erosion problems?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Wholly declared                      Part declared

Dalwallinu	Perenjori
Wyalkatchem	Koorda
Trayning	Dowerin
Nungarin	Mt. Marshall
Tammin	Mukinbudin
Kellerberrin	Westonia
Merredin	Cunderdin
Quairading	Beverley
Bruce Rock	Brookton
Narembeen	Wickepin
Corrigin	Kent
Kondinin	Gnowangerup
Kulin	
Lake Grace	
Ravensthorpe	

- (2) (a) 1976-77—  
       (i) Nil;  
       (ii) \$2 974 160;  
       (iii) \$280 956.  
 (b) 1977-78—  
       (i) Nil;  
       (ii) \$22 887 300;  
       (iii) \$226 978.  
 (c) 1978-79—  
       (i) Nil;  
       (ii) \$1 521 500;  
       (iii) \$231 688.  
 (d) 1979-80—  
       (i) Nil;  
       (ii) \$13 199 300;  
       (iii) \$286 100.

- (3) Assistance will be given for shire works programmes to assist farmers to clear fence lines, dams and water catchments that have filled with soil due to wind erosion.  
 Farmers have reduced stock numbers to lessen the erosion hazard.  
 (4) Isolated areas in a number of other shires are experiencing wind erosion.

#### LAND: AGRICULTURAL

##### *Release*

1104. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

In regard to the Minister's *News Release* dated 15 July 1980, concerning

the Government's policy on new land releases, which local authority districts are involved in the following areas—

- (a) Eneabba/Arrowsmith River;  
 (b) Hill River;  
 (c) Nambung/Moore River;  
 (d) Scott River;  
 (e) Mitchell River;  
 (f) Rocky Gully/Irwin Inlet;  
 (g) Lake Magenta East;  
 (h) Mount Hampton;  
 (i) Forrestania/Johnson Lakes;  
 (j) Salmon Gums/Balladonia;  
 (k) Bullfinch/Lake Moore;  
 (l) Lake Moore/Yalgoo;  
 (m) Yalgoo/Kalbarri?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (a) to (m) As indicated in the replies to questions 198, 737, and 1031 of 1980 and in particular to question 198, no decision on new areas to be released will be made until investigations referred to have been completed and suitable areas defined. It is not practicable to provide the information sought.

#### FRUIT

##### *Cherries*

1105. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) For what reasons has the import of cherries into Western Australia from South Australia been banned?  
 (2) (a) Has any investigation into the disease control methods regarding cherries in South Australia been carried out by his department, and if so, does this evaluation show whether such controls are adequate to obviate the risk of diseases being transmitted to Western Australia;  
 (b) if the risk factor is excessive, will he show why?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Importation into Western Australia of cherries or other stone fruit is prohibited unless the fruit is accompanied by a certificate issued by the Department of Agriculture in the State of origin certifying that the State or Territory is free from the diseases *Sclerotinia laxa* and *Sclerotinia fructicola*. These disorders commonly known as "brown rot" do not occur in Western Australia, but there are no other stone fruit producing States free of the disease.

Introduction of brown rot would result in serious crop losses and continuing high costs for control measures.

- (2) (a) Yes.

The treatments used in other States do not enable those States to guarantee the fruit to be free of brown rot.

- (b) The climate in the south-west of Western Australia is favourable for the establishment and development of the brown rot fungus and the stone fruit industry would be seriously disadvantaged if the disease became established.

## VEGETABLES

### Imports

1106. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What quantities of—

- (a) peas;
- (b) beans;
- (c) sweet corn;
- (d) potatoes;
- (e) cauliflowers;
- (f) other vegetables;

were imported into Western Australia in 1979-80?

- (2) What was the total value of these imports?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) and (2) This information is currently not available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Professional Officers

1107. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has the number of professional officers in the Department of Agriculture been reduced in the 1980-81 year?
- (2) If "Yes", then—
- (a) by how many;
  - (b) in what centres will such reduction take place and how many in each instance?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) and (b) Not applicable.

## CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

### System 6

1108. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) With regard to the answer to part (1) (b) of question 1944 of 25 October 1979 relevant to System 6, was the "Green Book" relating to the System 6 study submitted to the Environmental Protection Authority on or before 25 December 1979?
- (2) If not, on what date was the "Green Book" relating to the System 6 study submitted to the Environmental Protection Authority?
- (3) On what date will the Environmental Protection Authority release the "Green Book" relating to the System 6 study for public review?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Due to the complexity of the study and the necessity to reach consensus in each of the various committees, the System 6 study has only recently been completed. The report of the System 6 committee, which is the subject of the "Green Book", is now nearing completion.
- (2) The "Green Book" will be submitted to the EPA on completion.

