

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 7th September, 1977

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

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR P. V. JONES (Narrogin—Minister for Education) [5.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The main purpose of this Bill is to amend the definition of "fauna" in the Wildlife Conservation Act to bring about greater uniformity with other States and to give better control over protected fauna from other States when brought into Western Australia.

Crown Law opinion on the present definition as it appears in the Act indicates that it may exclude all those species of Australian fauna that do not occur in a condition of natural liberty in this State.

In effect, this means that it is doubtful whether the species that are indigenous to and protected in other States and Territories of Australia would come within the protective shield of this State's wildlife legislation once they are brought here legally or illegally.

As a consequence, the validity of licensing and other requirements of the regulations has been questioned by some aviculturists.

Although a recent legal argument challenging the validity of the licensing requirement was dismissed it still seems there is room for doubt whether any particular bird or animal is "fauna", and unless the definition is clarified the department may even have to prove that particular birds or other animals were bred or born within the State.

In other States the definitions of "fauna" or "wildlife", as applicable to the State, refer to birds, mammals and reptiles which are native to any State or Territory of the Commonwealth.

This allows for the better control of the bird trade as wildlife which is protected fauna in one place continues to be protected fauna even though it crosses the border.

A lot of trafficking in fauna is taking place. It is essential therefore, that all States should be able co-operatively to control the keeping and

movement of fauna. This should be possible irrespective of whether the species of Australian fauna involved is native to any particular State or Territory.

There is every possibility without these proposed safeguards for Western Australia to become the centre for fauna smuggling.

The desirability of achieving greater conformity in controls over wildlife has been pointed out by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation. In its second report "Trafficking in Fauna in Australia", the committee recommended that the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers consider uniformity and adequacy of legislation between States and Territories. This should be done as a matter of urgency so that neighbouring States and Territories have legislation that is not in conflict.

Apart from some consequential amendments to other sections of the Act, the Bill also updates the title of the position previously known as Chief Vermin Control Officer under the Vermin Act, 1918, and corrects a previous drafting error in section 12B.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Harman.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TWELFTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 6th September, on the following motion by Mr Hassell—

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech be agreed to—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR STEPHENS (Stirling) [5.32 p.m.]: In speaking to this debate I would like to add my congratulations to those others have expressed to the Speaker and other members of the House who have accepted positions of responsibility. I wish them well in the execution of their duties and trust they will carry them out with satisfaction to themselves, to the House, and to the State as a whole. I would like also to take the opportunity to welcome the new members of this House. In so doing, I regret that we cannot have new faces without losing some old ones, and I am sure a few

faces that are not here now will be missed by all of us.

However, I welcome new members on both sides of the House. I realise that in the Westminster system of Parliament there must be at least two sides to make it work. Of course, as a member of a third party I feel the system works better under the three-party system, particularly when the third party acts positively. I also realise that divergent views will be expressed, and I trust that while we may not agree with one another we will always respect each other's points of view.

Earlier in the debate the member for Albany referred to honesty in debate and the way in which we conduct ourselves in this House. This is something which must always be borne in mind. We should bear in mind our conduct and honesty, not only in this House, but also in the manner in which we conduct the elections which bring us here.

In that respect, I would like to compliment the constituents of the Stirling electorate on returning their present member. I feel they were able to see through a particularly odious part of the campaign, one that really sickened me. However, one has to take these things in one's stride, and all is well that ends well. The good sense of the constituents of Stirling will be justified, I trust, by the manner in which I conduct myself inside and outside this House in the next three years.

Reference has been made to the frustrations of debate in this place. Many of us have learnt, and the new ones will learn as they proceed, that we get very frustrated when we do not see our ideas put into effect. Most of us are fortunate in that the odd suggestion is carried out, and this gives us the encouragement and interest to keep going.

In the Address-in-Reply debate last year I referred to the need to review the Constitution so that it may not be altered without a referendum of the people. I was very pleased to note in the Governor's Speech that action will be taken along those lines and, in fact, a Bill has already proceeded to the second reading stage. Whether or not I am right, I feel justified in believing that perhaps the Government took notice of the comments I made in that debate.

Later last year in the Budget debate I complimented the Government on the fact that it had provided a grant of \$1 million to assist local government in respect of recreational activities. I also indicated that perhaps this idea could be carried forward by the creation of a fund to assist local government in the building of multi-use cultural halls—something which is sadly needed in the Albany region and, I understand, in other

areas of the State. I only hope the Government has given consideration to the implementation of that idea. I think it is a move which is very necessary.

In my opinion the fund should be administered in such a way that the Government would make money available to those local authorities which are prepared to help themselves; therefore, grants should be made on the basis of the amounts expended by local authorities.

Perhaps the Minister for Cultural Affairs could interject and say whether the Government is considering this matter. Apparently he did not hear me, but I hope he takes note of my comments.

I wonder whether the Government has given consideration to the provision of financial assistance to local authorities for the construction of multi-use cultural halls. I am hoping the Minister may be able to give some indication by way of interjection.

Mr Bryce: Try again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask the member for Stirling to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr Pearce: We on this side are listening.

Mr STEPHENS: There is an old adage, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try and try again." I am sure the Minister has got the message that I am interested in this and will not let up.

Mr Tonkin: It won't make any difference because he knows he has the numbers.

Mr STEPHENS: Another matter which was brought up in general debate was in respect of worker participation in industry. I was successful in moving an amendment to a motion in this House in that respect, and I am pleased to see that the Government took notice of it. I was particularly pleased to see a Press release on the 21st February in which the Minister indicated an additional officer would be employed in the worker participation section of the Department of Labour and Industry. This indicates the debates in this House are not all futile, and that at times notice is taken of what one says. Although we may not always succeed, we experience sufficient success to encourage us to keep on trying.

Mr Tonkin: What is happening to worker participation at the moment?

Mr STEPHENS: I have just pointed out that the Minister is proceeding to do something about the matter. I give him credit for taking notice of that motion.

Mr Tonkin: What is happening?

Mr STEPHENS: The appropriate section of the department is being upgraded, and its work will be increased.

Mr Tonkin: What work is that?

Mr STEPHENS: Work in the area of worker participation. However, I will not be sidetracked; I have made my point that—

Mr Tonkin: Nothing has happened.

Mr STEPHENS: —not at all—the debates in this House are noted at times.

Mr Grayden: It has been happening for at least two years, and you should know something about it.

Mr Tonkin: What is happening?

Mr STEPHENS: The member for Morley has had his chance, and I am having mine now.

With regard to speeches made by new members, I have been greatly impressed by them and it augurs well for this Parliament that we have new members with such ability. While I am rather reluctant to single out any member in particular, I intend to refer to the speech of the member for Yilgarn-Dundas. I was particularly impressed by the manner in which he recognised his predecessor (Mr Tom Hartrey) because I am sure members on both sides of the House have a great deal of respect for him. I was also very pleased to note the tone of the member's speech, and I am encouraged to feel that he may be going to emulate his predecessor in that seat.

However, I would like to correct one point the member for Yilgarn-Dundas made in his speech. When referring to the plight of nickel miners and the likely retrenchments, he said the Government adopts a socialist policy of buying up wool from the farmers, and he suggested a programme be instituted whereby nickel ore be bought and stockpiled. I would point out it is a popular misconception that the wool purchased by the Australian Wool Commission is purchased from taxpayers' funds.

Mr H. D. Evans: But there is an amount of \$200 million which is guaranteed by the Government. That was done by the Whitlam Government.

Mr STEPHENS: That programme does not cost the taxpayers one cent, because the wool is purchased with moneys raised by a levy on the producers. I endorse the remarks of the member for Yilgarn-Dundas to the extent that workers contribute to assist in purchasing the stockpile of ore.

Mr Tonkin: It is still socialist.

Mr STEPHENS: The point I am making is

that in the case of wool the purchasing is not done at the expense of the taxpayer.

Mr H. D. Evans: But we are risking the taxpayers' money.

Mr STEPHENS: No, we are not. Ever since the commencement of the scheme a profit has been made from the activities of the Australian Wool Commission.

Another reason for my comments in respect of the speech made by the member for Yilgarn-Dundas is that he referred to the promise of the Liberal Party to build a multi-storey hospital in Boulder.

Mr H. D. Evans: Skip that and get on to meat marketing.

Mr STEPHENS: The member claimed that members of the Liberal Party went to his electorate and promised a multi-storey hospital, but after the election all that was constructed was a pavilion-type hospital. The irony of it is that this reminded me of an incident in 1953 when I was the campaign manager for the late Len Hill. I regret to say that he lost the seat, but I trust it was not because I was his campaign manager!

During that campaign members of the Labor Party came to Albany. One was the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke, who promised a multi-storey hospital for Albany; not only did he do that, but he also showed a sketch plan of the hospital. We lost the seat and also the Government, and the Labor Party went into Government: The first thing it did was to say, "Sorry, multi-storey hospitals are old hat; the latest thing is the pavilion-type hospital." So Albany received one of those. There is a touch of irony there; but that is politics.

Mr Davies: You have a permanent care facility down there, so you are well advanced.

Mr STEPHENS: Yes, but we also have a pavilion-type hospital. I am very pleased to say that subsequently the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government built multi-storey hospitals at Northam, Bunbury, and Geraldton.

Mr Bertram: Coalition in name but not in fact.

Mr STEPHENS: The member for Merredin commented on the role of the National Country Party in government. I endorse the comments he made. I appreciate the role of a third party in coalition is rather difficult, but we must also realise that we cannot always necessarily be governed by joint party decisions.

To do so would be to surrender our identity completely. I just make the point—and it is understood by those on this side of the House—that the National Country Party reserves the right to bring to the floor of the House those

matters on which we cannot agree to a compromise. Such a situation occurred a couple of years ago and whether a similar circumstance arises in the future will depend on the situations that may develop.

My colleague the member for Merredin commented on the meat marketing referendum, and I should also like to make a couple of points with regard to it. The only point concerning the referendum which I support wholeheartedly is the fact that a referendum is being held. I cannot support the criteria being used for the referendum. I cannot support the idea of plurality of voting. I think it is ridiculous to say that the number of votes given to a person should be based on the degree of his financial interest in the industry. If we were to adopt that attitude we would have to be equally consistent and say that voting for the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly should be based on one's percentage of financial interest in the country and, therefore, on the amount of tax one pays. A property franchise for the upper House was abandoned many years ago and I do not think we should revert to that sort of thinking.

If we wish to extend the argument to make it appear completely ridiculous we could say that if we ever again needed conscription to defend this country—and I hope that never happens—one's degree of involvement in the conscription would depend on the amount of one's financial interest in the country. Under such an arrangement those with many capital assets would have to send more sons off to war.

I also cannot support the assessment of voting figures whereby more than 60 per cent must vote for question No. 1, 51 per cent for question No. 3, and it is matter of opinion as to the likely percentage in favour of question No. 2. Under the rules which have been laid down the situation could arise that 59 per cent vote in favour of question No. 1 and 40 per cent vote in favour of question No. 3. Is this to be interpreted to mean that we are in favour of question No. 2? The situation is completely ridiculous. There is no truth in the rumour that I intend to move an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, but I shall dissociate myself from the criteria and from the interpretation—

Mr H. D. Evans: Why don't you do something about it?

Mr STEPHENS: I have done all I can; my voice has been heard in another place, and that is as far as I can take the matter at the moment. I am dissociating myself from those matters to which I have referred so that the people I

represent in Stirling know where I stand in regard to the referendum. My voice has been heard in another place and I shall leave the matter there.

Since speaking in the Budget debate last year I regret to say that, apart from the grain industry, there has been no real economic improvement in the agricultural or mixed farming areas which I represent. This is a most regrettable situation which requires constant attention. During the last election campaign the Premier made much of the Rural and Allied Industries Conference. Quite frankly, I was not over impressed with his approach and I believe it was somewhat of a gimmick designed to win National Country Party seats. But, of course, it failed to achieve its assumed objective, and all the sitting National Country Party members were returned with increased majorities.

I believe the agricultural industry is studded with inquiries and that what we need is some action. The basic problems besetting the agricultural industry are reasonably well known and I believe—

Mr H. D. Evans: What are you doing over there? You are the Government.

Mr STEPHENS: I am not the Government; I am a member of the Government but I am not the Government. I am expressing my opinion. I believe we must improve our marketing arrangements. We also need to increase and improve the efficiency of our transport system. In this respect I am pleased to see that the Government has initiated the Southern Western Australian Transport Study. I look forward with interest to the results of that study which hopefully will bring some alleviation of our transport problems.

Another area of concern which is important to the rural industries is the containment of costs, and of the three points I have made the containment of costs would be the one I emphasise most. High internal cost structures and inflation are the main problems confronting the nation and the farming sector, and with the farming sector I associate primary industries such as mining because much of their production is exported and it is very difficult to recover the high internal costs.

I noticed in one of the newspapers recently that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics' March quarter statistics indicated that Western Australian farm costs rose by 6.3 per cent whereas average farm prices rose by only 2.2 per cent. That type of ratio has been continuing for a considerable number of years and therein lies the

problem of the rural sector in that our costs are rising far quicker than the returns.

During this debate there has been frequent reference to industrial relations; there was even an unsuccessful attempt to amend the Address-in-Reply on this subject. I believe that unless we recapture a sense of national pride and a realisation that collectively we cannot take more out of the country than we put in, we will continue the economic slide. We have all noted with considerable interest the tremendous improvement in production by Japan since the second World War.

I was fortunate enough to spend two years in Japan from 1946 to 1948. I was working as an interpreter and this gave me a good opportunity to mix with and understand the Japanese people. Above all I was impressed by the fact that although the country recently had been defeated at war, it had a tremendous national pride. Even in those days I realised that as a nation Japan could only go forward. The people were more interested in working for the country as a whole than worrying about the boss, whoever he was, and whether he was making extra money out of them. As a nation Australia will have to develop a sense of national pride and interest in the country.

Mr Tonkin: Would you like to live in Japan?

Mr STEPHENS: Yes, as a matter of fact it was with a great deal of reluctance I returned to Australia. I understand the system and the workers are looked after reasonably well. I am talking about the whole economic system and about how the worker is looked after by management.

Mr Tonkin: They are like ants.

Mr STEPHENS: They developed a system to suit themselves, but they have an intense pride in their country. This is what is lacking in Australia.

What I am trying to say is that there are widely divergent views as to the causes of strikes and industrial unrest. Blame is invariably attached to trade unions or to employers and Governments, depending on one's political philosophy. I do know of course that the Federal Minister for Primary Industry said that the strikes and industrial unrest are the result of "Pommy shop stewards". I will accept that there may be a preponderance of Pommy shop stewards, but if this is so, it is because of the apathy of the Australian worker. Therefore we should blame Australians who have allowed the situation to develop to the stage where so-called Pommy shop stewards have taken over.

Mr H. D. Evans: What percentage are Pommies?

Mr STEPHENS: I do not know.

Mr H. D. Evans: I bet you wouldn't.

Mr STEPHENS: I am quoting someone else and saying that if this is so we should look to Australians and blame them for allowing the situation to develop. That is the point. The percentage is irrelevant.

Mr Tonkin: Don't worry about facts; they only cloud the issue!

Mr STEPHENS: Whatever the causes, and regardless of who is to blame, there is daily evidence of industrial problems. The actual cost of strikes to the economy is hard to quantify, but certain facts are not. When it comes to working days lost, by world standards Australia shows up very badly. I have here some figures which indicate the working days lost due to industrial disputes, per 1 000 workers employed, and regrettably Australia is second on the list. In 1975—these are the latest figures I have available, but the year is irrelevant—

Mr Tonkin: Not really. They have changed considerably since then.

Mr STEPHENS: —1 390 working days were lost per 1 000 workers in Australia.

Several members interjected.

Mr STEPHENS: I will restate what I was saying in case it has been missed as a result of the interjections. Australia lost 1 390 working days per 1 000 workers employed. As I have said, this was due to industrial disputes. The only other country with a figure worse than that was Italy, with 1 640 days lost. On the other hand, West Germany lost only 110 days.

Mr Tonkin: They are a very disciplined people.

Mr STEPHENS: No. The information I have here contains a note which I was going to raise and I think it appropriate that I do so now. It is stated that the German trade unions are committed to the free enterprise system, no doubt because they had a taste of socialism under the Nazi regime.

Mr Tonkin: What rubbish!

Mr STEPHENS: I made reference to this a couple of years ago. Also in West Germany a decision to strike has to be endorsed by a 75 per cent majority.

Mr Tonkin: That is true.

Mr STEPHENS: That may be another reason why the number of work days lost in that country is so low. They are the two points we should study.

The only other country to which I will refer is Denmark which lost 190 work days. The footnote

regarding Denmark is that in that country two-year pay agreements bind unions and management. Disputes are settled in a labour court with powers to end strikes and impose fines.

Mr Tonkin: Another socialist country.

Mr STEPHENS: If we study the figures issued by the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics on industrial disputes and their costs, we find that in 1976 in Australia there were 2 055 disputes with an estimated loss of wages of \$114.552 million, while in Western Australia there were 250 disputes with an estimated loss of wages of \$8.462 million. Those figures show a terrible loss to the community.

Let us have a look at the causes of disputes. These figures may be found in the same publication of the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics, but they are for the March quarter only. We find that physical working conditions caused 18.8 per cent of the disputes; wages caused 19 per cent of the disputes, and that figure is not surprising because in the 25 years since 1952-53 the average minimum weekly wage rate has increased by 568 per cent but prices have increased by only 204 per cent. Therefore the wages factor is not a great area of concern. Managerial policy accounted for 46 per cent of the disputes. Before members opposite rise up and blame management for all the disputes, I believe it is as well that we understand the definition of "managerial policy" as laid down by the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics. The definition is as follows—

Disputes concerning the managerial policy of employers—computation of wages, hours, leave, etc. in individual cases; docking pay, docking leave credits, fines, etc.; disciplinary matters including dismissals, suspension, victimisation; principles of promotion and filling positions, transfers, roster complaints, retrenchment policy; employment of particular persons and personal disagreements; production limitations or quotas; etc.

Therefore it can be seen that managerial causes of disputes are very wide and varied.

Mr Bryce: And numerous.

Mr STEPHENS: Of course, there is one aspect of trade union activity that does not show up in the statistics and that is the use of the "industrial muscle" in the form of work bans. As a representative of a rural electorate, the ban on shipments of wheat to Chile and Indonesia springs immediately to mind. But of course there are many other examples. We have seen the ban on the shipment of live sheep; the ban on the

shipment of cattle; the ban on wool handling a few months ago; the ban on the Newport power station in Victoria; the possible ban on uranium; and so it continues. These bans do not show up in the figures of industrial disputes.

No responsible person objects to trade unionism, but of course there is widespread concern and objection to the growing tendency of certain unions to usurp the power and function of democratically elected Governments. I doubt whether the Labor Party really supports this tendency of the unions to usurp the power of government. To do so would make a mockery of their current cry of "one-man-one-vote".

The decisions being made by the various unions are made by a minority of the groups involved and they are trying to impose their will on the community against the wishes of the democratically elected Government.

Mr Bertram: Where did you get that bright idea from?

Mr Tonkin: The Government is not democratically elected, of course. That is the whole point.

Mr STEPHENS: I will not make any reference at this stage to the uranium ban that may or may not occur.

Mr Skidmore: Are you in support of Ian Smith in Rhodesia also?

Mr STEPHENS: That is another matter.

Mr Tonkin: Don't think that by saying the Government is democratically elected, we believe it is democratically elected because it is not.

Mr STEPHENS: It certainly is democratically elected in comparison with the situation where we have the union leaders dictating to the members exactly what will happen. Do not let us go into details because members opposite may come off second best. If I may continue—

Mr Skidmore: You are trying to follow in the Premier's footsteps. He does not seem to be objecting.

Mr STEPHENS: I am sure the Premier would be pleased to know that I was. There is an increasing awareness of the effect on the economy resulting from the lack of harmony in the area of industrial relations. The solutions seem to be as far away as ever. Increasing confrontation between government and/or employers on the one hand and unions on the other will not resolve the problems. While it may be true that certain union militants are out to create trouble either from the point of view of gaining power for power's sake or in order to gain power to pursue the interests of a

foreign ideology, it is equally true that the vast majority of unionists are moderates at heart.

Mr Skidmore: Why don't you have a bit of guts and name some of the unions that are doing this instead of just saying "unions" collectively?

Mr STEPHENS: Do not get upset.

Mr Skidmore: Well, I do get upset because you are always saying "unions" but you have not got the guts to give them a name. Start naming a few of them.

Mr Bertram: You have to show leadership in a minority group.

Mr STEPHENS: There are some unionists who seek power for power's sake, whilst others seek power in order to pursue the interests of a foreign ideology.

Mr Skidmore: Name them.

Mr STEPHENS: It is not pertinent to my speech at the present time. It is true that the vast majority of unionists are moderates at heart and object to some of the union tactics. If this were not so I think it would be true that we would always have, or usually would have, a Labor Government. Therefore it is obvious that many of the unionists do not vote for the Labor Party. It is also no doubt true—

Mr Bryce: More is the pity.

Mr STEPHENS: —that management is guilty of mistakes which cause ill-feeling and create a fertile bed upon which agitators are able to germinate the seeds of disputations. That the trouble is due to many causes is quite evident from a short extract that I will read from a Green Paper which is commonly referred to as the Jackson report. This report relates to the policies of the Australian manufacturing industries, but the matters referred to here I believe could be—

Mr. T. H. Jones: Did it get the green light?

Mr STEPHENS: —said to be indicative of the nation as a whole. The extract reads as follows—

The stagnation of fixed investment in constant prices is not new; it is of ten years standing. Manufacturing has tried to maintain earnings by running down its capital stock. Much of the equipment in factories, consequently is old, inefficient and overdue for replacement; desirable technical innovations have been delayed; and physical conditions for the workforce leave much to be desired. For ten years the rate of growth in labour productivity of Australian manufacturing has been far below that achieved in Japan, France and Germany, and marginally below Britain and Canada.

Our studies of the human condition in factories indicate serious and deepseated problems. For most of the workforce, the quality of worklife falls drastically short of what people would like. The rising expectations, education and standard of living of most workers contrast starkly with remote and centralised decision making that considers them as inanimate 'resources' or 'labour'. Industry is heavily concentrated in major cities. The problems of overcrowding spill over into worklife. Alienation and frustration are evidenced by unrest, absenteeism, high turnover, and indifferent quality of product.

The workforce is multi-racial and multi-cultural. Four out of ten were born outside Australia. They most frequently do the dirtiest, least skilled, menial tasks; tasks for which, despite unemployment, young native-born Australians cannot be found. Women are a quarter of the workforce and in some sectors eight out of ten. Little attention is paid to their special needs, particularly of the two-thirds who are married. The married migrant woman in industry is trebly disadvantaged.

People remote from the shopfloor who staff governments, traditional firms and unions do not appear to be conscious enough of these long-term problems, or well enough prepared to deal with them.

And so the article goes on in the same vein, but I think I have mentioned enough to indicate that the problems are recognised.

I do not think I need to give examples of the various types of problems, but there would be unanimous agreement in the fact that we are in deep trouble in the industrial area. As a first step towards curing the problem, I think a thorough and impartial diagnosis is essential. No doctor worthy of his name would attempt to cure a patient without first diagnosing the ailment. I wonder why, then, we continue to attempt palliatives without a full diagnosis.

The time for applying band-aid type treatment on an *ad hoc* basis has long since passed. We need to look for a new charter for industrial relations; a charter which will lead to co-operation between all sections of the community and a realisation of the need for such co-operation to achieve the maximum economic gain for the nation, the continent, the quality of life, and the quality of work life to the individual.

I believe the time has arrived when a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into

this problem and recommend the steps that should be taken to achieve this new charter. I know that Royal Commissions, by their terms of reference, can be used to stifle information and facts. As an example of such an inquiry, I regrettably refer to the Royal Commission into prostitution. I believe it was appointed more to hide than to uncover facts. For that reason, and in order to avoid such allegations, the Royal Commission which I propose should have the widest terms of reference possible. I also believe the Royal Commission should comprise at least five commissioners appointed to represent a wide cross section of the community. At least one of the commissioners should be a man with a high academic status, because attached to the commission there should be a small research unit to undertake detailed research work into some of the questions which may arise. The research unit could be under the supervision of the commissioner with the high academic qualifications.

The commission would need to look particularly into such matters as: The role of the State in industrial relations; the effectiveness of the arbitration and conciliation system; the role of collective bargaining—if it exists—the role and extent of worker participation; and the role and operations of unions, management, and employer organisations. It is important we look into those areas, and I will quickly give an example of a problem which occurred some time ago during the ban on mail to and from France during the French nuclear tests. When the postal ban was instituted I was approached by a couple of keen Labor supporters. They complained to me that they had no say in the decision-making process, and the ban on French mail. The decision had been made in Sydney. It is necessary for the work force to have a say. However, according to the comments of the people I have spoken to, the decisions with regard to the Pilbara also are made in the Eastern States.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): The member has five minutes.

Mr STEPHENS: Thank you. It is very important that we have a detailed inquiry. An inquiry of this nature could develop a blue print which would allow harmonious industrial and social relations to be secured in the coming years. I quite realise that such an inquiry would cost money, but so does the present industrial unrest.

When the Premier was talking about the Rural and Allied Industries Conference he said it would cost money, but the Government was prepared to spend that sum of money. I feel the area I have mentioned justifiably requires the expenditure of

money when it is remembered that the estimated loss of wages, in Western Australia alone, was in excess of \$8 million. The question is not whether we can afford the expense, but whether we can afford not to have such an inquiry.

There were several matters of a parochial nature which I did hope to touch on. You, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Watt) mentioned that I had five minutes. That means I will have two minutes after the tea suspension.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Watt): Yes.

Mr STEPHENS: Whaling, of course, is a subject which is of considerable interest to my electorate. The whaling station is situated in the electorate of Stirling. However, the subject of whaling has been adequately covered by a previous speaker and I endorse his remarks. I support the establishment of the whaling station and the continuation of whaling.

When I was a Minister I did my best to persuade the Whitlam Labor Government to desist from supporting the moratorium suggested at the international whaling organisation meeting. It is absolutely stupid to imagine that the 800-odd whales taken by the Cheynes Beach Whaling Company—if the company was prepared to forego its catch—would have any significant effect whatsoever. So, I wholeheartedly support the continuation of whaling at Albany.

I will now refer to train services. I asked a question a week or two ago and the reply to my question indicated that the number of passengers travelling from Perth to Albany had increased marginally from 7 500 to 7 660 in the three years ended 1976-77. However, the number of passengers travelling from Albany to Perth had increased considerably from 7 200 to 8 000-odd.

Mr Davies: Does that mean they are travelling to Perth and not returning?

Mr STEPHENS: That could be so. I believe the passenger service to Albany should be maintained but it appears that it is being allowed to run down. The increase in patronage has occurred despite the lack of any endeavour to promote train travel.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stirling has two minutes remaining.

Mr STEPHENS: Prior to the tea suspension I had just finished speaking about the need to advertise for more patronage for the train to upgrade the train service.

In the short time available I will make a passing reference to the plight of the potato industry in the Grassmere valley near Albany.

This area has been used as a source of water for the Albany town supply. Boring has taken place, and I have already communicated with the Minister about the fact that in one location water has been taken for a considerable number of years and the surface water has been lowered to the point where the potato swamps are in jeopardy. Already one farmer has had to sell his swampland because it is no longer suitable for potato growing. That is bad enough and it is of considerable importance to the growers concerned.

The field for water exploration is now being extended and, if water is found in any quantity, I believe the Government will have to move with extreme caution, otherwise the whole industry will be placed at risk and the Albany area cannot afford to lose any industries whatsoever. I regret I have not time to develop this point but I would like it to be recorded in *Hansard* and I trust the Government will give every consideration to the interests of the growers and the plight of the industry as a whole.

With those few remarks I support the motion.

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [7.32 p.m.]: *Mr Speaker*, I would like to join with other members in congratulating you upon your appointment to your office in this House.

I would also like to congratulate all the new members who have been elected to represent their constituents for the next three years, and to compliment the new members who have contributed to this debate, because, by and large, what they have said has been very interesting, the manner in which they have dealt with their subject matter has been excellent, and it has been a joy to listen to some of them. It has been somewhat painful to listen to some of the other members expressing to the House their beliefs and attitudes, and I will develop that matter as I proceed.

You Sir, were not here in 1968, at the time the Labor Party blooded its ranks with 10 new members. I think the contribution made by those 10 new members since 1968, and certainly in the Address-in-Reply debate in 1968, would probably be among the best, in both quality and quantity, we have had as far as speechmaking by new members in this House is concerned.

Mr Stephens: When did you come into the House?

Mr HARMAN: In 1968. I happened to be one of those new members.

Mr Sibson: What has happened to you since?

Mr Bryce: The class of '71 was not bad.

Mr HARMAN: Any unbiased judge of speechmaking and subject matter would look to that year as being one of the better years—

Mr H. D. Evans: A vintage year.

Mr HARMAN:—for contributions by new members of Parliament. So I have given some thought to the role of a parliamentarian, the attitudes and beliefs of members of Parliament when they are first elected and come into this House, and whether the beliefs and attitudes they hold at that time are still held by them some years later.

In talking about the role of a parliamentarian one has to look at two aspects of it: the positive aspect and the negative aspect. As regards the positive role of a parliamentarian, he would be one who certainly represented his constituents. He would be here to legislate in regard to both Acts of Parliament and regulations. He would see his positive role here as being to examine issues which come before the community, and I hope he would give a lead to people in the community on those issues; in other words, that he would take the time to study all the implications of the issues so that he could give a lead and advice to his constituents. He would take some initiative in the Parliament so that people in the community could become involved in the decision-making processes of the Parliament and the Government. That is the way I see the positive role of a member of Parliament.

I must concede that some members of Parliament will become members of the Executive Government and have an additional role to play; and some members of Parliament will become members of Her Majesty's Opposition and have additional responsibilities placed upon them.

We then come to the negative role of a parliamentarian, which is to come into this House, just to take his seat here as some members do, and see it as a place where decisions are made—usually in the party rooms or by the Premier—and as a stage where the decisions are acted out.

Those are the positive and negative roles of a parliamentarian as I see them. We then come to the question: How do members of Parliament perform these two aspects of their role? We must analyse that further by asking: What kinds of beliefs and attitudes do they bring to the Parliament and what do they really think about society? I thought that tonight I would carry out an exercise in regard to the beliefs and attitudes which members of the Liberal Party bring to this Parliament when they first come here, and see whether, after being in Parliament for some time,

those beliefs and attitudes are reinforced and remain with them.

Mr Blaikie: It must have given you a lot of satisfaction to research this subject.

Mr HARMAN: It gave me a great deal of satisfaction. I would describe the beliefs of members of the Liberal Party in this order: firstly, they believe they are elected under a democratic system and that Parliament reflects all the conditions of democracy. That belief has been expressed during this current debate. Secondly, the Liberals say Parliament will decide issues, but on most occasions the decisions are made in the party room or by the Premier, and Parliament becomes a stage where those decisions are acted out.

Mr Sodeman: How are your decisions made?

Mr HARMAN: Thirdly, Liberal parliamentarians come here to defend private enterprise and to espouse the view that there should be no Government intervention in the private enterprise system. They firmly hold the belief that our economy is a market economy in that the forces of the market determine production and consumption. They concede that the needs of society cannot be met by the operations of the market and that the Government must intervene to meet those needs. The Liberals worship private enterprise and positively venerate inequality and privilege.

Mr H. D. Evans: The elephant philosophy—every man for himself.

Mr HARMAN: Fourthly, the Liberals think they have a divine right to rule and it does not matter what methods they use to achieve that end.

Mr Coyne: Are you disputing that?

Mr HARMAN: Fifthly, the Liberals—new members coming in and some of the older members—believe Australian society should be seen as a class society with a dominant class identified by wealth and property. They believe private incentive and individual initiative should dominate, that society should be spurred on by greed and avarice and not by co-operation but by competition. Those are some of the beliefs with which I believe Liberals come to this Parliament.

Mr Bryce: And very perceptive, too.

Mr HARMAN: In addition, Liberals tend to treat workers as a kind of inert commodity bereft of any feelings, desires, ambitions, or needs. That has been made evident tonight and on other occasions during the course of this debate.

Mr Sodeman: It is totally untrue, of course.

Mr HARMAN: Let us examine some of these

beliefs. The first one I mentioned is the belief of Liberals that they are elected under a democratic system and that Parliament reflects all the conditions of democracy. When we really think about it, that is not quite the case. The member for Melville pointed out in his speech in an excellent manner that we do not have a democratic system in Western Australia.

Mr Shalders: Do you realise you are referring to a member's maiden speech, which your leader said was absolutely sacrosanct? He criticised me for referring to a maiden speech and you are doing it.

Mr HARMAN: The member for Melville and other members in this House—members from this side, certainly none from the other side—on many occasions have endeavoured to point out how undemocratic our parliamentary system is. As the member for Melville said, we have a situation where the seat with the largest number of electors—18 000—returns one member, and another seat with 2 000-odd electors also returns one member. We have the same situation in the Legislative Council, where one seat comprising 5 743 electors returns one member and another seat comprising 84 943 electors also returns one member.

Mr Clarko: The first one is the size of South Australia and Victoria.

Mr HARMAN: Obviously that is not a democracy, yet we have Liberals coming into this House believing we are living in a democratic situation. As regards your seat of Kalamunda, Mr Speaker, you can wave to your electors from the front steps of this House but it is not classified as a metropolitan seat.

As the member for Cockburn pointed out last night, one has to travel some 23 kilometres before one gets to his electorate and that is a long way further than one has to travel to reach your electorate, Sir, in the foothills. Let us dismiss this myth the Liberal Party believes in that this is a democratic system.

The other matter that I want to highlight tonight is the idea that Liberal parliamentarians come here to defend private enterprise. They espouse also the view that there should be no Government intervention in the private enterprise system. One often hears the Liberals say that it is regrettable the Government has to intervene in the private enterprise system.

Mr Bryce: They nationalised the Entertainment Centre.

Mr HARMAN: Let us analyse this particular aspect. As I said, we hear the Liberals say they worship the fact that we have a market economy

in that the forces of production and consumption have some effect in the market place. Let us see how true that is in the Australian context. We have a great deal of Government intervention in the Australian economy. We have Government support and Government regulation. We have more Government intervention in our economy than has any other country in the world, and yet the Liberals come here and say that they do not like to interfere in the private enterprise system. They believe that there is no interference at all but I do not know how they can come to that belief. However, that is what they like to say.

To examine this further, and in a great deal more detail, let us go back to the beginning of the Australian economy. The first enterprise in Australia was a Government enterprise. The Government looked after the convicts, guarded them and victualled them. That was a Government enterprise. Since that day, it has been Government enterprise all the way along the line.

The Government developed the railways, the road systems, and it looked after water supplies and communication. Why did the Government do this? It was to meet the needs of the industries of the time—the pastoral industry, the goldmining industry, and later on the agricultural industry. In order to accomplish this, the Government borrowed finance from the United Kingdom. From 1860 to 1890 we had a fairly rapid period of development, but after 1890 we coasted along through Federation. Our economy was hit by the first World War, and finally we were devastated in the years 1929 and 1930 because of the great depression. It was at that time the States were unable to meet their payments of loan moneys they had raised overseas, and because of this the Australian Loan Council was set up.

We now have the situation where the Premier of this State is advocating that we go beyond the Australian Loan Council to raise funds overseas. I want members to picture in their minds, our Premier, and some of the other Premiers, if they were allowed to get away with such a proposal. They would gallivant all around the world to try to raise loan funds for this State and for any other State.

Mr Shalders: They should be able to do it better than Mr Whitlam did.

Mr HARMAN: I would hate to see some of the great financiers of the world playing Mr Dunstan against Sir Charles Court and Mr Bjelke-Petersen against Mr Hamer, and so on. We would not be able to obtain loan funds at acceptable interest rates because the Premiers would be playing off

against each other. Of course, we would come off second best and this is why the Australian Labor Party says that we ought to be very careful in regard to raising funds overseas and outside the Loan Council.

The Premier keeps harping on the point that we need to obtain overseas funds for this State, and yet his Federal counterpart in Canberra keeps saying that we must have some regard for the growth of money. If we must have some regard for the growth of money, then we must have some regard for the inflow of capital funds into Australia, and that is why the Federal Government wants to keep some sort of rein on foreign investment in Australia.

Perhaps some Government members can understand our Premier's attitude, but I cannot reconcile it with the attitude of his counterpart in Canberra, a man of the same political philosophy, who says that we cannot take this course because we must keep inflation down by keeping the growth of money at an acceptable level.

Mr Watt: Did you protest when the Federal Labor Government wanted to borrow overseas?

Mr HARMAN: That is a completely different matter.

Mr Old: Of course it is!

Mr Watt: No it is not.

Mr HARMAN: I am talking about this State. There is nothing wrong with the Federal Government borrowing funds overseas—that is its role.

I have endeavoured to point out to the Chamber that ever since our first colonies and through Federation there has been this massive involvement by Government in the economy. The involvement is effected through a number of sources through import control, control on foreign investment, tariff policies, taxation, subsidies, bounties, and a whole host of regulations that the Federal Government and the State Governments have acquired over the years to involve themselves in the economy.

To give some proof of what I have been saying, I wish to refer to the remarks of a prominent Australian sociologist, a man called Encel.

Mr Clarko: A member of the Labor Party.

Mr HARMAN: In 1970 he described the Australian economy as a system of monopoly capitalism operating through a highly-regulated structure of output, prices, and wages, which is interlocked with and maintained by an extensive system of Government activity.

Mr Clarko: Why did you not say he was an

active member of the Labor Party instead of calling him a sociologist. That is Solomon Encel.

Mr HARMAN: The Australian economy has been a mixture of private and Government investment with Government exercising control through fiscal and monetary powers, through tariffs, subsidies, bounties, trade practices, prices justification boards, the Reserve Bank, and the Industrial Commission. It is a far cry from the laissez-faire model Government limited to defence, law and order, public works, and certain institutions. I will now quote the words of the former Prime Minister (Mr Gough Whitlam) in 1975. He said—

A remarkably permanent aspect of our Australian society and Australian history is that for all our sense of independence, for all our ability to improvise, to take initiatives, our demands for action always turn into demands for Government action, for Government assistance. At this very moment, almost every demand for protection of free enterprise, for the enhancement of business freedom, is couched in terms of Government assistance—a subsidy, a quota, a tariff.

So, Sir, I think this really dispels the myth, the belief, with which the Liberal parliamentarians come here. They want to believe we have some sort of near-perfect competitive market system in Australia. We do not have it, we have never had it, and if we did have it, why would we have increases in prices and increases in wages, in other words “stagflation”? One would think if we operated under a competitive market system, a reduction in the demand for goods would result in a fall in the price of those goods and a fall in wages because there would be no demand.

Mr MacKinnon: How can wages fall?

Mr HARMAN: That is the very point I am coming to. One would think that would happen in a competitive system, but we do not have a competitive system so it does not happen. That is a point I want to develop a little further.

The next point I wish to refer to in the Australian economy is the degree of concentration of economic power which the Liberal parliamentarians either are not aware of or forget conveniently. I want to refer to *The Australian Financial Review* which, in February, 1973, carried five articles termed, “In few hands”. These articles set out to show the concentration of wealth and power in the Australian financial world.

The author, Trevor Sykes, surveyed the top 20 shareholders of 251 companies ranging from BHP downwards. The survey, broken into industry

groups, showed that the top 20 shareholders had an average holding of 55 per cent of the issued capital of the companies surveyed.

Sykes claimed that the total number of shareholders was available in 185 companies surveyed and showed that 3 700 shareholders in the top 20 of these 185 companies represented 3.52 per cent of the total shareholders. In turn they controlled 53.66 per cent of the ordinary issued shares. Sykes added that the sample is large enough to be representative of Australia's 1 500 public companies.

This survey of Australian public companies was also able to demonstrate that foreign ownership accounted for the largest overall holding, averaging 15.96 per cent of all companies. Foreign holdings in mining companies totalled 28 per cent. Sykes says the survey understates the degree of foreign ownership and investment as private companies wholly owned by foreign interests, such as General Motors Holdens, Esso, and King Ranch are not included. Secondly, the survey covered only foreign interests that were clearly identifiable.

Among the top 20 shareholders the survey was able to pinpoint the large percentage of shares owned by nominee companies which Sykes calls the faceless men of finance. Nominee companies accounted for 7.85 per cent of total shareholdings—nearly three billion shares. Next in line in overall percentage holdings of shares were the institutions, notably the insurance companies, of which AMP “stands like a giant”.

Some idea of the activities of AMP was reported by *The Australian* in a series of articles dealing with the ownership of Australia's largest retail stores; namely Coles, Waltons, Grace Brothers, David Jones, and Myer Stores. In the first four AMP was the second highest shareholder. In the case of Myer Stores, AMP was the fourth highest shareholder with 15 per cent of the issued capital. That will give members some idea of the concentration of economic power in the Australian economic world.

Mr Laurance: Owned by thousands of policy holders.

Mr HARMAN: If members wish to take this matter further, I suggest they read the research of Hylda Rolfe who pointed out the degree of interlocking directorships in the Australian commercial system. Of 50 companies surveyed, there were 169 directors who between them held 617 directorships in another 325 companies. It was significant that the banks and insurance companies held the greatest spread.

The Jackson report on policies for the

manufacturing industry revealed that within the top 200 enterprise groups, 87 were foreign controlled, 68 of them with more than 50 per cent of their shares held by foreign shareholders.

Coming closer to home, I refer now to the report of the Royal Commission set up in Western Australia in 1974 to investigate the possible extension of the franchise of the State Government Insurance Office. It was only after a great deal of patience on my part that I was able to get the Premier to table in this House the report of that commission. The report revealed that of the 102 insurance companies carrying on general insurance business in Western Australia, approximately 80 per cent were not Australian owned. Of the 49 companies engaged in life assurance business in Australia at the end of 1972, 36 were incorporated outside Australia or were subsidiaries of such foreign companies. That gives members some idea of the concentration of economic power in the Australian commercial world and the extent to which foreign interests control Australia's commerce.

As an aside, I ask Liberal parliamentarians to try to reconcile the attitude of their Premier on this question of insurance with the recent granting of \$50 000 of taxpayers' money to an alleged millionaire who wants to play with boats in the United States of America.

Mr Clarko: We have had \$50 000's-worth already.

Mr HARMAN: The Premier has already said he does not intend to allow the SGIO to enter the general insurance field because he does not believe Government departments should be involved in normal private enterprise activities. Of course, he does not mind the SGIO handling certain types of insurance in Western Australia—mainly those items of business in which other companies were not interested from the beginning.