- (3) On receipt of the "Green Book", the EPA will give urgent consideration to the report, and will shortly thereafter make it available to both the Government and the public.

## TRAFFIC

### *Mopeds*

1109. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Would he advise if the advisory committee on vehicle performance has yet discussed the matter of the registration of mopeds at a national level?
- (2) If the discussion mentioned in (1) above has been held, has a determination on the matter been reached by the advisory committee and, if so, what was the determination?
- (3) Has the matter yet been referred to a similar committee in Western Australia?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), has a discussion on the matter yet been held and, if so, what was the outcome of such a discussion?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No. It is not the function of the advisory committee on vehicle performance to discuss registration of vehicles. They have, however, discussed a technical definition of what constitutes a moped.
- (2) The definition referred to in (1) has been circulated for public comment.
- (3) No similar committee exists in Western Australia.
- (4) Answered by (3).

## MINING ACT

### *Farmers' Union: Criticism*

1110. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) In regard to question without notice 130 of 1980, relevant to Farmers' Union criticism of the Mining Act, are shale and limestone also excluded from the definition of minerals at section 8?

- (2) (a) Are the following substances referred to in section 112 of the Mining Act of 1978—

- (i) shale;
- (ii) limestone;

- (b) if not, what is the reason for having the reservation in favour of the Crown at section 112 exclude these substances for public works, particularly when they are specifically referred to in the definition of minerals at section 8?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Shale and limestone are included in the definition of minerals in section 8, but specifically excluded where they occur on private land.
- (2) (a) No.
- (b) To ensure that the mining of these materials when they occur on Crown land is administered under the Mining Act.

## CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

### *Lake Cronin and Nerren Nerren*

1111. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Lands:

- (1) (a) Further to the Environmental Protection Authority's recommendation in 1975 concerning the Lake Cronin area, does the Minister or the Department of Lands and Surveys intend to prohibit the release of land within a 10 km radius of Lake Cronin;
- (b) has notice yet been given by the Environmental Protection Authority that land can be released without further reference to it?
- (2) (a) What action has been taken concerning the release of land in the Nerren Nerren east area following the Environmental Protection Authority's recommendation in 1975;
- (b) is the land involved now available for leasing or alienation?



Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) In accordance with EPA recommendation 11.10 Reserve No. 36526 surrounding Lake Cronin has been vested in the Western Australian Wildlife Authority for the purpose of "Conservation of Flora and Fauna".  
Discussions between the Department of Conservation and Environment and Mines Department have not yet resolved proposed extensions to the reserve.
- (2) (a) and (b) Land release east of Nerren Nerren awaits rationalisation of proposed reserve and pastoral lease boundaries.

## RAILWAYS AND ROADS

### *Advertising Signs*

1112. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the committee set up by him to review outdoor advertising policy along main roads yet reported its conclusions to him?
- (2) (a) Would he please table a copy of the report;  
(b) if not, would he please list the recommendations made by the committee?
- (3) (a) What recommendations were made concerning advertising along railway reserves;  
(b) is the company Australian Posters Pty. Ltd. obliged to seek local authority concurrence in regard to advertising signs on railway reserves and, if not, why not;  
(c) what is the Main Roads Department's view concerning hoardings on railway reserves facing or directed at motorists on adjacent main roads?
- (4) (a) Would he please name the members of the committee and the interests they represent;  
(b) (i) were any observers specifically invited to attend meetings of the committee;  
(ii) if so, whom were they;  
(iii) what interests did they represent; and

- (iv) what percentage of the committee's meetings did they attend?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) The report is under consideration. I am not prepared to release details at this stage, though I can say that there appears to have been a genuine attempt to achieve a consensus in areas where there are divergent views.
- (4) (a) R. J. Mofflin—Chairman—Main Roads Department.  
J. B. Boulton—National Safety Council of WA.  
I. R. Englert—Outdoor Advertising Association of Australia.  
L. Y. Hitchen—Department of Tourism.  
R. T. Matla—Federated Chamber of Commerce of WA (Country).  
K. A. Smith—Department of Conservation and Environment.  
W. J. Solloway—Royal Automobile Club of WA.  
Local Government Association—  
—from time to time—  
B. R. Lucanus, R. J. Belton.  
C. W. Tuckey—Country Shire Councils' Association.
- (b) (i) Yes;  
(ii) Mr D. R. Warner and Mr W. Snell;  
(iii) Main Roads Department and Outdoor Advertising Association of Australia respectively;  
(iv) 92 per cent and 67 per cent respectively.