The Premier does not want the SGIO to enter the lucrative fields of household insurance and life assurance, but he is prepared to permit the Department of Tourism to enter into advertising and promotional activities for the benefit of a millionaire who is sailing a yacht over in the USA. How can members opposite reconcile those two attitudes adopted by their Premier? I believe the Premier's statement that the Department of Tourism would be permitted to advertise for the benefit of Western Australia as a result of this contribution was simply his way of laundering a payment of \$50 000 of taxpayers' money to an alleged millionaire.

Sir Charles Court: It does not go to him at all;

it goes to the trustees. Bond does not even own the boat.

Mr HARMAN: When I requested the Premier to give the House details of the agreement supposed to have been made between the Government and the group mounting the challenge, I was not able to obtain it. However, a reporter from the *Daily News* was able to obtain it, and publish it in his newspaper.

Mr Sodeman: He was probably a bit more enterprising than you.

Mr Clarko: Or courageous.

Mr HARMAN: No, I went about it in a legitimate fashion; I asked the Premier for the agreement. He denied that request, but the newspaper reporter was able to obtain a copy.

Sir Charles Court: Do you assume he got the lot?

Mr HARMAN: I do not know how much he got, because I did not get anything; the Premier did not even say whether he had carried out an investigation to ascertain how the agreement fell into the reporter's hands. The Premier seems to suggest it was all right for the reporter to have access to this sort of information, but that members of Parliament should not be permitted to have it.

Sir Charles Court: Not at all; I was very annoyed at the report.

Mr HARMAN: What sort of investigation did the Premier carry out? That is why I am asking how Liberal parliamentarians reconcile the two attitudes of the Premier. On the one hand, the Government denies Government departments the right to enter private enterprise and on the other, it permits Government departments to carry out these sorts of activities if it suits the Government.

I should like to refer to one more myth the Liberals seem to perpetrate, and this concerns the position of the workers of this State. The Liberals seem to treat workers as some kind of inert commodity, bereft of any feelings, desires, or ambitions.

Mrs Craig: That is rubbish.

Mr HARMAN: I realise members opposite will say that it is rubbish, but that is how they look upon the workers of this State—simply as some sort of commodity.

Even in a small State like Tasmania, which has not a great population but which has an enterprising Government, workers are treated better than we treat them in Western Australia. For a number of years there has been established in Tasmania a committee which investigates recessions and retrenchments in industry.

Mr Blaikie: I imagine it is overworked.

Mr HARMAN: The committee meets regularly and knows in advance if some firm or industry is likely to suffer from some economic happening resulting from action taken either in Tasmania or elsewhere, and steps are taken to plan for the workers who are likely to be retrenched.

I asked the Premier to consider establishing a retrenchment committee in Western Australia; it could be made up of public servants and people from industry and unions, and could meet regularly to examine the position in Western Australia. Of course, my suggestion was never adopted, as a result of which we saw the recent case where, although the Government knew in advance there would be retrenchments in the nickel industry in Western Australia, it was not until after the event had occurred that planning processes were swung into action to assist retrenched workers. I maintain that if we had a retrenchment committee meeting on a regular basis in Western Australia, such situations would be catered for in advance of the actual event.

If the Government has the great regard for workers that it claims to have, why is it that so many of our work force are unemployed? Has it not been a deliberate policy of Governments—certainly since 1945—to endeavour to maintain full employment? That policy was observed in Western Australia and Australia generally until about 1971, but it seems to have lapsed since then; now, there seems to be no sort of commitment to full employment. This Government and the Federal Government do not seem to be concerned that we have such a large number of people unemployed.

When a person is unemployed he suffers all sorts of traumatic consequences. Members would know that when they are working they like to have a relationship and some sort of interaction with their fellow workers. People can get a kick out of going to work if they are in satisfying employment; people can enjoy the prospect of going to work each day. But that does not apply to people who are unemployed. In fact, a large number of young people have never had the opportunity to be employed. So, when we hear the Government talking about having some regard for workers, we cannot really accept it. If it were concerned, we would not have such a large number of people out of work and a great many more who are living in constant fear that one day they too will be out of work.

One often hears the Premier saying that the workers of this State should work a little harder if

they wish to earn more. Obviously, it is his opinion that the workers of this State do not work hard enough; that is the only conclusion one can draw from his remarks.

Mr O'Connor: Some do not. Do you deny that?

Mr HARMAN: The Premier does not say "some"; he says, "If workers want to get more, they must work harder."

However, the Premier conveniently overlooks the fact that if a worker is anxious to become more productive the matter is not only in his hands and brain; the machinery he uses and the environment in which he works must also be taken into consideration.

Members opposite conveniently overlook that fact; they seem to think that a worker should go off to work and work hard all day, and that is the end of it. They forget that in our manufacturing industry today, things are not as they should be. The member for Stirling quoted from the Jackson committee report, and I use the same report to lend weight to my argument. It states—

Our studies of the human condition in factories indicate serious and deepseated problems. For most of the workforce, the quality of worklife falls drastically short of what people would like. The rising expectations, education and standard of living of most workers contrast starkly with remote and centralised decision making that considers them as inanimate 'resources' or 'labour'.

That was the opinion of the Jackson committee. When Liberal parliamentarians start talking about the workers of this State being more productive, they should also consider the environment and the machinery with which they must work. In many cases, because of our tariff system and because manufacturing industry in Australia has never been geared up to compete overseas because of the protection it receives from the Government, our industry has never improved its machinery in order to become more competitive.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has four minutes remaining.

Mr HARMAN: I wish to conclude on this note: I have made allegations that Liberal parliamentarians have certain attitudes and beliefs when they come into this Parliament. Because of the undemocratic nature of this institution, and because decisions are made in party rooms and are only acted out in this Chamber the policies and attitudes of Liberal parliamentarians are reinforced by the system, which has been in operation in this State for a

great number of years. All I say is that members opposite should have some regard for their beliefs. They should be analysing and subjecting those beliefs to a lot more analysis and self-criticism.

If members opposite simply go along, accepting the attitude which seems to prevail in this country today—namely, that they can put over the story people like to hear, knowing that in fact it is not the truth—they will do themselves and in turn their constituents a great deal of harm. Liberal parliamentarians are not putting to the people the exact situation which obtains in Australia today.

MR BLAIKIE: (Vasse) [8.15 p.m.]: I also wish to make some comments on the Address-in-Reply debate. May I join with other members who have already indicated their support to you, Mr Speaker, and add my congratulations on your elevation to the high office you hold. It is quite evident that the impartiality you have shown is equal to that of former Speakers. No doubt you will remember your friends when you give decisions from your high office!

Mr Bryce: Friends from both sides!

Mr BLAIKIE: The member for Maylands, who has just resumed his seat, referred to the fact that 1968 was a particularly good year. I think that you, Mr Speaker, might agree that 1971 was a particularly good year because that was when we both entered Parliament. However, I have not as yet made as much progress as you have.

I also congratulate those members who came to this Parliament in 1974, and who have been elevated to a higher office; I refer to the member for Wellington, the member for Murray, the member for Gascoyne, and the member for Karrinyup. I also offer—without the same warmth—my congratulations to the member for Ascot on his elevation to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He would understand that my good wishes do not hold the same sort of warmth and sincerity I offered to my colleagues.

Mr Bryce: That is a double-handed compliment.

Mr BLAIKIE: I think the new members will agree that they have found Parliament a little strange. This is something which new members usually take a little time to learn; to understand the proceedings of Parliament, and the methods and sittings of the House. No doubt, one or two new members have already been frustrated. To those members I offer some fatherly advice: this is a great place to temper people, and a great place in which to learn. This is also a place where one will not make any changes overnight. I say that rather advisedly.

I can assure the new members they will make

good friends amongst members from both sides of the House, and they will meet people from a tremendous variety of walks of life. Surely that is what Parliament is all about: people representing people from all walks of life and from all areas of Western Australia.

Periodically I hear comments that the members "on the other side" are not doing their job properly. Quite frankly, we are all here to do a job, and to do that job as best we can. It is the different ideologies which determine how one goes about doing one's job, and that is the main point of contention.

No doubt new members have been concerned when, having got to their feet and while making their speech, they observe other members walking around the Chamber, walking out of the Chamber, reading newspapers, and showing no apparent interest at all. On top of that, no doubt, they have been rather frustrated, after having made what they considered to be a brilliant speech, to find that the representatives of the Press have gone to sleep, have gone home, or have not been present all the time. This is one of the great levellers of parliamentary life. For my own part, I am getting a little older; certainly, a lot wiser.

Mr Nanovich: And a lot greyer.

Mr BLAIKIE: Probably that is so, too.

It is time we reviewed the sitting times of Parliament. It was coincidental that I received a note from the member for Perth who has similar ideas to mine. I believe sitting times should be reviewed and revised. I have researched this matter and I found that in 1891 the Premier—Lord Forrest—introduced a motion which resulted in Parliament sitting on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and on Tuesday and Thursday evenings. Those sitting times were subsequently changed so that the members were able to have Thursday afternoon off.

An interesting feature of the debate which took place at that time was that reference was made to the fact that there was not much point in sitting during daytime, because the only time members did any work was during nighttime.

In 1952 the sitting hours were again changed to bring them into line with present-day sitting hours. Quite frankly, I do not believe the argument advanced in 1891—that members should work all night—holds any real value in 1977.

Mr Bertram: Why, what is wrong with it?

Mr BLAIKIE: I can well recall that last year on one occasion we sat until 5.40 a.m.

Mr Skidmore: There were some very good speeches that night.

Mr BLAIKIE: That is rather interesting, because I distinctly remember the member for Swan was sleeping on at least three or four occasions that night, as was the case with most members anyway. If any member believes he can make an intelligent speech at 4.30 a.m., that is point one to him. In any case, I guarantee that no-one would be listening to him. His colleagues would be wishing he would shut up so that they could all go home.

Mr Bertram: There is probably a good idea in that.

Mr BLAIKIE: The point I want to make is that on the occasion of that late sitting I took the member for Boulder-Dundas home and after a cup of coffee I got to bed at about 6.30 a.m. My daughter started her music practice at 6.40 a.m., so that was the end of my sleep for that day. It was also probably the reason for my being in my usual snappy mood.

I make the point that our sitting times should be revised. This is 1977 and we certainly should have a close look at the matter, especially Thursday sitting times. They could commence earlier than 2.15 p.m. I do not believe we would do any less work, but we would probably finish up with more intelligent debate, and members would receive better consideration from their fellow members.

I am quite certain that any new member who is honest with himself would agree with the sentiments I have expressed. This is my seventh year in this Parliament. I found Parliament rather strange for the first couple of years. However, I am certain that if we revised our sitting times, we could also revise the length of time during which members may speak. I assure members that I will take my full 45 minutes tonight because this is one of the best speeches they will hear. However, quite frankly, I believe a member, when speaking to a Bill, should be able to get his point over in 15 minutes. I believe a time limit of 15 minutes would be beneficial from the parliamentary point of view, and it might also make the job of the Press a little easier when reporting our proceedings for the people.

Mr Taylor: What sitting times would you suggest?

Mr BLAIKIE: I want to convey my appreciation to the Government, and place it on record, for the action taken in regard to probate. Probate duty is one of the most iniquitous taxes imaginable. I do not agree with any tax; I think all taxes are bad; however we have to have them.

Mr Bryce: Do you believe that taxation is theft? Do you have a sticker on your car?

Mr BLAIKIE: I express my personal thanks to the Government for the action it has taken with regard to probate, and for what it has indicated it will do in the future.

I want to place on record also that it was not only the Liberal Party members of Parliament who made very strong representation, but also the members of the National Country Party. I think we achieved a point in unison. I want to ensure that the record is straight on that matter.

I congratulate the member for Albany—and I ask him to convey my congratulations to the people living in Albany—for the contribution that town has made towards placing Western Australia on the tourist map. Albany has conducted a significant promotion and advertising campaign for the sesquicentenary year of the settlement of the town. The promotion has been unique, not only for Western Australia, but for the whole of Australia.

While I am a parochial person at the best of times, I consider the example set by the Town of Albany could be used as a copybook by other towns, and similar projects should be carried out. Albany certainly has achieved something by its advertising and this is acknowledged right across Australia, and throughout the world. I again ask the member for Albany to offer my sincere congratulations to the people of that town. They have done their job extremely well.

Mr Watt: I will pass on the congratulations of the member for Vasse.

Mr BLAIKIE: While the celebrations in Albany have been a great advertisement for tourism, I want to say that the Vasse electorate is endowed with special tourist qualities.

Coming back to matters of electorate interest, the Government has undertaken to carry out a hydrographic survey of the area in the vicinity of Cape Naturaliste in order to locate a site for a boat harbour. The purpose of the harbour is to enable the exploration of the fishery potential in the area, which is as yet untouched.

No doubt, not many people are aware that we have two fish processing plants within the Busselton district. An additional fish processing plant is under way at Augusta. The development of the fishing industry, and other associated industries, has shown a dramatic growth during the last five or six years. This applies especially as far as crustaceans—if one can refer to marron farming in that group—are concerned, and the industry is showing tremendous promise.

Mr Clarko: Will you promise to bring in half a dozen marron for each of your friends?

Mr BLAIKIE: One usually looks after one's friends, and when it is time for such a favour to be returned I will remind the honourable member.

Most of the fishing activity at the present time is for pilchard or mulies and about 600 or 700 tonnes is the current catch per year. The whole of the catch is sent to the eastern seaboard where the fish are used as bait by anglers.

At present the whole of the catch has to be manhandled. When a boat returns with a catch of two tonnes of mulies, the whole of the catch has to be manhandled into dinghies, and manhandled at the shore. That is a cave-man style of operation. I again thank the Government for indicating that it will carry out a hydrographic survey, but I make the point that once the survey is completed and a site located, the construction of the boat harbour must proceed.

The extension of the fishery zone to 200 miles from the coast will prove to be of tremendous importance and the fishery will return considerable wealth to this State.

Another real need is the provision of launching ramps for pleasure boats. There are four or five ramps within the area for use by pleasure craft, but they all face unprotected waters and when an adverse wind is blowing the boats cannot get out. The establishment of a boat harbour is vital to the fishing industry, and it would also be most strategic to the tourist industry. It would lead to bigger and better returns from that industry.

Tourism is such a tremendously important industry in the area that these facilities are urgently needed. However, as far as the fishing industry is concerned, the matters I have mentioned are most essential.

One of my constituents was most enthusiastic when I was speaking to him the other day about Australia's success in the America's Cup trials. He was very pleased about the \$50 000 advance which the State has made in order to assist in the promotion of the America's Cup. This constituent suggested I remind the Premier that Geographe Bay is a far more suitable sailing area than the jagged reefs of Yanchep or the murky waters of Rottnest. Geographe Bay would provide a venue which would be the most suitable in the whole of Western Australia for the staging of an Admiral Cup World Challenge.

One of the aspects I appreciate about the Address-in-Reply debate is that it allows members to record their thanks to the Government as well as their dissatisfaction with works that have not been carried out. The latter

may not be such a pleasant aspect of the debate. I would like to record my thanks to the Government for the hospital at Busselton. I can recall as a new member of parliament in 1971 the hospital at Busselton was the most pressing and vital need in my electorate. There was a great deal of procrastination by the Government of the day. However, today that hospital is almost a reality. I would expect it to be completed very soon at a total cost of approximately \$4 million. This hospital has been a tremendous boost to the community and has greatly increased the confidence of the people in the area. Two years ago when we were discussing the problems associated with the hospital, by sheer coincidence I believe we had something like 2½ doctors; that is two doctors working full time and one working a day or two a week.

Sir Charles Court: I am glad you explained about the half.

Mr BLAIKIE: The part-time doctor also grows grapes of a standard fit for the appreciation of Her Majesty the Queen. Dr Pannell is one of the outstanding wine makers in Australia. He is also an excellent medico. He comes from my electorate.

Today there are some seven or eight doctors resident and operating within the district itself. This increase has been generated by the new hospital and the facilities which will be available there. I congratulate the Government on this. I am sorry that the Minister for Works has just left the Chamber as recently the Minister was investigating the question of renovations to the hospital at Margaret River. By the time the Minister and party arrived to inspect the hospital the renovations had already begun and as a result we call him "the instant Minister for Works", to his credit.

The hospital at Margaret River is in a very sad state of repair. It is in urgent need of total major renovations and will be a big job. The district is entering into an era of new prosperity. Certainly when I came into Parliament this was not apparent; however it is today. The new prosperity is contributed to by the district's vineyards which are making their mark around Australia. The bulk of the State's pine planting programme situated in the Margaret River area will bring more employment and labour into this area. The recent milk quotas for dairy producers has given a further dimension to the area and has increased the confidence and security of the people who live there.

This illustrates the real need for the Government to recognise that the facilities that

are there need to be upgraded as well because there will be a vibrant community which will extend and grow in the future. For these reasons, I believe funds must be allocated to this area.

I would also like to mention the community recreation grants that the Government has made available to local government to the extent of \$1 million. I extend my appreciation to the Government for what it has done in this regard. One of the recipients is the town of Margaret River where some \$70 000 was made available for a community recreation complex. What is required now is for the shire to meet its commitment and I understand it is on a \$2 for \$1 basis. We have a complex worth about \$200 000-plus which is vital and necessary to the community and the area will reap the benefit from its construction.

I would also like to comment on a similar complex which has been built at Augusta. While I have been a critic of the Australian Assistance Plan, the funding for the complex at Augusta came from that source. With assistance from the local government a total sum of \$95 000 was made available. The community has now achieved, through a self-help self-work programme, a complex that I believe would probably be valued in excess of \$300 000 and has been a tremendous community project. Augusta is a retirement town and the age of the people concerned is very high and the manpower is extremely limited; if one could get manpower it would probably be at an average age of 65 to 70 years. These people have got together with the aid of local builders and they have built this project which I believe would be the envy of any community in Western Australia. More particularly, with the limited resources available they have gone out on a self-help voluntary basis and achieved this themselves.

One of the people to whom I wish to pay particular tribute is the chairman of the Australian Assistance Plan within the area and the local councillor for the area, Councillor Eric Stephenson, who carried out most of the co-ordination work. It certainly has been a tremendous community project.

Similarly at Boyanup a local committee is presently working on a most important project; in fact, it would probably be the most important project within my electorate. This project is still in the investigatory stages and the local committee is negotiating with the shire to see whether the necessary loan repayments can be met if it is decided to go ahead with the project. I believe it is important because of its proximity to Bunbury. One does become involved, when

representing country areas, in situations where we finish up with decentralised centralisation.

If one were to look at the area of Bunbury—with all due respect to the member for Bunbury—one would see the periphery, say 15 to 18 miles around the town, as being virtually devoid of any sort of real community sporting activity. I believe it is important for those areas, whether it be Capel, Boyanup, Brunswick, Waterloo or Australind, that they maintain their own identities. It is equally vital that they have the ability to proceed with these facilities otherwise one finishes up with decentralised centralisation. We have all these small communities sucked into the orifice of the main community which has all the funding and the ability to provide facilities which are certainly very costly. However, by doing this, the surrounding communities and towns actually lose out and virtually become towns that one drives through at 50 miles an hour.

I believe that the Boyanup project for a community recreation facility, although in close proximity to Bunbury, is most important for that very reason.

I am very pleased to see the Government allocating a further \$500 000 to the upgrading of the Bussell Highway. It was also indicated that the final amount would be available for the completion of the Yallingup-Dunsborough Highway. As pleased as I may be about that, I am most concerned at the deterioration of the Brockman Highway. Members may not be aware that the Brockman Highway runs between Nannup and Karridale. Some \$12 000 has been allocated by the Main Roads Department for an upgrading programme on that highway. My inquiries revealed that the \$12 000-worth of upgrading happens to be a respray with bitumen or whatever substance is used.

It is another paint job. Inquiries indicate that the road will be kept going for "another five years". For some four or five years promotion has been under way on the Leeuwin Way tourist project which promotes travel via the Eyre Highway. As a result, a tremendous number of Eastern States visitors have been travelling to Albany and the Leeuwin Way. No matter which way they come into this part of Western Australia, at least on one occasion they will travel over the Brockman Highway. At best I could describe the Brockman Highway as little better than a poor goat track. It is a very poor goat track indeed in this day and age, particularly for the type of vehicle that all of a sudden we have been subjected to with the final construction of the Eyre Highway. It has been of tremendous benefit

to Western Australia, but along with the benefits we have been presented with some problems.

The type of conditions that are now prevailing are an occasional timber truck or vehicle of local origin using the road which has been used for many years, but we are experiencing an increasing number of Eastern States visitors. These visitors are mobile because they are obviously using the roads. Probably 80 per cent of them are towing caravans. The other matter I would like to bring to the attention of the House is that it is quite common to find a convoy of four or five caravans and each would be up to 40 feet in length on this road, while at the same time there is a similar procession of vehicles moving in the opposite direction. As I said earlier the road is a little better than a goat track although it does have a sealed surface. The situation has become quite deplorable and there is a vital need for an urgent allocation of funds to enable work to be carried out on this road. The road should be completely modernised from one end to the other; however, I do not expect that to happen. At least a programme should be initiated to take out the blind corners before a tragedy occurs.

Mr T. H. Jones: What about the two major ones I would like to hear about; the problems of erosion and the blue bottle? What about telling us about them? Tell us what you will do about them.

Mr BLAIKIE: I am pleased with the assistance provided by the member for Collie who, in his most co-operative manner, is attempting to help me. He has found that droves of his electors come to the Vasse electorate, which apparently agrees with them. May I say that thanks to the co-operation and assistance of the Government I believe the problem of erosion is fast being overcome. I point out also that in the period between 1971 and 1974 there was almost a lament because the Government of the day was most uncompromising.

Mr T. H. Jones: Don't tell me it isn't worse.

Mr BLAIKIE: It has improved dramatically. If the member for Collie comes down to Vasse—

Mr T. H. Jones: I am down there often, as you well know.

Mr BLAIKIE:—he would see the latest sausage-type groyne which has been installed there. It is the only one of its kind in the southern hemisphere, and it is working extremely well. I also suggest that if he cares to come down to Busselton and have a swim tomorrow he will find he will not be stung by blue bottles.

Mr T. H. Jones: No, but do it in January and you will find out all about it.

Mr BLAIKIE: Could I suggest to the member for Collie that the only stingers he will get in January come from the Wellington Weir wasp that he brings with him.

Mr Old: He is the Wellington Weir wasp!

Mr BLAIKIE: A matter which has been raised by members on occasions in this debate is that they wonder about the futility of speaking in this place, because they wonder if anyone hears them. I have reason to believe sometimes members are heard. However, in 1973 in the Address-in-Reply debate I raised the matter of rail services and, in particular, the *Australind* service to Bunbury. I read the following extract from a Press release I made after speaking in the House at that time—

Mr Blaikie said the *Australind* train service was inaugurated in 1948 and was the commencement of an important era of public transportation to the South-West.

The *Australind* rail service to Bunbury and the road passenger services to Manjimup, Busselton, Margaret River and other areas was a forward imaginative move.

However, this is now 1973—25 years later and basically the inaugural schedules have remained unaltered.

He said—"The Railway Department must attune itself to the needs and requirements of people who use this service".

I am a little disappointed to state that was in 1973 and in 1977 the situation has not changed; in fact, I believe it is getting worse. Further on in my comments I indicated there should be a revision of the existing transport services.

A revision took place, and a train service was withdrawn and a bus service replaced it. It is my assessment that the bus service has not been successful. I believe the scheduling of the passenger timetable has certainly not been an advantage to the service, because it has not changed in 30 years. It is most important that it be changed, because how on earth can one say that what was required in 1947 is still required in 1977, and will be required forever and a day? So much for the *Australind* service.

Coupled with that problem is the matter of road feeder services which feed into the *Australind* service and provide the main source of public passenger transport for people in the south-west. Since my election to this Parliament in 1971 the number of passengers using the services has been declining. The Government has had to take action. I certainly do not condemn it for this; as a matter of fact on a couple of occasions I have stood up and fought to keep the services open, but

because the number of people using them has declined they have become uneconomical.

Mr T. H. Jones: Couldn't the services be upgraded?

Mr BLAIKIE: Yes, as long as we can get the people to use them.

Mr T. H. Jones: They will use them if there is a better service.

Mr BLAIKIE: I agree, and that is precisely the basis of my argument. I believe the timetabling of the service is not in tune with what is required in 1977, and so people do not use it. The patronage declines, and the Government finds it can subsidise the service no longer. I might add I made very strong representations in respect of one service to the Minister of the day, and I was staggered to learn that only one passenger used the service, and it cost the Government \$78 each time. No member of Parliament, and no Government could support the continuation of that service.

Mr T. H. Jones: Which service is it?

Mr BLAIKIE: It is the service to Nannup. It is out of my electorate, but the lady who uses it came to see me. Perhaps she preferred to get a refusal from me rather than the member for Warren! I point out that the service to Nannup was the lifeline of that person. Before it was removed, it was operating once a week, but now it does not operate at all.

I believe we must look very closely at country services, and certainly country passenger services because many people in the country are dependent on them. Unless we provide these services, people will drift back into the towns and the city and this will mean an additional loss of population in rural areas.

I believe we could make use of existing school bus services. Some members may well say that school children should not have to travel with drunken passengers, but that is neither suggested nor proposed. Even around the city, a drunken passenger cannot travel on a Metropolitan Transport Trust bus, but if one is of sober habits and conducts oneself properly, one can travel on the MTT buses and ride with a busload of school children. I believe this would be one way to solve the present dilemma. Already the idea is being implemented, but could I say that it has occurred with the connivance of bus operators who certainly are not operating the service with the approval of the Education Department. I suggest that this is happening already in many areas of Western Australia, and it is providing a vital service.

In areas where buses are used to transport the school children into towns, it is possible and feasible to utilise those services and this idea could save the Government tens of thousands of dollars. In some districts buses travel from one town to another so that the children may attend either a junior or a senior high school. This would give people living in these areas an incentive to stay there.

When people have lived in a country town for 45 or 50 years, usually they are quite happy to stay there as long as they can have a few of the niceties of life, and one of the niceties of life happens to be the ability to have access to other places, to leave one's home, and to return to it. I feel quite strongly about this matter, and I believe it is quite practical.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

Mr BLAIKIE: I wish to talk about other matters and, in particular, one matter which has caused me concern of late. Possibly I should not direct my remarks to members of the Opposition, but I will say to members of the House generally, and particularly to new members of Parliament, that they ought to study carefully any regulations laid on the Table of the House. This is subordinate legislation, and many times it has proved to be more embracing than the parent legislation.

I have some examples to cite. One matter was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine, and although he did not raise it as a complaint, I was concerned when I realised that I, as his elected representative, had allowed this to occur. This gentleman operates an artificial insemination semen collection service. It is the only service of this type in Western Australia, and indeed, the only one this side of Victoria. Probably veterinary officers can claim that the regulations are absolutely necessary and vital, but when we see what has happened in reality, the regulations become ridiculous.

This person wished to obtain two licences, so it became necessary for him to establish two completely separate services. It was necessary for him to build two laboratories, two crushes, two separate yards, two sets of quarantine pens—and each set of quarantine pens had to be X feet away from the other—two sets of lanes, and two sets of rails. In fact, he had to duplicate everything, and this was necessary because he wanted two licences. I believe that regulation was quite ridiculous.

Another matter in regard to subordinate legislation is causing me concern, and I believe

this one is of a more serious nature. It relates to the milk industry, the dairy industry authority, and the regulations concerning whole-milk quotas. It is all very well for the authority to have its regulations and to lay down conditions, but it is also important that there should be a degree of flexibility. Certainly no flexibility was shown in the case to which I will refer.

My constituents, Colin and Judy Duffy, have two whole-milk licences for two different properties. The Duffy's are proposing to milk approximately 1 500 cows on the two properties, in two dairies. The legislation which set up the Dairy Industry Authority requires that where two quotas are held, two dairies are necessary. It is possible that this is one of the biggest dairies in Australia, and I certainly hope the Duffy's are successful. However, a stumbling block has arisen. These people have asked for consideration to allow them to build a joint milk room, and this is where we find the inflexibility. The Duffy's were told that they could subdivide the farm to have a dairy on one side of the fence and a dairy on the other, but they would have to have two milk rooms, even if these milk rooms were just two inches apart, and even if the cost was \$25 000 each. I believe this is a farcical situation. I know it is necessary to have rules and regulations, but I believe also that there must be some degree of flexibility. Mr Speaker, how much time do I have?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute remaining.

Mr BLAIKIE: The last and final matter I wish to raise is the referendum to be conducted in regard to beef and sheep meat marketing. It was my belief that sheep producers would receive one ballot paper and cattle producers would receive another. However, all the producers have been asked the same question, under separate ballots, and this question is as follows—

Do you favour the establishment by an Act of Parliament of a cattle and sheep marketing corporation?

I was under the impression that the cattle producers would be asked, "Do you want a cattle marketing corporation to be established?" and that the sheep producers would be asked, "Do you want a sheep marketing corporation to be established?"

I do not believe the two questions should have been confused. I fail to see why a sheep producer should have the opportunity to say whether a beef producer should have a beef marketing corporation established in his industry, and vice-versa. I express real concern on this matter

because I believe it will cause some confusion to producers. Mr Speaker, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

MR BATEMAN (Canning) [9.00 p.m.]: Mr Speaker, I have no intention of speaking for a great length of time in the Address-in-Reply debate. I am sure that by now your mastoids must be quite bruised, so I will not indulge in a lot of monotonous repetition. I simply offer you my congratulations for reaching the high office of Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. It is only right and proper for members to congratulate you, because yours is an important job. I realise it is not an easy job and I know that, even with the impartiality Speakers like to apply to the position, it is very difficult to remain totally impartial when you are nominated by a particular political party.

During the time the Labor Party was in Government in Western Australia under the Premiership of John Tonkin, I found out what it is like to sit in the Chair. I know how difficult it can be at times especially when a Government has a majority of only one, as we had. However, I do congratulate you in all sincerity.

This is probably the first and last time I have had the opportunity to congratulate a member of Parliament who deserves every possible commendation. I refer, of course, to the former Premier, the former member for Melville (Mr J. T. Tonkin). I came into this Parliament many years ago. I almost feel like I am one of the sons of the Parliament, rather than one of its fathers! John Tonkin was one of the greatest benefactors this Parliament has seen. I suppose "benefactors" is the wrong word; he did not come up with much finance, but he certainly came up with a lot of advice! John Tonkin gave me some of the best advice that a member of Parliament could ever hope to receive. His wisdom, advice and encouragement some 10 or 12 years ago helped to keep me in Parliament.

One of the things John Tonkin always said was, "My door is always open." In fact, the saying was so well known that it became an affectionate joke among members from our side. However, his door was always open, and not only to members of the Australian Labor Party but also to any member of Parliament to walk in and receive the benefit of his wisdom and experience. John Tonkin respected the institution of Parliament, and everything Parliament stood for. He served Parliament for over 40 years, at times under very trying circumstances.

I will never forget the three years I served with John Tonkin in Government with a majority of

one. Never did a man have so much pressure put on him as did Premier Tonkin. In fact, the pressure was so great that I believe it hastened the death of Speaker Toms. We sat day and night, with an Opposition which was right on our heels. It was not like today, with fairly reasonable sitting hours; we sat through the night on many occasions. I do not complain about the tactics of the then Opposition; that is what the game is all about. In fact, the pressure of the day almost put the second Speaker (Danny Norton) in the box as well.

Mr Skidmore: How are you feeling, Mr Speaker?

Mr BATEMAN: I can assure members that the Speakership today is a breeze compared to what it was; the present Premier and all his offsidiers really gave us curry. Those members who were in this House during the period of the Labor Government will appreciate what I am talking about. It was pressure from the time the House sat until it adjourned. Once I sat in the Chair, on and off, for 18 hours in one day. It is not a very nice feeling to be subjected to that sort of pressure when one is in the Chair. However, John Tonkin came through with flying colours. He did not flinch at any stage of the game. He always had a smile for everyone. It did not seem to ruffle his feathers a bit, although I can assure the House that it ruffled the feathers of many other members. This is the first and only time I have paid such high tribute to a person I consider to be a real friend, both in politics and in private life.

I recall saying some eight or nine years ago that I never agreed with the Address-in-Reply debate. I do not knock the Address-in-Reply motion itself; I think that is fair enough. However, we have spent almost four weeks in this House debating the motion, and for what? All we have heard is the hymn of hate sung by members. Some, of course, have raised problems relating to their electorates; I do not object to that. However, we have wasted all this time achieving nothing, and at the end of the session we will be racing like billy-o to get the Parliament up and away by November or December. We will be working until all hours of the night, yet in the first four weeks of this Parliament we have made no legislative progress at all.

I remember when I last made similar remarks, the Premier of the day (Sir David Brand) interjected and rubbished me, saying that my remarks would not make me very popular. That may have been so, and it may be so on this occasion. But surely Parliament is an institution established to create the laws of the land. I am

sure the time will come when the Address-in-Reply debate will be taken up only by speeches from the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, new members and perhaps one or two other members from either side. It seems futile to go on day after day, night after night, moving amendment after amendment. However, I agree that some of the amendments have been very sound, and should have been moved.

I do not know how we are going to get around the problem. It seems quite wrong to waste four weeks prior to the presentation of the Budget when the time could have been more profitably spent in considering Government legislation. The passage through both Houses of some of this legislation is quite important, and we should not be wasting our time in this manner, only to get stuck into it right at the end of the session, sitting here until we see the sun rise, getting niggly, and moaning about the whole situation. We must adopt a logical and common-sense attitude to the Address-in-Reply debate. In effect, it has become a grievance debate, and we already have the opportunity for members to express their grievances in the grievance debate on private members' day.

I am led to believe I am the last speaker in the Address-in-Reply debate.

Mr T. H. Jones: Move your amendment, then.

Mr BATEMAN: I am just about ready to move it! No, I guarantee members I will not move any amendment.

It has always been my belief that Australia is overgoverned. We cannot afford to have three tiers of government—Federal, State and local. People cannot afford to pay the present taxes and rates which are levied upon them. Somewhere down the line, one of us must give way. I do not honestly believe the State Government is actually governing, when one considers the way local authorities are acting. We all heard the member for Vasse a moment ago refer to legislation by regulation. I concur with his remarks, because there is too much of this going on. Local authorities can introduce regulations applying to their specific areas about which we in this House know nothing.

The Melville City Council, the Canning Town Council, and the Gosnells City Council all have different sets of building regulations. There is no uniformity of building regulations throughout the State. In point of fact, local authorities sometimes bring down rules and regulations to which even the Minister for Local Government takes objection; and he can do little or nothing about

that situation because the local authorities go ahead and bring them down anyway.

Let us consider what Mr Bond did at Two Rocks. He built all the shops and other buildings there without any building permits. But if I had to build a little shed at the back of my property and it was within six feet of the boundary line the Gosnells City Council would tell me to knock it down. Mr Bond was not told to knock down the Two Rocks structures.

Mr Rushton: I am hoping our yacht wins at Newport shortly, and then we will all be happy.

Mr BATEMAN: I shall mention that in a moment. Whilst talking about rules and regulations, I point out that in Western Australia there are only three things for which one does not need a licence or a permit. They are a canary, a cat, and a *de facto* wife. One needs a permit for everything else.

Mr Skidmore: It will not be long before they fix the canaries up!

Mr BATEMAN: That is true. I invite members to tell me of anything else for which one does not need a licence or a permit. We are over-governed and somewhere along the line we have to have a good look at the situation. I am sure that local government has taken over and we in this place are merely puppets who do absolutely nothing, because local government ignores the Parliament.

Mr Rushton: Don't you believe it!

Mr BATEMAN: Local authorities override the Minister left, right and centre; they can do anything they want. They will resume a house or land without any trouble, and the Minister knows that to be a fact. The local authority has done it in the area in which I live; it has resumed land and houses without any reference to the Minister or anybody else. Local authorities enter their own little cells and all they are concerned with is what is happening in their own palaces, because they are all empire builders.

Mr Rushton: Their regulations come here.

Mr BATEMAN: They do not. We are bypassed; there are a lot we do not see.

Mr T. H. Jones: Look out, the Act will be amended.

Mr BATEMAN: I hope it is. All nonsense aside, I am absolutely certain that this State cannot afford the luxury of local government, State Government, and Federal Government. When looking at local government I should like to get into the 3 per cent issue and, irrespective of all the frivolity, really consider the millions of dollars—not hundreds of thousands—which are spent.

Mr Nanovich interjected.

Mr BATEMAN: The member for Whitford used to be a councillor on the Wanneroo Shire Council, and I wonder whether he can tell us how much that shire council allocated for the cigarettes, cigars, and a few beers after the show, in cash terms.

Mr Nanovich: Very, very little.

Mr BATEMAN: The honourable member was a shire president at one time and he should know that in certain city councils it runs into millions of dollars. If members wish that to be proved I shall prove it to them. All this money comes from the ratepayers which is why our rates are so high.

Local authorities were originally roads boards, which is what they should have remained so that they could build and develop roads. What do they develop today? They develop absolutely nothing.

Mr Nanovich: Do you say that ought to be the only responsibility that should be placed on local authorities?

Mr BATEMAN: As far as I am concerned, it is. We should do away with local government or do away with the State Government if local government is to have all these responsibilities. There are town planning departments in local government, in the State Government, and in the Federal Government. It is costing millions of dollars of ratepayers' money to maintain three separate departments; they all fight like hell with one another, and none of them agrees.

Mr Nanovich: The town planning departments within local authorities are saving millions of dollars.

Mr BATEMAN: That is absolute nonsense. As I said earlier, there is no uniformity anywhere with regard to building by-laws.

Mr Rushton: Yes, there is.

Mr BATEMAN: No fear, there is not!

Mr Rushton: It is still the same book.

Mr BATEMAN: They are not the same rules; they are completely different.

Mr Rushton: Throughout the State they are the same.

Mr BATEMAN: They differ from shire to shire and we have to do something about this situation. Another matter which annoys me tremendously concerns part of my electorate which used to be in the electorate you, Mr Speaker, represented. At Forrestfield the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott has allowed a building company to rape the countryside by clearing all trees, scrub, and shrubs thereby leaving absolutely nothing standing.

Mr Rushton: In Forrestfield?

Mr BATEMAN: The shire has allowed the company to create a dust bowl. It has allowed the building of houses within 20 feet of a hot-rod track. How would any member like to have a house within 20 feet of a hot-rod track?

Mr Rushton: In the Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott?

Mr BATEMAN: I am sorry; I meant to say Kalamunda Shire. In the summer months when the gully winds are blowing the dust, sand, and dirt is two feet high in the houses. The shire gave no thought at all to the matter. I am not criticising the Town Planning Department because Gosnells City Council and Canning Town Council have done the same. They have done it because they want as much in rates as they can get to build their empires, to enable their administrative staff to drive around in flash cars, and to have better chambers than this one. We ought to be ashamed of our Chamber. Members should go and look at some of the local government chambers.

Mr Rushton: What has happened to you lately? You used to be a friend of local government.

Mr BATEMAN: I still am.

Sir Charles Court: I am not quite sure whether you want to wipe out the State Parliament or local government.

Mr B. T. Burke: The Stirling City Council is paying \$40 000 a year for a consultant.

Mr BATEMAN: The ratepayers will pay. Members should look at some of the council offices. This is why I say we have to have a good look at where we are going, because local authorities are eroding the powers of this Parliament. The structure of local government is becoming greater all the time, so much so—and I make this remark quite sincerely—that even the position of the Minister for Local Government may become redundant because local authorities will bypass him.

Mr Rushton: We respect their autonomy; we want them to be autonomous.

Mr BATEMAN: If we do we should disband this Parliament and not waste the millions of dollars which we waste here.

Mr Rushton: We have our role.

Mr BATEMAN: We are not serving this particular role. The Federal Government could take over our role along with all the various departments in local government, because as far as I am concerned local government has taken over.

Mr Bryce: What will you do with 87 unemployed State parliamentarians?

Mr BATEMAN: We might send them to Kambalda or to a uranium mine.

Mr B. T. Burke: Send them to Dalkeith. The Premier has 100 000 jobs.

Mr Rushton: Think of those good ovals your shire built.

Mr BATEMAN: I am pleased the Minister mentioned that. I am looking for interjections.

Mr Court: Are they helping?

Mr BATEMAN: The ovals in my electorate are very good indeed and all of the sporting organisations that use them pay a lot of money for their upkeep. All the pavilions have been paid for by the sporting organisations, not by the local authority. An organisation I have a lot to do with spent over \$44 000 building a hall-cum-social room.

Mr H. D. Evans: You were going to have a word about Bond.

Mr BATEMAN: I will get to him shortly. We may say that local authorities spend a lot of money but with all due respect so do the ratepayers and sporting bodies.

Mr Rushton: It is a team effort and that is my last interjection.

Mr BATEMAN: I am sure the Minister will agree with me when I say how pleasing it was to read in *The West Australian* of the 29th August regarding moves by local government to save on petrol consumption. I am sure the Minister for Labour and Industry would be interested too. I do not often refer to newspaper cuttings but this particular article stated, in part—

Local government is advocating a State Government plan to conserve petroleum supplies in Western Australia.

The South Perth City Council will ask the Government to review urban and transport planning with a view to reducing the consumption of petroleum fuels.

If real efforts were made, a great deal of fuel could be saved. If local authorities and the State Government were to ensure that all their vehicles were not used over the weekends and were not driven home by officers every night a great saving would be achieved. I know of one instance where the secretary to a local shire clerk said she needed a vehicle and was given the okay to take one home. No-one can tell me that such actions are right and proper. It is a squandering of ratepayers' money and the fuel we need. Every day we read of the need to conserve fuel.

I ask members to drive around my electorate on any weekend and see the number of cars belonging to local authorities and the State Government parked in driveways and on verges. The Minister and I attended a function on a recent Sunday and we saw a fire truck parked outside. Heaven forbid, a little common sense should be used. No-one would growl if a senior person, or someone on 24-hour call, was provided with a car, but the office boy should not receive the same benefits. A common-sense approach to this matter would save a considerable amount of fuel.

Mr Bryce: If we took the emission control device off the cars we would probably save as much again on fuel.

Mr BATEMAN: Mr Speaker, I have been on my feet for 25 minutes now although I was intending to speak for about 10 minutes only. I suppose I could thank the Minister for Local Government for some assistance in this respect.

Last but not least, I would mention that I have been in this House for something like 10 years and I have never spoken on a subject which I have had a great deal to do with; namely, the native problem. I was with the Public Health Department for many years and during that time I assisted the Commissioner of Public Health on a certain committee. On that committee were people such as Professor McDonald and Professor Ronald Burn. Dr Henzell, who was Commissioner of Public Health at the time, was represented by Dr Snow, the Director of Epidemiology, and I was the secretary of the Allawah-Grove settlement.