1113. *This question was postponed.*

## FRUIT AND VEGETABLES

### *Processing*

1114. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Honorary Minister Assisting the Minister for Industrial Development and Commerce:

- (1) Is it part of Government policy to finance the cost of premises for country industries involved in the processing of fruit and/or vegetables?

- (2) If "Yes" to (1), what constraints are placed on eligibility?
- (3) If "No" to (1), what assistance is available to persons who desire to set up a country located industry concerned with fruit and vegetable processing from the Government?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

- (1) Government guaranteed assistance is available to manufacturing or processing industries and is essentially designed to enable approved applicants to borrow for their total capital needs as well as their working capital requirements.

In addition amending legislation is now being prepared to implement the Government's recently announced new assistance to industry incentives by way of capital establishment and regional assistance grant schemes.

Provided the main activities of the industry include a genuine element of processing of fruit and/or vegetables (e.g. canning), and is not simply a retailing or wholesaling operation, the industry may be eligible for assistance under the abovementioned schemes.

- (2) Apart from the eligible industry qualification the main criteria in respect of eligibility for Government guaranteed assistance are—

Funds not otherwise available—applicants are expected to firstly approach their own bank and other reasonable sources of finance to obtain the funds.

Competition—State assistance to an applicant must not conflict with the interests of others who have established in a similar industry without such assistance. (This qualification may be waived in regional areas.)

Equity—applicants must be able to contribute a reasonable proportion of the total funding required for the proposal.

Viability—applicants must satisfy the Government that the business will be profitable and capable of meeting all its commitments including loan repayments.

Security—the State requires adequate security over the assets of the undertaking, to secure the guarantee (other than in exceptional circumstances).

Source of Funds—a suitable source of funds must be arranged to satisfy the guarantee.

The proposed capital establishment grant scheme will provide for assistance of up to 15 per cent or a maximum of \$200 000 of capital requirements for pioneer or non-competing industry establishing in a regional area, or up to 10 per cent of a maximum of \$200 000 of capital requirements for pioneer or non-competing industry establishing in the metropolitan area.

The proposed regional industry assistance scheme will provide for a capital grant scheme for established industries in regional centres limited to a maximum of \$60 000 per applicant. These grants to be considered where the applicant—

- is not in competition with a similar venture in the region; and
- is expanding the operations; or
- is diversifying to meet the needs of the region in which it is located; and
- the project is considered to be in the best interests of the State.

It must be emphasised that all of the above criteria are guidelines only and that all applications are considered on their merit, and may be assisted, if the circumstances warrant, even though they do not meet all of the criteria outlined above.

- (3) See (1) and (2) above.

## HEALTH

### *Medical Practitioners: Interns*

1115. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it a fact that a number of young doctors who are currently employed as interns in public hospitals have been advised that there will be no positions available for them next year?

- (2) Has it been the case for many years that inexperienced doctors in only their second year out of medical school have been given the opportunity to work under supervision in public hospitals?
- (3) How many doctors who are currently employed as interns in public hospitals will be required to find alternative employment next year?
- (4) Is the Government concerned that many young doctors who might wish to stay on in a public hospital to gain extra experience may now be required to go into private practice to earn a living?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) 27 so far as is known. Of this number, some are likely to be employed interstate and others in this State if there are withdrawals by any successful applicant.

- (4) There is some reason for concern, but these young doctors have had lengthy education plus six years at Medical School and one year's compulsory internship and there are other avenues open to them, including the Family Medicine Programme.

In the main they have enjoyed a privileged situation in being guaranteed one year's internship to enable them to complete their pre-registration intern year.

Although every attempt is made to provide a second year's residency, the funds available to the teaching hospitals cannot guarantee this.

It is therefore necessary to restrict the numbers of residents in second year and even though restrictions are made, medical graduates are in a privileged position when compared with other professions such as those who have graduated in the law, as these graduates are not even guaranteed compulsory pre-registration employment.

---