We were faced with the problem of controlling all sorts of diseases. It was an unhappy situation and I was involved with this work for five or six years until the settlement folded up. Through our work we changed Allawah Grove from a place of disrepute to a training centre for 80-odd families who came to respect the centre. Unfortunately I sometimes had to go to court in order to evict some of the people who would not play the game, but overall the area did produce some fine leaders in the community. I feel it was a great shame that Allawah Grove was bulldozed in order to extend the Guildford Airport to accommodate jumbo jets.

We had a Salvation Army officer who took care of the place every day and an officer from the Child Welfare Department gave lectures to the mothers. The Lions and Rotary Clubs assisted where they could and Mr Vin Walsh, who was previously the weather man at Channel 7, helped a great deal. It was a wonderful project and at Allawah Grove I met some of the nicest people I

have every known. There was a family there by the name of Brophy and they were fine people.

It saddens me very much that today we do not have similar projects in our community. We have so much land which could be used for this purpose. The Government found \$50 000 to give to Alan Bond, a man who I think rubbished Fremantle, the city I was born in, and I believe he deserves to be castigated for his remarks.

Sir Charles Court: We have not given him anything.

Mr BATEMAN: He is a larrikin. He is seen as an ambassador, and win the cup or not, one should not have people like him spilling dirt on the country like he did. I shall not say any more about him. With the \$50 000 given to him the Government could have bought four or five homes.

Sir Charles Court: We have not given him a cent.

Mr BATEMAN: The Premier is the man who has said the most and done the least. There is plenty of land at Bullsbrook. There are acres of land there which could accommodate four or five Bunnings homes to cater for the poor fellows in the Swan electorate. I went past them the other day and although they are black, they are still human beings. They have little kiddies and it is terrible to see them under their present conditions. A scheme similar to that at Allawah Grove could be commenced to help these poor beggars.

One little old black fellow said to me one day, "Look mister, you are trying to do to us in 100 years what it has taken you to do yourselves in 2 000 years." How right he was. I agree that they have their problems and many of them, and they will have problems for a long time; but we have had ours too. That little old black fellow was very sane and expressed a great deal of common sense in those few words.

I could talk for hours about Allawah Grove because I spent a great deal of time with the folk and had a lot of fun with them. Some strange things were seen there. One night one chap said to me—I was trying to be nasty—"it is okay for you, Mr Bateman". I was kicking him out after he had been in a fight. He went on, "I might be bloody black on the outside, but I'm bloody yellow on the inside." They have a lot of funny sayings and they are dear people. Every bad and wrong thing they do has been copied from the white man. We gave them VD, and everything bad that it is possible to give them. This might sound nasty, but it is true. Our bad white men mixed with their women and so we have the half-caste. We have nothing to be

proud of in regard to what we have done for the Aborigines—nothing whatever.

That is why I say again that it would not have hurt the State Government to give a lousy \$50 000 to these people. It was quite simple to give that amount to Bond, because he is a member of the Liberal Party. He drives a Rolls Royce around with "Liberal" written all over it. I have seen him in it in my area time and time again. I am sure that had something to do with his getting his \$50 000.

That \$50 000 would have been sufficient to enable four or five homes to be erected for these people in an area where they can do their own thing. I am as absolutely certain as I am standing here that they are not ready to be assimilated into the community in the manner in which they have been thrown into it up to date.

I give great credit to the former Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Edgar Lewis), a former member for Moore, for all the good work he did for the Aboriginal people. The only blue he made was when he lifted the restriction on alcohol and gave the Aborigines the right to drink. Many of the Aboriginal people can handle alcohol and will be able to do so always, but many cannot and never will be able to. That is something which will have to come with time, as it has with the white man.

It is for this reason that I appeal sincerely to the Premier on their behalf. I have a great deal of feeling on this matter, because I have had a tremendous amount to do with the Aborigines. I have met them on common ground and have spoken to them for many hours, as has my wife. They are human beings the same as we are, and we should be doing more for them than we are at the moment. In some way we should give them a piece of land of their own with buildings similar to those which were established at Allawah Grove. They must be under supervision of course, which is not the case on the reserves. The reserves are just full of rubbish and all sorts of vile things. They are cesspools for disease and everything else of which we can possibly think.

Mr Speaker, thank you for putting up with me for the last 35 minutes. I would like to talk for a great deal longer, but I know that one of our members will do so on another subject! However, I think my speech will conclude the debate on the Address-in-Reply, and I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

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

PERTH MEDICAL CENTRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 9th August.

MR BATEMAN (Canning) (9.35 p.m.): I would like to indicate we have no objection to the Bill. Even if we had, it would not make any difference because the Bill would be passed just the same.

I am a little concerned about the fact that the Minister for Health has not been here for a fortnight and, as this is his Bill, he should be here now. I know it is not an important Bill, but that is not the point. The Bill concerns him, so he should be here. I believe that this also applies to members who have questions on the notice paper. I do not consider that the answer should be provided if the member who has asked the question is not present. However, that is another subject.

With respect to the renaming of Royal Perth Hospital to The Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre, I consider that the situation will be a little confusing because there is already a hospital with a similar name in Adelaide. I know that several doctors have expressed their disappointment at the renaming of Royal Perth Hospital. If it had to be renamed, I am sure we could have found another name—a Western Australian name. We should have pride in our State. I know that in the main we are Australians, but we are Western Australians also. The Minister's speech reads—

I am pleased to introduce this Bill which will give effect to Her Majesty's gracious approval for the Perth Medical Centre to be named The Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre.

This brings me back to what I was saying about local pride. The Americans have the right idea. At every opportunity they sing their national anthem, even at school fetes, and so on. As a matter of fact each State has its own song. This applies in Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and so on. They all have pride in their States. We should have the same pride in our State and we should have named the centre accordingly. Possibly the Royal Perth Hospital is as good a name as any, and we could have left it as it was. The Minister's speech continues—

The centre is something important and permanent in our community and will remind us and future generations of the devotion Her Majesty has shown. It will also remind us of Her Majesty's visit

I agree that it will; but we could have been

reminded of her visit just as much if a plaque had been unveiled by her in front of the hospital. This has always been the case when various buildings have been opened by the Premier and other Ministers.

The Minister said that the centre is something important and permanent in our community, and so it should be. Perth itself is permanent. It has been here for a long time and it will be here for many more years. We will all be dead and gone as will be our grandchildren, but Perth will still be here. With all its troubles, faults, technical problems, strikes, and everything else, the centre is our pride and joy and its name should have remained as the Royal Perth Hospital.

However, we have no real objection to the Bill and therefore support it.

DR DADOUR (Subiaco) [9.39 p.m.]: I think we had better set the record straight. It is the Perth Medical Centre which is having its name changed, not the Royal Perth Hospital. The Perth Medical Centre—now The Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre—is situated in the Subiaco-Nedlands area, and not in Perth.

Mr Bateman: I know I was wrong. I have a note about it here.

Dr DADOUR: I support the change of the name although I have a few misgivings about the centre itself. Her Majesty would be even more pleased with the centre if it were run properly. A great deal is still to be done and tonight I will prove without doubt that I know what I am speaking about.

I have a copy of the Perth Medical Centre Trust report for the year ended the 31st July, 1969. Part 9 of that report reads—

The Trust, although by the Statute named the "Perth Medical Centre Trust" has not in terms, been given any power or authority with respect to "Medical Centre" as distinct from "Reserve".

The Trust thinks it proper to bring this to the attention of the Minister.

That means nobody is in charge of running the centre. There is no authority which has that power. The Perth Medical Centre Trust does not handle any money whatsoever. It does not allocate funds, nor does it seek any money. So we are left with the problem of having nobody in charge of the Perth Medical Centre which will now become the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre.

I spoke on this subject at length in 1973 when the Perth Medical Centre Act was amended. This is a subject which is dear to me. Just recently, the diagnostic block was completed and opened by

Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II while she was in Perth.

I have never seen a more luxurious building and it must equal a five-star or seven-star hotel, if the ratings go that high. The sheer size of the passageways, the wasted space, and the number of shops have to be seen to be believed and the carpeting, and the lighting fixtures are beyond doubt the most lavish I have ever seen. We have to pay for that structure, maintain it, and staff it. I believe this should never have been allowed to occur. If there had been some authority in charge it would not have occurred.

I have been fighting an uphill battle. When the present member for Victoria Park was the Minister for Health I battled with him. The Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, backed me to the hilt, and I will refer later to the *Hansard* report of the debate which occurred.

The Perth Medical Centre covers an area of approximately 55 acres, and it has five tenants. They are the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital—which includes the hospital complex of the centre—the Institute of Radiology; the University of Western Australia; the State Health Laboratory; and the State X-ray Laboratory. Let us examine the five tenants.

The Medical School of the University of Western Australia is responsible to the University of Western Australia and, in turn, the University of Western Australia is responsible to the Australian Universities Commission. The second tenant is the State Health Laboratory which is responsible to the Director of the State Health Laboratory who is, in turn, responsible to the Commissioner of Public Health who, in turn, is responsible to the Minister.

The third tenant is the State X-ray Laboratory. Half of the staff is responsible to the Commissioner of Public Health, and the other half is responsible to the Director or the administration section of the Medical Department. In turn, both of those departments are responsible to the Minister. The next tenant is the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, which is responsible to the board of the hospital and, in turn, that board is responsible to the Minister. Then we have the Institute of Radiology, which is responsible to its own board and, in turn, that board is responsible to the Cancer Council of Western Australia. So, we have a large number of people responsible to a lot of heads of departments, most of whom are probably responsible to the Minister. However, we still do

not have a governing body and, as a result, there is no control.

I raised this matter with the Premier when it was decided to change the name of the centre, but I have not had a report back to me as yet. I suppose the best place to get that report is in Parliament. I am worried because this problem is getting worse, and it is costing this State a great deal of money which should not be wasted. There is duplication of facilities on the site, and the buildings are far too luxurious. I cannot even contemplate how they got past the drawing board.

The Perth Medical Centre Trust has two committees. The first committee—the Joint Planning Committee—comprises representatives from the Medical Department, the State Health Laboratory, the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, the Institute of Radiology, and the University of Western Australia. This committee is responsible for the planning of the Perth Medical Centre, except for the Medical School, the Institute of Radiotherapy, the laboratory services, and the State X-ray Laboratory. So the planning committee has control only of the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital building and it is not left with very much authority.

The second committee representing the five tenants is not bound by a majority vote. If one of the five members does not agree with the majority vote he has only to thumb his nose and do as he wishes. His department does not have to abide by any decision. One wonders how this situation has occurred, but I think it was accidental. I do not think anyone could be so evil as to purposely allow development over an area of 55 acres without anybody being in charge. I believe the situation just happened, and ever since the weakness was discovered it has been perpetuated. For that reason, the Medical Department has gained control in a roundabout way.

If I have a complaint to make about the Perth Medical Centre, to whom do I complain? There is nobody in authority. So the situation is that the Perth Medical Centre has been allowed to grow with nobody responsible for the staff growth, which will be generated further in the near future with the completion of a 400-bed block. If the staff situation runs true to form, and there are seven staff to each patient, an extra 2 800 people will be employed in addition to those already there.

If the pattern runs true to form, and I see no reason that it should not, up to 10 000 people will be employed in that area of 55 acres, while very little has been done to the surrounding road system. We have a bottleneck at Nicholson Road,

Hay Street, and Axon Street, all caused by the railway. Another restriction occurs at the West Perth subway. People commuting from the northern suburbs have difficulty getting past the railway line. When they do get past the railway line they filter through Subiaco and Shenton Park to the Perth Medical Centre. This has resulted in devaluation of the land, noise, dust, dangers, and everything else.

Quite often it is the second car of a family which is being used by mother who is a part-time nurse; it is probably an old-model car and it sounds like a chaffcutter in the middle of the night. There are five changes of shift for the nurses and shift workers, and between 8.00 and 9.00 a.m. and 4.00 and 5.00 p.m. a tremendous amount of traffic is generated through the area. I have been crying about this ever since I have been in Parliament. Yet we have these beautiful buildings. The Public Works Department should have stepped in and done something about all these problems. Surely it has some control. The Main Roads Department has also shirked its responsibilities by permitting all these problems to occur without any reference to the roads.

On top of that, three years ago the Subiaco City Council and the Nedlands City Council were allocated \$120 000 to widen Aberdare Road on the Perth Medical Centre side to give better access to and egress from the new hospital road. We battled for two years until fortuitously there was a meeting between the Subiaco City Council, the then Minister for Health, and the administrators of the hospitals in the Subiaco area, at which this matter was brought up by chance. The Minister did not know anything about it, but the executive officer knew something about it. As a result, an Act of Parliament was passed providing about a quarter of an acre of land to enable the road to be widened and traffic lights to be installed. It took us two years to have the problem recognised and over two years to have something done about it. Surely somebody must be in control.

I spoke about this matter at great length in 1973 when we were debating an amendment to the Perth Medical Centre Act. I will quote what the present Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, said at page 4409 of *Hansard* for 1973—

As far as I am concerned, if there is a change of Government next year one of the first things I would do would be to get some detached and competent persons to make a close examination of the total complex, including the repatriation hospital. Because the land was so readily available and there

was so much of it, those concerned have been prodigal in its use, so much so that some of the ambitions that were originally held for this complex have been lost sight of and, in fact, will never be achieved unless the matter is taken in hand now.

That was in 1973, and I cannot see that anything has been done since, because nobody has as yet been put in charge or given authority. The Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Board has not the authority. I think authority should be vested in that board because it is the largest tenant in the area and each of the other four complexes in the area has representation on it.

Another problem is that the Perth Medical Centre Trust decided it wanted the centre to come under one local authority. It did not like being partly under the Subiaco City Council and partly under the Nedlands City Council. It would have been easier had the centre come under only one local authority. The trust has no way to make or enforce its own by-laws, so it has to rely on the traffic officers in Subiaco for the part of the land which comes under the Subiaco City Council and on the traffic officers of the Nedlands City Council for the other part of the land. This has led to a great deal of controversy and has inevitably built up animosity between the two councils. We had one referendum two years ago which resulted in each of the councils saying it wanted no part of the other. Certain people have revived the controversy because it suits them to have nobody in control and to have confusion and chaos.

One corridor at the centre is so wide that four double decker buses could be driven through it side by side.

Mr Speaker, have you had a look at the corridor in the Sir Charles Gairdner complex?

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I have had a look at the Bill and it seems to me the honourable member is wandering a fair way away from the subject matter of the Bill. I ask him to confine his remarks more particularly to the question before the Chair.

Dr DADOUR: I beg to differ, Sir, because these matters are referred to in the Premier's second reading speech. The Premier said—

The centre is developing in a fine way in accordance with the plan to achieve a great medical complex and I believe that The Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre will become a centre of world renown.

I am talking about the incompetence in the whole

set-up. I cannot be debarred from speaking about that.

Mr Skidmore: He has not gone outside the 55 acres.

Dr DADOUR: I am still inside the 55 acres. The second reading speech states it will become a wonderful centre.

Mr B. T. Burke: You have not spoken about the size of the Royal Perth Hospital.

Dr DADOUR: The honourable member should speak to his brother about that because it is in his electorate. I am speaking about something that is dear to me.

I support the Bill and I am in favour of the change of name. I am pleased the Premier seeks to change the name of the centre to honour the Queen, but I ask that he do something about the control of the area; I beg him to. I asked him about it several times when we were in Opposition and he said, "We will do something about it when we become the Government." That was four years ago and nothing has been done yet. Action should be taken in all fairness to the people who live near the centre, so that if a complaint is to be made, it can be made to a responsible body. As it is now, complaints fall on deaf ears.

Mr B. T. Burke: Did this matter come to your party room before you read about it in the newspaper?

Mr O'Connor: It is none of your business.

Dr DADOUR: The change of name was an Executive decision and nobody knew about it until the announcement was made because it was meant to be a surprise. I have no argument about that. My only argument is about putting someone in charge of the site. That is all I ask. I think it is very important that somebody be given charge by Statute so that he can be responsible to the people who live nearby. I think it is a fair gripe on my part.

Mr B. T. Burke: I agree.

Dr DADOUR: A problem arose when houses in the surrounding residential area were being bought up. This caused no end of grief to many people. Letters were sent out telling the people they could have first option if they moved. When the Perth Medical Centre or the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Board bought the houses, they were allowed to run down. They were used as store rooms or change rooms and even for multi-tenancy by some people.

Mr B. T. Burke: What did they buy them for?

Dr DADOUR: What does the honourable member think they were bought for? These were bought to house their cronies, etc.

Mr B. T. Burke: I mean at that time.

Dr DADOUR: At that time they had every intention of buying the land between Verdun Street and Aberdare Road—the total block. The intention was to grab the lot for residences and extra land. The 55 acres of land was not enough.

So that was another problem we had to overcome, and the previous Minister for Health—the present member for Victoria Park—put a stop to it, and a very effective stop. He did a good job in that respect.

I do not have any more to say tonight. I have referred to the points I wished to bring forward, and I hope the Premier will fulfil his promise made to me in 1973.

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier) [10.01 p.m.]: I thank members for their contribution. If I may deal firstly with the comments made by the speaker for the Opposition, I think this was a case of mistaken identity, and it has been put right by the member for Subiaco. We are dealing with the Perth Medical Centre, as it was known, and of course it now is the Queen Elizabeth II Medical Centre. It is a major complex and one must realise we are talking not only about Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, but also about a complex of buildings and operations. These operations have been listed by the member for Subiaco, so I do not intend to repeat them.

I remind the speaker for the Opposition that when we are talking about Queen Elizabeth, we are talking about her in the context of Queen of Australia, so local pride is brought into the name. Apart from a few people who wrote to the Press and to me about it, there has been a very wide acceptance of the name, and a general acknowledgment that it was a good idea to name the whole centre in honour of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen, and also to commemorate the silver jubilee. It is known by the Opposition that before we made the announcement about the name we consulted the Leader of the Opposition to tell him of our intentions.

I will now deal with other matters touched on by the member for Subiaco. Of course, some of these items should not have been the subject for discussion in this particular legislation because, with the exception of changing that one word in clause 6 that had crept into the original Act in error, the whole of the Bill was intended, for obvious ethical reasons, to be devoted to the one subject. Therefore, no attempt was made in this legislation to change anything to do with the actual administration of the centre. However, I agree with the honourable member that the

extravagance shown at the centre is reprehensible in the extreme, and some action is being taken about it.

The passages or corridors—I do not know the correct name for them—in the diagnostic centre to which the member referred, are quite incredible. What manner of madness allowed them to be designed in that form is beyond me. If one arrived sick at the door of the diagnostic centre, by the time one reached the correct section and found someone to take down particulars, one would be dead. Apparently the system is not intended for people in that condition! I can assure the honourable member that some action has been taken as a result of what occurred there.

Of course, there is a great deal of other very expensive work involved, but perhaps history will prove this to be economical in the long term. In this context I refer particularly to something the member did not mention, and that is all the underground work to take care of communication throughout the centre. Perhaps the people who designed the system in this very bold, extravagant fashion may prove to have been farsighted as the centre becomes one of the world's great medical centres. At present, of course, it appears to be a little extravagant. I am in no way condoning the design of the part of the building to which the member for Subiaco took exception. The first time I saw it in all its grandeur, I could not believe my eyes.

Mr Skidmore: Is it better than your office, Mr Premier?

Sir CHARLES COURT: Again, in terms of history, the man who designed it and managed to obtain the funds for it may be lauded in 100 years' time for his imagination. As the member for Subiaco well knows, a great deal of concern has been expressed about this design.

The other point raised by the member for Subiaco was the question of greater supervision of the whole area. I believe he will find that action has been taken already to have greater control over the development of the area as a total complex, and if we find that statutory changes are necessary they will be made. It would be our desire to bring forward a Bill of that kind quite independently of the Bill before the House which has a very historic significance. I thank members for their support.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate,

reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to the third reading.

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

BILLS (4): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Railways Classification Board Act Amendment Bill.
Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Works), read a first time.
2. Administration Act Amendment Bill.
3. Criminal Code Amendment Bill.
4. Offenders Probation and Parole Act Amendment Bill.

Bills received from the Council; and, on motions by Sir Charles Court (Premier), read a first time.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION ACT

Disallowance of Regulations: Motion

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [10.12 p.m.]: I move—

That the regulations made under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950-1975, published in the *Government Gazette* on the 24th December, 1976 and laid on the Table of the House in the Legislative Assembly on August 3rd, 1977 be and are hereby disallowed.

Since I have been in this Parliament I have not had the opportunity to move a motion which would give me unlimited time to speak until tonight. Therefore I will not be restricted to that terrible feature of trying to put forward a conclusive argument in support of my motion in a limited three-quarters of an hour. However I trust members will bear with me because the issues which I wish to raise are very important to a number of people. It would be a great pity indeed if I were to gloss over what I have to say in the interests of being quick, and covering the matter in less than three-quarters of an hour would be an injustice to those people.

The regulations I seek to have disallowed are those regulations which look after the Wildlife Conservation Act and allow it to operate. One would feel in that situation wildlife conservation certainly would connote conservation as being one of its major issues and obviously concerning

wildlife. But it is passing strange to be able to relate such a situation to the proposed regulations.

In 1975 in this House we debated at length some amendments to the Vermin Act and we moved to disallow certain regulations. Those regulations are almost identical with the regulations which I am seeking to move to disallow this evening.

When one looks at the question of conservation I feel perhaps one ought at least to remind oneself exactly what the word means. Therefore, for the purpose of the record and to be sure I am not misleading myself and certainly not doing an injustice to those members of the two associations which have the conservation of wildlife at heart, I shall quote the definition that appears in *Websters Dictionary*, which is as follows—

the preservation, act of guarding against loss, decay or injury.

Therefore I believe it is pertinent to say that if one were to look at regulations for conservation one should find that they are just that.

I should like to refer very briefly to some of the speeches that were made on Wednesday, the 29th October, 1975, when we were talking about the disallowance of the regulations under the Vermin Act. The then Minister for Agriculture (Mr Old) was dealing with the issue and he made some quite profound statements about the question of conservation and the need to protect the primary producer. He stated in his discourse, which is recorded in *Hansard* of the 29th October, 1975, on page 3907, volume 4, as follows—

... apart from reaching general accord with the organisations, the regulations, as gazetted, would be of great benefit to the rural industry.

In fact, this is a field that is being widely investigated throughout the world. The amount of damage done by pest birds is quite enormous in various parts of the universe and it was the desire of the Agriculture Protection Board to protect primary producers from such happenings in Western Australia.

I would not quarrel for one moment with the proposition that the then Minister for Agriculture—and I understand he is still the Minister for Agriculture although he has a shadow looking over his shoulder in the form of the Premier—put forward. I find myself in accord with his thoughts. However it would assist the primary producer if the birds which are free to fly throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia at the present time were caged.

I would have thought if one took all the birds and caged them one would be doing the primary producers a good turn, and one would not want to apply any restrictions by way of licence or vetting requirements on the people who caged the birds. These regulations make it almost impossible for people to undertake the hobby of aviculture.

The Minister goes on to say—

I have before me an article . . .

The Minister begins to talk about the proceedings of the Sixth Vertebrate Pest Conference held on the 5th to 7th March, 1974, at Anaheim, California. He then quoted an extract from those proceedings as follows—

Small flocks of monk parakeets . . . were recently sighted and reported in Southern California.

These birds caused a considerable amount of destruction. The Minister then goes on to say—

It has been estimated that crops in California could suffer to the extent of \$2 167 700 in one year, purely as a result of the destructive nature of these birds.

Further on the Minister said—

That gives a fairly good indication of the reasoning behind the regulations introduced by my department.

That was about the major substantial argument the Minister advanced at that time in regard to the question of why those regulations should be invoked. It was a major and substantial part of his speech upon which he hung his hat and said, "Because I believe the monk parakeets in California have escaped into the wilderness of California and have caused so much trouble there we ought to bring in regulations to control every bird in Western Australia." In fact the Minister goes further than that. He has said, "We will even control those birds in every other State of Australia right down to those birds in Tasmania." It appears the Minister expects those birds will fly across the Bass Strait, invade the bastion of the borders at Eucla and fly across the plains as a result of which we in this State will have a plague of whatever type of bird it is which is flying across Australia.

How stupid and ridiculous can one be? That was the reason for our moving at the time that the regulation be disallowed.

Those regulations finally saw the light of day and received the breath of law in their lungs because they were passed by this House and were sacrosanct for a short time. The assurance given by the Minister at that time was that this would be the final look at the regulations to control the

avian fauna in our State, and there would be no need for us again to consider the matter because complete protection from this scourge would be provided to farmers, orchardists, and all other primary producers.

Of course, it is not only avian fauna which is subject to the regulations made under the Wildlife Conservation Act. The Act also deals with the trouble caused by dingoes which attack sheep and create a problem for pastoralists; and it also deals with emus and their destructive capacity to break down fences, destroy crops, and cause havoc. Also there are certain species of birds which cause untold harm to fruit crops if they get amongst them. Later on I want to come back to emus, because around that species of bird there lies a tale of incredible hilarity when one considers the regulations. However, I do not want to spoil that story; I will leave it to that part of my speech.

So the scene has been set for us to look at the matter of these regulations. At that time the regulations were made under the Vermin Act, but now they are made under the Wildlife Conservation Act.

I would like now to move to some of the complaints that have been brought to my notice by constituents of mine. We on this side of the House have the opportunity to raise this matter as members in our own right, unfettered by party policy. We made no decision on this matter in the party room, and it was my wish that I raise the issue in the House because within my electorate I have many, many bird lovers. In particular, I have residing in my electorate officials from two associations that are directly concerned with the matter of aviculture.

I refer firstly to a letter I received from a lady who is an aviculturist and who resides in Great Eastern Highway, Greenmount. She is a member of the W.A. Avicultural and Wildlife Association, and in her letter she says she would like to protest regarding the proposed regulations published in the *Government Gazette* because she feels they are wrong and oppressive and should not be invoked. She went on to refer to public servants being cunning enough to hold the gazettal of the regulations until the last minute. Then she said—

. . . may I ask you to please check into this situation if you can and try to stop these foolish regulations. One rule is that we will have to pay \$1 each species of bird we keep. It costs me about \$8 a week to keep my birds in seed, so add to that the cost of the license and you will see it will no longer be possible for an ordinary lover of birds to be able to afford to keep them. If this is accepted by

parliament then it will be a sorry state of affairs. . .

She goes on to say that she believes it is wrong, and she hopes I can move to disallow the regulations. It has taken me some long months to be able to move for the disallowance of the regulations. They were gazetted on the 24th December, and it appears in some places there is thought that a further gazettal of regulations was made in February. I have checked as best I can all the *Government Gazettes*, and I find no other regulations have been gazetted until the gazettal of regulations referring to the Wildlife Conservation Act on the 12th August, 1977.

It is pertinent that I refer to those dates because I wish to show the way in which bird lovers and aviculturists of this State have been misled by the conservator and also by the Director of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife (Mr Bowen). I say that quite deliberately, because I will prove conclusively that as far as I am aware no regulations were gazetted. However, an easy method to invoke regulations is to write a letter and include in it certain matters that one wants everyone to agree to, and have the Minister waive any responsibility for tabling the documents in the House, and then tell the people concerned they are the regulations that they will have to work under. I will come back to this point later.

I was quite alarmed at that situation, and I made approaches to the Director of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife on the 8th February, 1977. I wrote a long letter to him and explained that the regulations would place a financial burden on many people. I pointed out that perhaps many old age pensioners would want to keep more than nine birds, and if they were forced to obtain a licence a greater financial burden would be imposed upon them. Some of those people could be subject to the special licence fee of \$2, plus \$1 for each species of fauna specified in the licence. So one can see what a great burden could be placed on people who love their hobby of keeping birds.

I have looked at many aviaries since this dispute started, and I can only say that birds in aviaries are far better off than those that fly in the wild. Members need only come to my home in Bassendean where I am cultivating a native garden around the house to see the number of birds that are being attracted there; and they will see there are also any number of rotten cats raiding the birds and killing them. It is proposed to control aviculturists, while feral cats are allowed to roam at will destroying the fauna of this State without any effort being made to ensure their owners obtain a licence in an endeavour to

control them. Cats would destroy more birds around the metropolitan area than are destroyed by any other method. However, I do not raise that as the prime reason that the regulations should be disallowed, because many reasons are involved.

As I said, I wrote to the director on the 8th February, and I must say the promptness of his reply would certainly put some other departments to shame. I received his reply on the 14th February, only six days after I wrote to him; and that is something I appreciated. I would like to come back to this letter, because the director attached an appendix to it which sets out the requirements of all the licences. I will deal with that in depth later. I merely point out that I received a reply from the director, and that he dealt with the matter in depth.

I would like to refer now to a further letter I received from one of my constituents who resides in South Guildford. This is quite a long letter, and it is indeed a great pity that I am not able to hand it in for inclusion in *Hansard*. The sooner we are able to do that, the better it will be, because people will be able to express their opinions in a manner becoming of those who desire to protest about regulations they find oppressive. If I do not refer in some detail to this letter, I will be doing my constituent an injustice. For the sake of time, I will paraphrase the letter where possible, quoting only where it is absolutely necessary.

My constituent expresses dismay at the proposed restrictions to be applied to her hobby. She goes on to state—

I concede that "Wildlife" i.e. Animals and Birds bred and raised in the wild, must be protected, but I also consider that birds which I have bred, in my backyard aviaries, from parent birds, that I have lawfully obtained, (by purchase from other Aviculturists or licensed dealers) and for which I hold a Licence from Fisheries and Wildlife Department, are my property, and as such I should have the right to dispose of them, if I wish, without undue interference from the Department.

That is not a bad sort of comment. She raises the birds from young, and increases the number by breeding, only to find somebody now is to tell her, "You are no longer the owner of the birds because I am going to tell you how you will breed them, and in what numbers you shall breed them. The control over them will be such that you cannot dispose of them without following some very irksome procedures." Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Crane), people simply want to keep birds.

We should bear in mind that the aim of these

regulations is to protect the interests of farmers, orchardists and others who could experience difficulty with our avian fauna. That is the very basis of the Wildlife Conservation Act as it relates to birds. My constituent continues—

In support of this contention, I submit the following points.

1. Birds which are **LAWFULLY HELD AND LICENSED**, in the possession of an Aviculturist, are to be considered the personal property of the Licensee, and may be disposed of to any other Licensed Aviculturist in Western Australia, as may the progeny of these Licensed birds.
2. Permission to export birds from the State must be obtained from Fisheries & Wildlife Department, but this should not be withheld unreasonably, or for an undue length of time.
3. No birds should be seized from an aviary without order of a court or Magistrate, and in the event of a seizure, the birds should be held where the owner is able to observe them, pending an appeal.

I believe that point is well made. The birds are hers; she has paid for them and bred them and she feeds them. She gives them far more of the necessities of life than the birds living in the wild receive, but she then could find herself in the position where a wildlife officer takes away her birds because she is contravening some stupid, ridiculous regulation. Having lost her birds, she then has no recourse to any higher authority. In fact, the powers vested by the Act in wildlife officers exceed the powers of the police. They do not need a search warrant. They can simply walk on to a property, inspect an aviary and make a selection of birds they believe are involved in a contravention of a licence.

It has been reported to me that some people who profess to be wildlife officers have actually gone onto properties and, on inspecting aviaries containing a great number of species of birds have said to the owners, "Can you please identify the birds, because I do not know which ones relate to the licence you hold." They do not know the various species of birds! When one has a look at how many different varieties there are, it is not surprising for the layman to be unsure of himself in this regard, but these people are supposed to be wildlife officers enforcing the regulations. Is there any justice in that?

What sort of standing can a wildlife officer have when he asks the owner of certain birds,

"Tell me the ones you should not have, so that I can take them away and prosecute you"?

A particularly vexatious aspect of the regulations to my constituent is the \$50 import fee on so-called rare and endangered species, plus a nominal fee of say, \$5, to cover the department's costs in issuing a permit. My constituent has this to say—

So-called Rare and Endangered species are expensive and have a limited market in Western Australia. Also many species listed as Rare and Endangered, are not in fact so, or are easily bred in aviaries, or need to be bred in aviaries to ensure their survival.

Here is another paradox in the regulations. People who have owned birds for years and years in this State have proved conclusively that they are able to breed up species of birds which were thought to be almost extinct. They have done so not only in this State but in other countries. However they are now told, "You do not know anything about the matter." Then the wildlife officer comes along and says, "And neither do I; I do not have a clue!"

This is the sort of hobby the Government is trying needlessly to control. These regulations are not needed; they represent an imposition upon people and destroy any faith people may have in Governments. Governments are supposed to act responsibly on behalf of the people, but these regulations certainly do not reflect the Government's sense of responsibility.

My constituent goes on to state that in the South Perth Zoo, from a total of 475 Australian parrots in 1975, the zoo managed to breed only nine young. Members should consider the efforts of private aviculturists, who breed far more than nine young each year, and from supposedly endangered species—and they are not operating with 475 birds. My constituent supplies details in this respect—

In the breeding season 1975, my breeding result was 61 Australian parrots, and in 1976, 72 Australian Parrots, 54 Gouldian Finches. My breeding results included Hooded Parrots and Major Mitchell cockatoos, so-called Rare and Endangered species.

The regulations are designed to protect rare and endangered species. These people are assisting the Government to protect the fauna of Western Australia, and the Government has now told them they will have to pay for that beautiful privilege.

Mr O'Connor: How many breeding parrots does she have?

Mr SKIDMORE: She does not mention the number, but it certainly would not be 475. Yet our zoological gardens, with all its expertise and know-how, could manage to breed only nine young from 475 Australian parrots.

Mr Bertram: What are the names of those parrots?

Mr SKIDMORE: Do not get me into that area, because I do not know. I will be happy to lend the honourable member a list giving the details of some 400 such birds. They have common names such as "White-Tailed cockatoo" and ornithological names which closely identify the species. If the honourable member wishes to interject, he should do so in a manner which assists me, because that interjection was not germane to my argument.

Mr Clarko: There would be nobody left on that side if you started slinging off at your mates.

Mr SKIDMORE: I indicated when I started my speech that I am speaking here tonight as a private member on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of many people in Western Australia who enjoy and love the hobby of looking after and keeping birds; and if everyone on my side were to desert me I would appreciate all those members on the other side staying to listen to what I believe, and will prove, to be an injustice to the people who wish to carry on that hobby.

My constituent continued by referring to the way in which birds may be kept in aviaries and to the size of aviaries. I do not wish to quarrel with that, because I am not capable of evaluating whether the department's requirements with regard to aviary size are good, bad, or indifferent. However, I say in passing that a great many bird keepers would keep their birds in aviaries far in excess of the size laid down in the regulations.

It has been stated that one of the main reasons for these proposed regulations is to stop the smuggling of birds either into or out of Australia, or into and out of this State. My constituent states that she believes the penalties should be much greater than they are, and I agree with that. The penalties which are imposed on those who are caught smuggling are ridiculous. It is well known that such people drug the birds and put them into suitcases. If they can take out of this State 20 highly prized birds and manage to land only one in Singapore or the Malaysian States they will make a handsome profit on the deal, notwithstanding that 19 will be dead in the process.

It is well known that one of the reasons for keeping aviary birds is to protect and preserve them. My constituent mentions that by virtue of

people keeping birds in aviaries and breeding them, a species of bird in America which was almost extinct was saved and its numbers have been brought up to a realistic level.

In conclusion she goes on to say that she hopes I am successful in my efforts. She then mentions she is a member of The Avicultural Society of Western Australia and that she acts in an official capacity in the formulation of the society's monthly magazine.

On the 5th January of this year I received a letter not from a constituent of mine but from the Secretary of the Avicultural and Wildlife Association (Mrs Sheahan). She set out her objections to the proposed regulations and mentioned that the association gave a great deal of cover to them—13 full pages—in a special issue of its magazine. I have read that issue and I shall quote from it later. So it is sufficient for me to leave that letter at this stage.

I replied to Mrs Sheahan and to the secretary of the other association, who is also a constituent of mine and resides in Greenmount. She expressed the same very keen desire that the regulations be disallowed so that she may carry on her hobby as an aviculturist uninhibited by the pettiness of the regulations, which destroy any effort to be conciliatory and certainly make no effort to protect pastoralists. I think it is a bit of a laugh that such puerile arguments could be advanced as reasons for these regulations to be introduced.

I wrote to Mrs Sheahan earlier this year and told her I intended to move that the regulations be disallowed and would deal with the matter when Parliament resumed; and I have done just that. That is only a small amount of evidence of the number of people in my area who have complained to me by letter, but just as many people have complained to me by telephone expressing their disgust at the regulations and suggesting to me that theirs is one of the very few hobbies in this State which is subject to licence fees.

Other people in this category are the lovers of dogs, who have been subjected to increased licence fees recently imposed on them by legislation passed in this House. Is it envisaged that every person who plays lawn bowls should be registered and pay a \$2 fee before he can bowl a ball across a green? It is as valid to put that forward as a means of protecting bowling greens by ensuring that not too many bowlers play on a green, as it is to bring in these regulations to control fauna which are supposedly placing pastoralists at a disadvantage.

I should like to make a comparison of the

original regulations and the proposed regulations to show how patently obvious it is that the proposed regulations are nothing more than an exercise in glorious empire building in an effort to obtain finance from the people concerned, so as to create more jobs in a department which—if it were doing its job of looking after the fauna that is a danger to the pastoralists instead of racing around persecuting aviculturists in such a petty manner—would well merit establishment.

There is a proposed regulation which is headed, "Licence to Breed and Keep Avian Fauna". Three types of licence are required. The first is a basic licence to breed and keep birds or species or classes of birds specified in part A of appendix C. The regulations then refer to an advanced licence and enumerate the birds in appendix C. It then mentions a special licence to breed and keep birds included in parts A and B of appendix C and also such individual birds specified in part C of that appendix.

Without going into any great detail on that issue, I merely wish to say that if that were all a person who wished to engage in the hobby of keeping birds had to do, the situation would not be too bad. But paragraph (4) of proposed new regulation 12 states—

An application for a licence issued under this regulation or for the renewal thereof—

- (a) shall be in writing addressed to the Conservator of Wildlife;
- (b) shall set out the name of the birds or species or class of birds in respect of which the licence is required.

I should like to pause there because my investigations reveal that aviculturists say that although the four species of birds listed in appendix C are supposed to be easily identifiable by local and common usage names, it is almost impossible to designate them in the way in which they appear in appendix C.

Of course we could rely on the wildlife officers who have such a profound knowledge of their duties and of the birds which they have to inspect in aviaries! They will merely ask the aviculturist all about the birds so that they can identify the species! I say that because the aviculturist will have to identify the species of birds, as many of the officers concerned would not know a bird from a sheep.

The regulations go on to state—

Shall state the avian fauna by specie and number held.

It might be stated that if a person has fewer than

nine of the categorised birds under part A of appendix C he does not have to have a licence. I want to come back to that aspect later on, because I want to indicate how ridiculous it is that that should be the cut-off point. I wonder who dreamed up the magical cut-off point of nine birds. I cannot envisage why nine birds would be any less dangerous than 10 birds, and therefore should not be subject to licensing. What is the difference? Is it a sop to the people to soften the blow which the regulations will be to their hobby? Is that the idea? Are the people being offered an olive leaf on the one hand, while on the other hand they are being hit on the head?

I wish to refer to some of the problems associated with birds. Awful troubles are experienced when the male and females are together, because they have a propensity to reproduce. I will deal with that aspect later on.

Under the old regulations the holder of an aviculturist's licence was not able to buy or sell any protected fauna unless the prior approval in writing of the Chief Warden of Fauna had first been obtained. That is most pertinent, because all aviculturists agree with it and they all abide by it. The obtaining of prior approval in writing has not presented any great problems. However, under the new regulations it will not be so easy, and I will prove this when I deal with a breakdown of the requirements.

The regulations went on to refer to the magical figure, not of nine, but of less than 10. The first glimmer of light appears as to why some smart Wizard of Oz in the department decided on the figure of nine. It was because he suddenly had a brainwave that "less than 10" meant nine and therefore if a person has only nine birds a licence is not required. So much for the thoughtful calculations of the wildlife people to protect the species on the one hand, and the farmers on the other.

Under the old regulation every application for a renewal of a licence was made in writing and was accompanied by \$1, and the application had to set out the number of each specie of fauna which was held under the authority of the previous licence, and such other particulars as the chief warden required.

That was a simple process which was required to be followed every 12 months. An aviculturist listed the birds he had and those he wished to keep. A licence was then issued without much hassle. However, the situation is different under the new regulations.

Regulation 12A(7) indicates that the holder of a licence is not permitted to have in his possession

or control any avian fauna, other than the avian fauna permitted under his licence. That is fair enough on the surface. However, if a person has a certain number of birds and a certain specie, and he wishes to increase the number, how does he go about it? Does he breed more birds? If he does not have a licence and he breeds, he is in trouble. He will have to get a licence to do so, if he has more than nine birds.

I will give an example. I have nine birds—five male canaries in one cage and four females in another. I keep my birds separated that way, and so I have frustrated males and females all getting upset and regarding me as a miserable person because I will not allow them to breed. However, I am not permitted to do so. If I put all the birds in one cage I will be in diabolical trouble in about six weeks. Therefore, how do I get over the problem? If I want more than nine birds how do I go about it?

I cannot obtain a licence because I do not have 10 birds. I cannot place my males and females in together and breed more young birds because I will then have more than nine without the requisite licence, and so I am in trouble.

Mr Rushton: You could give them the pill!

Mr SKIDMORE: That could be a good idea. It is not as silly as it sounds, because I understand that certain chemicals are available now to provide birth control for other than *Homo sapiens* who have the field to themselves at present.

As I was saying, how do I overcome the problem? How stupid and ridiculous can regulations be? Why have a cut-off point? Are nine galahs in a cage less dangerous than 90 galahs in a cage? For 90 galahs a licence must be obtained. I will deal with the categories of birds later on, and demonstrate how stupid the situation is.

Regulation 12A(7)(b) indicates that no licensee shall have in his possession or control any fauna in excess of the number specified in or endorsed on his licence. I have just mentioned how stupid that is.

Let us assume that a person has overcome all the difficulties associated with the categories of birds in parts A and B of appendix C, and he has 40 birds for which he has a licence. How is the person going to convey to the different species that they must cut out all their shenanigans in the aviary, because they are not allowed to breed as their owner's licence permits him to have only 40 birds? Of course he could get over the problem probably because the wildlife officer in all likelihood will not know one specie from another.

Paragraph (c) of the same regulation 12A(7)

states that the holder of a licence must not breed any fauna other than the fauna he is permitted to breed under the licence. That is a beauty! I have just indicated how impossible it is to breed under the licence if a person already has the maximum number permitted. So why do we have to tell people they cannot breed any fauna other than the fauna permitted under the licence?

This would be one of the greatest laughs of all time if it were not for the fact that the situation is so serious to those persons who keep birds as a hobby. I am concerned, because of the ridiculousness and pettiness of the regulations and the way they destroy the initiatives of the people involved.

Paragraph (d) states that a person shall not breed or keep any fauna in captivity on any premises other than those specified on his licence. We must bear in mind that aviculturists go to a lot of expense to establish beautiful aviaries into which they place magnificent birds. As I have said before, these are a delight to see.

Does this particular part of the regulation imply that someone in, for instance, the Mundaring electorate will build an aviary somewhere hidden in the forest and proceed to traffic in birds, and breed more than he is entitled to breed?

I might say that the aviculturists in this State are more responsible than that. The only time a problem arose with regard to the release of birds in this State was when a Government decision was made to release birds from the zoo. That is the only time foreign birds—exotic species—were able to get into our forests and the metropolitan area, and they bred to plague proportions. Those birds were mentioned in 1975 when I spoke on the disallowance of regulations similar to those now under discussion.

A further provision in the regulations states that a person shall not sell or dispose of any alien fauna to a person who is not the holder of a licence issued under the regulations. When I read that provision I thought there was some hope, and if I bred more birds than I was entitled to keep I would be able to dispose of them. However, that is not the case because the regulation states that I am not able to sell or dispose of any alien fauna to a person who does not hold a licence.

I can only sell to a person who is able to produce a licence. I pose the question: Am I supposed to police the regulations of the department? Am I supposed to ask a person whether or not he has a licence before I can sell to him? In fairness to the aviculturists, they may be prepared to abide by the regulations, but they are

not prepared to abide by the restriction relating to the disposal of birds. This is one of the problems associated with this question.

What are we to do with the birds over and above the quota? If I were allowed to have 10 parakeets, and they bred and increased in number, what am I supposed to do with those extra birds? A person who breeds them is supposed to kill them, or dispose of the eggs before they are hatched. That is what the regulations stipulate. This is supposed to be a great utopian answer to the problems of the pastoralists and the farmers.

I do not denigrate the pastoralists and the farmers, and I am sympathetic towards them in their fight against the vermin which destroy stock on their farms. However, this is a silly situation which is ludicrous in the extreme. It should not be allowed to occur in any civilised country, and most of all it should not be allowed to occur in this State.

I would now like to refer to a hilarious incident associated with the regulations. One has to laugh; this is one of the greatest jokes I have ever heard. At page 17 of the regulations there is a rule headed, "Licence to take emu eggs".

Before I proceed, I would point out to the Minister that it would be of some benefit if the regulations and the Act were reprinted. I have had to add some 125 amendments to the regulations, and about the same number of amendments to the Act to bring it up to date.

Mr Bertram: It is typical of Government mismanagement, and a typical Government shambles.

Mr Old: Which regulations does the member have?

Mr SKIDMORE: I have the fauna conservation regulations.

Mr Old: Well, they have nothing to do with me.

Mr SKIDMORE: Why is the Minister jumping up and down? If he is arguing with his colleague do not bring me into it; I have enough problems.

I will return to the regulations headed, "Licence to take emu eggs". This will protect the farmers from the emus! We will give the emus "larry-do". Let us look at the sheer stupidity of the regulations.

Mr H. D. Evans: What does the APB have to say about emus?

Mr Blaikie: What does the Egg Board have to say about emu eggs?

Mr SKIDMORE: The regulation states that the Minister can issue a licence to a person of

Aboriginal descent, or to an associational body so that such licensed persons can take emu eggs. So, actually, it is not as bad as it looks. The Aborigines will be able to collect emu eggs and do their carvings; they will be protected.

Mr O'Connor: It sounds like discrimination.

Mr SKIDMORE: Absolutely. The regulation states that the Aborigines are able to collect emu eggs, but I am not able to do so. The point is well taken by the Minister.

I am concerned with the so-called problem with emus. They can be killed in their thousands when they move south alongside the rabbit proof fence on the other side of Merredin where they destroy acres and acres of crops, and cause a nuisance. However, I find it passing strange that we have a regulation aimed at the conservation of farming land, which will stop people from gathering emu eggs unless they have a licence issued by the conservator, or whatever name he happens to have at the time. I think that "conservator" is probably the best title.

I will refer to a magazine put out by the Avicultural and Wildlife Association. It is a special edition published in July of this year, and contains some 20 pages. Again, I say it is a great pity the contents of the magazine cannot be included in *Hansard*. Maybe we will be able to have them included one day—hopefully. I will refer to some of the problems which the association claims will be inherent in the regulations so far as the hobby of its members is concerned. The association suggests that no case has ever been made out to justify the requirement for a licence to be taken out merely because a person desired to keep a species of bird which also existed at large in Western Australia.

I might want to keep nine galahs in a cage, and look after them and feed them. However, if I let them out some person will blast all hell out of them with a shotgun because they will be considered to be a nuisance.

Mr Blaikie: No he cannot; he has to have a licence.

Mr B. T. Burke: If we could shoot all the galahs in this place we would be in Government!

Mr Nanovich: You would not be here.

Mr SKIDMORE: I do not think the present levity would be appreciated by the people I represent. The society goes on to say—

No case has ever been made out that would or could justify the policing of people who keep birds to any greater extent than the rest of the community.

I think that is fair comment. I will paraphrase where possible and the article goes on to say—

No case has ever been made out that would or could justify the Chief Warden of Fauna or his Department to assume that it has the knowledge, experience and ability to determine with any rationality what the requirements of Aviary Birds are.

I have already indicated the paucity of knowledge of the wildlife officers, and this can be proved, and I could let the Minister have details where aviculturists have had to point out to an officer a particular specie of bird that he is there to check on. To continue—

No case has been made out that would or could justify the dividing up on arbitrary or any other lines, the species of Aviary Bird for the purpose of Licensing, and suggest that it serves no useful purposes relative to the Conservation of Wildlife.

Let us be honest about it. We divide birds into categories so we can better preserve them. The only conservation I can see is when we have nine birds—five males and four females. In all seriousness there would be no purpose in categorising birds for the purposes of conservation except to collect \$1 for each specie of bird someone owned. All of a sudden someone said, "We can get some finances from the aviculturists who have not paid their fair share for the keeping of these birds. Let us levy a sectional tax on the hobbyist." This fee allows the wildlife officers to get around in new green uniforms and peak hats; the only thing missing is the gum boots.

Mr Blaikie: Do you realise the problems the farmers have?

Mr SKIDMORE: The member for Vasse has asked whether I have any realisation of the problems the farmers in his area have with galahs.

Mr Blaikie: Do the problems we have worry you?

Mr SKIDMORE: Yes, they do, and I understand the problems. My feelings should be well known to the honourable member. The member for Vasse was either out of the House or asleep when I mentioned earlier the problems caused by many species of birds that damage crops and pastures. My sympathies lie with the farmers. However, I want to bring to everyone's notice the ludicrous position obtaining with the keeping of birds when people can obtain licences and shoot thousands of them in the bush. With reference to regulation 40(a) the association states—

Regulation 40a appears to be beyond the

possibility of explanation when one views it against the embarrassing Emu slaughter that took place less than a year ago. Do we then want the Emu population to build up again so that we can have a repeat performance in a year or two's time.

The idea of the conservationists is the preservation of wildlife, and while they actively pursue that goal the Government destroys emu after emu. Rightly or wrongly the conservationist is prepared to say that is wrong. My opinion is that at times vermin must be destroyed and I have made this point before. But surely I am entitled to put forward the conservationists' views tonight as they genuinely believe the emus should not be slaughtered in the way they are. It is cruel. I have seen such shootings myself as a youngster at Moorine Rock. Army personnel were sent there with machine guns and they fired off round after round, and the sum total of their efforts was 70 dead emus out of a flock of 8 000. There were bullets going everywhere and the emus just shrugged their feathers and ran away laughing; that is, if emus do laugh.

Surely this is not fair. Are we supposed to destroy fauna just because we have come in to this country and upset the ecology? Do we have the God-given right to destroy anything just because we want to run sheep and not emus? This is the point I make: A line should be drawn and a more humane way of handling the problem of these birds should be found.

I turn to page 13 of the magazine. I do not wish to weary the House, and I hope other members have read the publication as it is a good one, although it does have faults in that it tends to become very personal when referring to some wildlife officers. One might reflect on the reason for this. I wonder whether the wildlife officers have treated these people in the right way. The aviculturists say they have not, and therefore they express their dissatisfaction.

The article mentions grammatical, spelling, and other errors to be found in the regulations, but I do not want to go into that aspect too much. However, it is passing strange that the association has to bring to the Government's notice all these mistakes in English and I hope the Government takes note of them.

I will mention one of the salient features of their submission. Action was taken because there was an inherent danger in being able to shoot home the blame to aviculturists for keeping indigenous birds in Western Australia. Certain wildlife officers do not even require regulations to

be gazetted. All that is needed is to write a letter to them and say something is in force.

On page 13 the article states—

KILL! BUT DON'T KEEP!

I have already mentioned that. What does one do with one's extra birds? The article states further—

... Bird-keepers were required to have a License issued by the Government of W.A. to keep birds which were, in fact, being destroyed in the bush by the tens of thousands with the blessing and often active participation of the same Government.

Since, under our constitutions, each State is responsible for its own Fauna, the Fauna Conservation Act is confined to such species of Vertebrate Fauna that was to be found in a state of natural liberty within the borders of the State of W.A. In official jargon, these species are known as "Indigenous" or "Introduced" Fauna. When questions were asked as to what constituted indigenous or introduced Fauna, the advice forthcoming was that the Department relied upon Dr. Serventy's check list, and this state of affairs continued for some years.

Here is a department which supposedly has among its officers experts to determine what are indigenous and introduced fauna but who rely on Dr Serventy's check list to establish criteria. I take nothing away from what Dr Serventy has done in his endeavours in relation to the conservation of fauna and wildlife in this State but I find it strange that the experts in the department cannot work out what are indigenous and introduced fauna. The report continues—

However, the stage has now been reached whereby the Chief Warden of Fauna come Conservator of Wildlife claims to have the sole power to decide for himself just what is and what is not "Introduced" or "Indigenous" fauna. Thus he can claim that any bird or animal in the world comes within this category and therefore comes under the Fauna Conservation Act and the Regulations.

When I read a letter which was sent out by that person to the association members will realise how dictatorial his attitude is towards the people who wish to keep birds.

The article goes on to talk about domestic stock. I will not read it but it is quite enlightening to follow the logical argument put up by the association, which has done a tremendous amount of responsible work—far in excess of that done by

the departmental officers—so that its members can have a hobby.

Mr Old: You really love the departmental officers, don't you?

Mr SKIDMORE: In this particular instance I have very little love for the officers concerned, as I have made very clear in the last 18 months since I was invited to intervene on behalf of the people who want to indulge in this hobby. The specious argument that has been put forward is that they are endangering indigenous species. I will continue to criticise the departmental officers—not as persons.

Mr Old: Not much!

Mr SKIDMORE: I criticise their efforts in regard to aviculturists.

Mr Old: You were belittling them a while ago because they have uniforms.

Mr SKIDMORE: Yes, because the people paying for the uniforms are the hobbyists. They are footing the bill.

I come to the subject of the so-called exotics, and I will refer to appendix C, to which I have referred previously. There is criticism of the Conservator of Wildlife in these terms—

Yet he goes on to list (in the body of the Regulations) the birds of foreign origin "That may be kept without a license". Now if this does not imply that all other birds of foreign origin do require a License (in spite of the fact that they are not Fauna within the meaning of the Act), then what is the purpose of including this section in the Regulations?

That was remiss. Someone had made a "boo-boo", which was discovered when these people tried to analyse the regulations. It was very quickly plugged by the Conservator of Wildlife; he plugged up that loophole in very quick time. To continue—

Of course it is a well-known fact that over the past 20 years the Chief Warden has shown a marked antipathy towards people who dared to keep birds of foreign origin like those included in the list published. He likes to call them "Exotics"—perhaps he thinks that it sounds more sinister and mysterious. But to apply these adjectives to the common Canary and Pigeon does seem to be somewhat confusing to many people.

It seems to me to be strange to call a canary an exotic bird. When we look at appendix C we see exactly what is going on.

Mr Clarko: Do you know what the word "exotic" means?

Mr SKIDMORE: Of course I do, but can the honourable member tell me the canary is an exotic bird in Australia today?

Part A of appendix C lists certain birds which can be kept without a licence. They are budgerigars, zebra finches, galahs, red-capped parrots, Port Lincoln parrots, Western rosellas, and Western silvereyes. They are all Western Australian birds which breed in the bush and have done so for years. Yet aviculturists are required to have a licence to keep them in a cage. I cannot understand it.

The only time to my knowledge that birds escaped and became established in the metropolitan area was at the behest of the Government, when Indian turtle doves were released from the zoo. They are now probably among the most conspicuous birds in the metropolitan area and among the most prolific breeders. I do not believe they have caused great concern to pastoralists. I do not think they are racing madly around knocking over crops, killing sheep, or fouling water tanks. I do not think they are doing as much damage as the monk parakeet does in California. The Minister used as an analogy what had happened in America but we have no monk parakeets here because there are already stringent Federal and State controls in regard to their importation, as the Minister and the aviculturists well know.

I come now to the disaster area the drafters of the regulations found themselves in when they could not determine what were indigenous and introduced fauna.

Mr Clarko: Use the word "exotic" in its right context.

Mr SKIDMORE: The honourable member is so clever. I know my ability to understand the Queen's English is limited. I do not have his university education and I apologise for it, but I would prefer he kept his views to himself. It is easy to misunderstand people who are trying to make a point.

Part C of appendix C deals with Australian birds and says—

... all other species of Avian Fauna indigenous to W.A.

The association's comment on that is—

But we would submit that if he considers that the above species are indigenous to W.A., the Part "C" can contain anything he considers to be appropriate.

That is the section enabling the Conservator of Wildlife to say certain types of birds may not be

kept in aviaries and may not be imported or exported.

There are around 4 000 species of birds in the world but only roughly 100 species which may be kept are set out in the schedule. So that leaves a wide field for the Conservator of Wildlife to look after. The phrase "indigenous to Western Australia, and" restricted the number of species, so the Conservator of Wildlife decided he would overcome that difficulty. Therefore, in the *Government Gazette* of the 12th August, 1977, there appeared an amendment to the regulations to delete the words "indigenous to Western Australia, and". The conservator went further afield to include every bird in the world. So he wishes to say that every bird in the world is a pest and should not be permitted into the country.

Perhaps it might be said that I should not quarrel with such an opinion, and I would not do so if that were the real reason for the removal of the phrase. However, I am suspicious enough—and so are the aviculturists—to believe that this regulation will control the type of bird the aviculturists wish to keep in their aviaries, species of birds which are kept in other States successfully and without any danger to the outside world or to pastoralists. This is a very restrictive regulation, and it could be likened to the discrimination against the German shepherd dog. The member for Karrinyup will appreciate that the same principle is involved here, and we find that the same specious argument is used. The member for Karrinyup fought valiantly against the argument that the German shepherd dog would breed with dingoes and cause havoc to the sheep flocks.

Mr Clarko: Perhaps you should sterilise the birds!

Mr SKIDMORE: We are told here that certain species of birds will endanger the fauna of Western Australia if they are released and allowed to multiply. When we consider the number of birds that have been released on occasions, it makes us wonder just how many birds of a particular species would have to be released to cause problems. I do not think the release of a few budgerigars or finches would do much damage.

Thousands of these birds have escaped from cages in Western Australia. Thousands of these birds are kept singly in cages, and as frequently they are permitted to fly around the house they can escape easily out of an open window. If one wished to do so one could go north and trap millions of budgerigars.

Mr Blaikie: Millions?

Mr SKIDMORE: Yes millions.

Mr Blaikie: Maybe some control is needed after all.

Mr SKIDMORE: Apparently the budgerigars do not worry anyone in the north. Perhaps the honourable member can tell me of damage which the budgerigar has caused. In the case of geese, I would have to agree that these birds can attack rice crops, but we cannot say the budgerigar is a predator. Looking at some of the other species listed, the regulations become ludicrous in the extreme.

How can we have regulation by letter? It is simple; all one must do is to become a dictator and then send out a letter in terms such as that forwarded to the Secretary of the Aviculture and Wildlife Association on the 18th February, 1977. This letter was sent by the Conservator of Wildlife, and I will paraphrase the unimportant parts of it, although perhaps the whole letter is important. In the letter the conservator mentions that a review was undertaken and that the department contacted all the associations but that the particular association to which he was writing had put forward no recommendations. Subsequently far-reaching amendments were made, including amendments to regulations under the Vermin Act. The letter then states—

After discussion and consideration of the views and arguments put before the Department, the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife has given *pro tem* approval to amend parts of the regulations to read as follows:

Without the gazettal of the regulations, and without laying the regulations on the Table of the House, the conservator says that the Minister has given *pro tem* approval to amend the regulations. The second schedule is set out, and this includes provision for fees for licences to import birds. Then a real gem appears on page 29. It states—

All species which the Conservator of Wildlife considers to be not indigenous to Western Australia—

Then the fees are set out. It will cost 50c to import a canary. Finches will cost \$1 each to import, and all other protected birds will attract a fee of up to \$5.

This provision is ludicrous because we have so many thousands of finches in our own State. For the life of me I cannot see why anyone would want to import a finch, and pay \$1 for the doubtful privilege of so doing.

The amendment then sets out other species, and goes on to appendix C. One would imagine that

had there been any change to vital parts of the regulations, the regulations would lie on the Table of the House. I have heard the Premier say that regulations are not sacrosanct and that they should be available for public scrutiny. We believe we should have a chance to look at them and to deliberate upon whether or not we should move for disallowing. However, it becomes very difficult to move to disallow a regulation which one does not know about. I would not have known of this supposed regulation, had I not received a copy of the letter.

Under appendix C we find listed all the birds one would assume to have been gazetted in the regulations which I am moving tonight to have disallowed. However, we find that the Conservator of Wildlife has taken it upon himself to include the following in part A—

The cockatiel or weero, the king quail, the diamond dove, the star finch, the long-tailed finch, and the chestnut-breasted finch.

These species of birds were added by letter, and this was a *pro tem* arrangement. In the list of Australian birds the amendments added the turquoise parrot, the pale red-headed rosella, and 13 more species of birds.

Had it not been for this letter, I could have moved to disallow the list of birds as set out in the regulation of the 24th December, 1976 but I could then have found the Conservator of Wildlife had issued a new regulation naming some more birds. I would not have been able to move to disallow such an amendment because it would not have been laid on the Table of the House. I am concerned about paragraph 4 which states—

From the date of this letter, therefore, the amendments set out in paragraph 3—

That is the paragraph to which I have just referred. To continue—

—will be operative. The Minister has approved the waiver of the differences between the fees computed under the regulations and the *pro tem* arrangements. He has also accepted my recommendation that these *pro tem* arrangement be allowed to operate for at least a month to give your Association and the Fauna Dealers time to consider them and submit any data or comments you wish.

Who is kidding whom? He says now regulations may be made by writing a letter of which the Minister approves, and then he says a month is allowed in which a person can submit any comment in respect of disallowing the regulations if he so desires. Who is running this country? We hear the Premier saying it is being run by the

unions. I dispute that. However, it looks as though someone is trying to ensure that the Conservator of Wildlife can run things merely by writing a letter and saying it has the force of a regulation. I am deeply concerned at this departure from the usual tenets of our parliamentary system which enables the conservator to overcome a matter that is under scrutiny in this place.

I would like to deal with the regulations tabled in this House on the 16th August, and these refer to the appendix C which I mentioned before. These regulations were published in the *Government Gazette* on the 12th August, 1977. Of course, now it will be necessary for me to move at a later stage to disallow these further regulations on the same grounds that I am moving to disallow the other regulations tonight. The Minister is trying to tidy up his mistake, but he is doing it in a way that makes it more difficult for people to import or export certain birds.

Mr Bertram: Was the regulation vetted by the Premier's regulation committee?

Mr SKIDMORE: I doubt it very much, because the regulations are made by letter and are not tabled in this House. Therefore, they would not come under the scrutiny of that committee.

I would like to refer in brief to some of the comments which have appeared in magazines published by the Avicultural Society of Western Australia. Members who have received these documents would know that two of the officers concerned live in my electorate. One of them has contacted me by letter. At a meeting held by the association in March, 1977, Mr Shugg apparently pointed out that the holders of birds under an existing licence will not be immediately inconvenienced, and that the regulations will be policed and permits will be required before transactions may be made.

An article in one of the magazines states that the exact details of those permits, etc., are not known at this stage, but will be opposed as they become available. It says in the meantime it is felt there is no call for panic. So in March it would appear that Mr Shugg had put aside the fears of the society and was able to satisfy it that all was well.

However, in July of this year in the notes of the same society there appeared some doubts, to the extent that it was said much of the need for the prohibitive regulations was brought about by irresponsible activities of so-called aviculturists and nest robbers in the past, and that it was up to aviculturists to act responsibly in the future so

that they could pursue their hobby and protect our unique wildlife at the same time.

So, the members of the Avicultural Society of Western Australia did have some hope in July that their fears were not founded. They were addressed by two officers of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife and in their article they stated they were reasonably satisfied. But then, just a short month later, there appeared to be a realisation that somebody might have been misled, that possibly the situation was not what they were led to believe it was, because the following notes appear in their magazine—

Breeding Season is with us again but the other facets of our operations must still go on as usual. The Committee is still busy on the new bird-keeping regulations, and hopes that everyone concerned is going to throw their weight behind the Committee, when the need arises.

Don't adopt the old attitude that "it won't happen to me". The new regulations as planned will impose irksome restrictions on all of us. If we breed a number of birds and have to apply for permission to sell them individually, and the person who wants to buy them also has to apply for a permit to purchase them, there should be a dramatic drop in the unemployment figure, as Fisheries & Wildlife will need a staff of 100 just to process this section of operations.

That is true. The number of transactions involved in that is stupendous, and each and every one of them will have to be policed.

Mr H. D. Evans: Put up the fee.

Mr SKIDMORE: That is right; make the hobbyist foot the bill. The notes go on to say—

Not to mention the number of Wildlife inspectors to inspect our Aviaries to see if they are suitable!

It is felt that if we have our birds Licensed, and register the young as soon as they fledge, we should be allowed to sell or otherwise dispose of these **LAWFULLY HELD** birds, to any other W.A. aviculturist, who holds a **PERMIT** to obtain them, without further recourse to the Department.

They say exactly what other constituents of mine have said. Why should those people who only breed the birds have to be faced with the position of having to pay in order to sell their progeny and their excess stock? What in the name of hell will that do for the conservation of wildlife in Western Australia?

Mr B. T. Burke: Another taxing measure.

Mr SKIDMORE: It is worse. To continue with the notes—

The \$50 import fee on so-called RARE & ENDANGERED SPECIES, is completely unwarranted, as even if these species were available to us, the prices would be so high as to preclude most of us from obtaining them.

I have been advised that if one wishes to import a macaw—and please do not ask me to be more specific than that—

Mr H. D. Evans: I do not think you can; I think they are prohibited.

Mr SKIDMORE: —the going price is \$700 a bird. Let us assume, as the member for Warren says, they are prohibited; and probably for good cause. That would not stop the conservator; under this regulation he could smartly issue a permit, because he has a God-given right to do that. The notes go on to state—

On the other hand some of these species' only hope of survival lies in their being bred in suitable aviaries. One gets the impression that the Department considers most Aviculturists to be either Criminals or near-criminals, that spend all their time in the bush, climbing trees and taking birds, which I think most of us would find far from convenient way to obtain our birds.

Regulations have been invoked supposedly to prevent the robbing of nests. Mr Speaker, can you imagine these people racing into the bush, climbing up trees, and robbing nests? Of course not! They would not do that. I do not deny there is trafficking in birds. It seems to me an effort should be made to overcome that problem and that the hobbyist should be left alone.

I understand a committee has been set up by the Government to investigate this particular question, and I hope I will receive the wisdom of its decisions on some future occasion. I am led to believe that the committee felt some of the associations were satisfied, and the committee would come back and report that to the House. I find it passing strange that the committee wishes to adopt that attitude when in a very short period between March and August of this year there has been a complete change of attitude on the part of one association which has always exhibited a degree of reasonableness in regard to officers of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife.

I certainly would not make any secret of the amount of scorn some members of the other association have for the Conservator of Wildlife, and I believe there could be justification for it when one looks behind the scenes. However, that is not a question I wish to pursue tonight.

Mr B. T. Burke: You can see the interest of the farming members. Look at the member for Greenough; he is fast asleep!

Mr Old: He heard it all the first time.

Mr B. T. Burke: He didn't learn much from it.

Mr Old: We are on it for the sixth time now.

Mr B. T. Burke: What are you doing butting in when you have not even fixed the drought?

Mr SKIDMORE: At least the interjections are giving me a chance to have a drink of water. With respect, Mr Speaker, at this late hour of the night I wish to continue giving my reasons for disallowing the regulations and I believe the last argument I referred to was very pertinent.

The Avicultural and Wildlife Association sent out a special edition of its magazine in which it set out its objections to these regulations, and I have quoted some of these objections. The Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife felt so upset about the issue and about the association's attitude being so wide of the mark that he was constrained to write a letter which was tabled in this House on the 25th August. The letter is headed, "Wildlife Conservation Regulations" and is dated the 1st August. He mentioned it had been made patently clear from the number of inquiries made to his office by members of Parliament that there was some dissension and disputation over the regulations. The Minister wanted to put the record straight. I shall paraphrase the Minister's letter and then refer to the refuting of his remarks by the association concerned. Very briefly, the Minister said—

The Avicultural Society of WA was invited in 1973 to consider possible changes to the regulations and also to make a submission.

In paragraph 4 he went on to say—

An approach was also made to the other major organisation, the Avicultural and Wildlife Association in a letter dated 18th April, 1975. The Association was invited to make suggestions and assist in the review, however, no practical response eventuated.

This very pertinent point was discussed in one of the rooms of Parliament House where officers of the Wildlife Association attended a meeting of aviculturists. I organised this meeting. Those present denied that they had ever received a letter and also denied that a letter had ever been sent. They still deny it today. They went on record as saying categorically that the Avicultural and Wildlife Association had not at any time been invited to take part in any discussions relative to the Fauna Conservation Act or amendments

thereto. They said that their repeated requests for information on this subject had always been rebuffed. So much for the Minister's explanatory notes to assist members to ascertain who is telling the truth.

The Minister continued as follows—

Controls provided under the regulations are necessary as most species of Australian birds are protected. That is they may not be taken or kept in captivity, bought, sold, bartered or exchanged except under license. This practise applies generally throughout Australia.

The association in its reply said the following—

To be anything like factual it would have to be relating to species of bird that are not normally kept in aviaries, and is therefore extraneous to the main line of this discussion. But even so, the exceptions are so vast that this aspect is unworthy of consideration without considerable unbiased data from which one could arrive at a balanced conclusion.

Let us have a look at the criterion established by the wildlife department which is the cut-off point between all those which could be included in the bird world and all those which could not be included. This may be found in part C of appendix C. Dr Serventy, who is not even a member of the wildlife department drew up a list of birds which he felt should and should not be included. It was never intended that that list would become the criterion used by a responsible department to endeavour to show the degree of approval that it had for the type of birds that people should keep. I repeat again, it was just a very convenient way of being able to slug the aviculturist to provide the wherewithal for more officers to be employed, so they could go around and pinch more aviculturists and increase the largesse to the department.

The Minister continued as follows—

There were numerous reasons why it was felt that the regulations should be amended. One of the main reasons for a change was the growth in the illegal bird trade. An extremely serious situation had also developed through extensive nest-robbing and destruction to supply the requirements of aviculturists.

It is patently wrong that should be said by the Minister, because it can be shown to be wrong. He states that there were numerous reasons why the regulations should be amended. One of the main reasons was the illegal growth of the bird trade, and by imposing licence fees on birdkeepers the Minister believed he would be able to control

that illegal trade. I cannot see how this is going to happen. The Minister said that the nest robbing and destruction were carried out to supply the requirements of the aviculturists. I am told by the aviculturists that if one took a bird from the bush and put it in an aviary of birds of like species which had been caged up for some time, it would be very hard indeed to imagine what might happen. I am told that the bird which had been taken from the bush could be attacked by the aviary-bred birds. It could be killed. Likewise, the bird from the bush could subject the aviary-bred birds to all sorts of problems and attack. The aviculturist who has paid \$30 or \$40 and maybe even \$400 or \$500 for that bird surely is not going to take a bird that he has caught in the bush, and put it into a cage amongst these highly-prized birds. Of course he will not do that. He could destroy his whole collection. He will not lay open his whole aviary to the ravages of an introduced bird which could destroy all the aviary birds. It is like putting a cat among the pigeons.

The Minister continued as follows—

Illegal trafficking in birds is seriously affecting the survival of some species.

I agree 100 per cent with the Minister. The illegal trafficking in some of our species is endangering the survival of that species, but it is not the aviculturist who is trafficking in birds; it is the man up north. It is the smart-aleck who is hiring planes and getting out into the country.

I would hazard a guess that there are plenty of the birds of this State going out on the self-same planes which are flying husbands and their children out of this country! Or am I being melodramatic in suggesting such a thing? That is no more an unreasonable proposition than the very tenuous basis which has been adopted by the wildlife department to verify and justify the regulations. In fact, I believe that proposition is more valid. If the officers of the department went up north to see what was going on and left the aviculturists alone they would be serving a better purpose. Of course, there is no profit up there. It costs a lot of money and the departmental officers feel it is far better to go around pinpricking the aviculturists and saying, "You have too many birds. You cannot have that sort of bird. It is going to be taken away from you." It is much easier to obtain money in that manner. The Minister went on to say—

The new licensing system was introduced because the previous one proved ineffective.

It was ineffective, because it operated so well and there was no room for empire building. Under that licensing system there was need to employ

more wildlife officers to police the aviculturist. It was so simple. That system did not entail a great deal of filling in of forms. It did not need a great deal of effort on the part of the department. Why does the department want to say to the aviculturists, "Put \$2 on the head of each bird and you can keep them"? It says that makes it easier to control. What rubbish! I have not heard of such ridiculous regulations in all my life. Of course, these regulations will raise a tremendous amount of money. I believe the Treasurer will be really happy about them. It will save him a great deal of money over a period of years. The poor old hobbyist is to pay extra by way of licence fees.

The Minister went on to mention the growth in the department, and said—

The Department has grown significantly since 1958 when it had only one wildlife officer. It now has twenty three and all except one spend some time on avicultural and dealer problems.

I had considerable difficulty with the department in assisting a dealer in Midland to obtain a licence to trade in canaries. One would almost think the man was trying to import monstrous great eagles to sell from his shop! He could not get a licence because there were too many canary dealers, and it was thought the man could lay himself open to bird trafficking. For any member who is interested, the case is documented and is available for examination in my office.

In my speech tonight I have concentrated on the hobbyist, but the situation is just as bad for dealers. However, as I have not been approached by any dealers, and as I have no idea of their attitude towards the regulations, it is not within my province to include them in my remarks. The Minister continues—

It is worth noting in respect to the Avicultural and Wildlife Association that during the term of the current Government invitations have been extended to this Association by the Conservator of Wildlife to meet and discuss problems. However, they have not been accepted.

They have never been made! I deny quite categorically that such invitations were issued, and the Avicultural and Wildlife Association supports my claim. The only time officers of the department conferred with the aviculturists was when they were at Parliament House at my invitation to discuss their objections to the regulations under the Vermin Act.

The next statement, supposedly by a logical and responsible Minister is a gem! The Minister states—

If there were no such hobbyists, there would be no nest-robbing nor illegal trading and smuggling.

Oh, come on! Of course the hobbyist is not responsible for illegal trapping and robbing nests. However, the Minister believes this to be the case, so he has applied restrictive regulations which will ensure that the hobbyist will never again have the satisfaction of keeping and breeding birds without interference. I would have thought that a person who raised a bird from a fledgling would be more inclined to value and protect that bird than to harm it or its kind. The Minister continued—

As a Government we have a responsibility to ensure that species of Wildlife are not endangered.

The aviculturist protects wildlife against the depredations of feral cats and other predators to be found in the wild, and for that they must pay. In regard to this last point, the Avicultural and Wildlife Association said that smuggling was a lengthy subject which had been dealt with from time to time over the years, and that the Conservator of Wildlife must be well aware the regulations had never served the interests of Western Australia. The introduction of this subject in a document of this nature can serve only as a red herring.

I agree wholeheartedly that it is a red herring, drawn across the trail to try to depict the aviculturists not as responsible people, but as people who rob nests and subject the wildlife of this State to depredation.

I believe the regulations should be disallowed. I should like each member consciously to examine the issues. I am prepared over the weekend to drive any member to the homes of some of these aviculturists so that they can examine for themselves the beautiful aviaries kept by these people and see the care and attention lavished upon these birds. I am convinced that if members accepted my invitation they would accept the validity of my argument. The association does not deal only with birds; it is conscious of its responsibility to all wildlife. On numerous occasions the association has undertaken to examine the whole concept of wildlife in Western Australia. They have visited many of the forest areas and have logged the different types of fauna to be found in this State, with a view to their protection and conservation.

I sincerely hope members listen to my plea tonight and agree to disallow these regulations. I do not suggest regulations are not needed, but I do say we need more rational regulations. They must be fair, and not repressive. We do not need

regulations which even the wildlife officers cannot understand. If we disallow these regulations we will be giving some justice to the aviculturists, the people on whose behalf I have spoken tonight. They are not few in number; there are thousands of them in Western Australia who enjoy the hobby of keeping birds in captivity, for the betterment of the birds concerned.

Mr H. D. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier).

House adjourned at 12.07 a.m. (Thursday)

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE UNEMPLOYMENT

Girrawheen

1. Mr WILSON, to the Premier:

In view of the chronic unemployment situation in the suburb of Girrawheen, as reported in last night's issue of the *Daily News*, will the Premier have the situation as it is affecting people there further investigated with a view to offering assistance to the Wanneroo Shire Council to provide work opportunities in the area, similar to that offered local authorities in the eastern goldfields, because of the particular local problems which have recently arisen in that area?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I am advised that the Girrawheen unemployment situation reported in yesterday's issue of the *Daily News* is distorted.

This is because Girrawheen is a relatively new high density residential suburb with little or no manufacturing industry yet established.

The Commonwealth Employment Service office was located in this area temporarily, pending the completion of permanent premises.

The new premises will be in the southern portion of the Wanneroo Shire and will be more representative of Commonwealth Employment Service offices generally in that both the unemployed and the potential employers will register.

Due to the location of the temporary office, a disproportionate ratio of persons registered as unemployed at Girrawheen, and would be balanced out

by a disproportionate ratio of job vacancies in surrounding commercial and industrial areas.

However, the unemployed in this area have ready access to the total metropolitan employment area through, at the minimum, a daily telex hookup to all other Commonwealth Employment Service offices.

Under these conditions and in view of the entirely different circumstances in the metropolitan area compared with remote areas, such as the eastern goldfields, it is not considered that special assistance—such as that given to the eastern goldfields and drought stricken areas—is warranted in this case.

MEAT

Commission

2. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Can the Minister advise what sum of money has been spent by the WA Meat Commission in advertising since the commencement of the livestock marketing referendum?
- (2) Has this expenditure been approved by the Minister?
- (3) To what account will the expenditure be charged?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) \$3 500.
- (2) No. Expenditure of this nature does not require my approval.
- (3) The commission's central administration account.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Disqualification of Councillors

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

- (1) Is there any reason why councillors disqualified under section 37 of the Local Government Act could not have protected themselves by taking advantage of the provisions of subsection (3) or (4) of section 37 of the said Act; if "Yes", what is it?
- (2) Why is it considered equitable that a member of a private company or a partnership should have the same protection from disqualification as would apply to a single trader?

- (3) Who does he mean by the words "these people" in the last page of his speech when he said, "However, under the provisions of the Bill these people will be deemed to have not committed an offence"?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) Yes. Subsections (3) and (4) of section 37 were enacted in 1976 and were effective only from the 12th November, 1976. Therefore some members were already in office. There are instances where members are unaware of the transactions which cause disqualification.
- (2) Because there is no apparent reason that the same principle should not apply.
- (3) The words refer to the persons mentioned in the previous paragraph who are excluded from the application of the validating clause but who could otherwise be subject to the provisions of section 40.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

Amendment to Section 37

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

Further to the Minister's reply to question 635, and particularly his reply to part (2) of that question—

- (1) Has he made any attempt to ascertain the number of councillors who are currently disqualified under section 37?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) The present position is that transactions causing disqualification are not known to many members and I have not been able to ascertain what the actual figure is.

P. E. MULLALLY

Discussions between SEC and Minister

5. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

In view of his statement that he contacted a commissioner of the SEC to verify whether the Mr P. E. Mullally who was involved in the Tresillian controversy and "other things" was the same Mr Mullally who was employed by the Commission at that time, will the

Minister be kind enough to tell the House the "other things" in which he believed Mr Mullally was involved?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

I referred to the known fact that Mr Mullally was involved in the whole controversy, plus the fact—which came to my notice just before I asked about the fact of his employment—that he has signed, in a capacity which came out in the answer to one of the honourable member's questions today, a writ against the Government.

The SPEAKER: There have been in excess of 80 questions on notice today, and I indicate that I will take no more than two further questions without notice.

P. E. MULLALLY

Discussions between SEC and Minister

6. Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

As the Minister has now explained that the motivation for his contacting a commissioner of the SEC about Mr Mullally was (a) his involvement in Tresillian, and (b) "other things" with which he was involved—that is, the writ he signed relating to this matter—does the Minister now admit he contacted the commissioner of the SEC simply about Mr Mullally's involvement in the Tresillian controversy?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

The first part of the question is entirely hypothetical and is an attempt to put words into my mouth; so I will not reply to it. As to the second part of the question, I have supplied him with ample information in clear English.

Mr B. T. Burke: What are the "other things"? I will tell you shortly.

NICKEL MINES

Nepean, Redross, and Selcast

7. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What marketing arrangements do the companies mining the nickel deposits at Nepean, Redross, and Selcast mines in the eastern goldfields have for their ore?
- (2) Are any of these arrangements in jeopardy in the immediate future?

- (3) Is there any real possibility of the aforementioned mines closing down or suffering large-scale retrenchments in the immediate future?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

(1) to (3) It is quite obvious a question like this should go on the notice paper in order to be considered and answered correctly.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

RAILWAY ROAD BUS SERVICES

Withdrawal and Replacement

567. Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Will he list each of the Westrail bus services which have been withdrawn in the past three years?
- (2) Will he also list the replacements for these services where replacements have been made?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The route sections where bus services have been completely withdrawn—
Merredin-Wyalkatchem,
Quairading-Corrigin,
Donnybrook-Katanning,
Busselton-Nannup,
Jurien Bay Turnoff-Jurien Bay,
Pinjarra-Kondinin, via Narrogin.
- (2) As patronage on these bus routes only averaged one or two people per trip no replacements have been made.

RAILWAY COUNTRY SERVICES

Freight and Passenger: Withdrawal

569. Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

Will the Minister list the rural passenger train services and rural freight train services which have been withdrawn in the past three years?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Rural passenger train services—

A review of passenger operations in 1975 showed that by replacement with bus services, considerable annual savings and the avoidance of considerable capital expenditure could be achieved.

The Government therefore decided to purchase 12 new air-conditioned buses and to convert the following trains to bus services—

Overnight trains from Perth to Albany and Geraldton on Fridays, returning Sundays.

Daylight trains from Perth to Bunbury and returning on weekdays—other than the Australind—on Sundays.

Freight train services—

Disregarding bulk traffics and special services run on a day-to-day basis according to seasonal demand, the following regularly scheduled general purpose trains were cancelled per week—

One train in each direction—Avon to Mullewa and Avon to Wyalkatchem.

Two trains in each direction—Kalgoorlie to Esperance.

The Mullewa and Wyalkatchem trains were cancelled to enable introduction of more economical train working.

Services on the Esperance line were reduced owing to a fall-off in the traffic available.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Welshpool Electorate

587. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

When is it proposed to erect traffic lights at the following intersections:

- (a) Oats Street and Orrong Road;
- (b) Leach Highway and Abernethy Road;
- (c) Alexander Road and Abernethy Road?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

These installations have been programmed for this financial year.

HEALTH

Chiropractic, Osteopathy, Homeopathy, and Naturopathy

588. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does the Government intend acting on the recommendations of the report of the committee of inquiry into chiropractic, osteopathy, homeopathy and naturopathy which was tabled in Federal Parliament in April, 1977?
- (2) If "Yes" when is it anticipated that legislation will be introduced?
- (3) If "No" to (1), why not?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The Government believes that the report should have the wide study and consideration recommended by the committee.

HEALTH

Chiropractors Registration Board

589. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What are the names, occupations and qualifications of the members of the Western Australian Chiropractors Registration Board?
- (2) In what countries and at what colleges were the chiropractor members of the board trained?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) Mr P. L. Sharp, QC and Barrister;
Mr R. C. Scott, Chiropractor, DC;
Mr K. R. Todd, Chiropractor, DC;
Mr C. E. Watson, Chiropractor, DC;
Mr L. G. F. Giles, Chiropractor, DC.
- (2) Mr R. C. Scott, Canada, Memorial Chiropractic College;
Mr K. R. Todd, America, Lincoln Chiropractic College;
Mr C. E. Watson, Australia, Roberts Health Academy;
Mr L. G. F. Giles, Canada, Memorial Chiropractic College.

SWAN RIVER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Boundaries of Swan and Canning Rivers

590. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) What progress has been achieved as a result of representations by local government bodies seeking alterations to the boundaries proposed for the new Swan River Management Authority?
- (2) Who are the members of the Swan River Management Authority and what interests do they represent?
- (3) When is it expected that a final decision will be made on the placement of the boundaries of the Swan River Management Authority for the Swan and Canning Rivers?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Negotiations are currently proceeding with all local government authorities within the proposed boundary areas.
- (2) See *Government Gazette* of Western Australia, No. 54, Perth, Friday, 2nd September, 1977, or answer to question 134 in the Legislative Council.
- (3) Within 12 months.

NATURAL GAS

Prices

591. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) What was the original price of gas purchased from Western Australian Natural Gas when purchases were first made?
- (2) How many times has the price of gas been increased?
- (3) Will he list the increases and give the date of each of the increases?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) to (3) The agreement between the State Energy Commission and the participants of the West Australian Natural Gas Pty. Ltd. contains an article requiring strict confidential treatment to the agreement.

HOUSING

Esperance

592. Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many State Housing Commission homes are there in Esperance?
- (2) How many are in the course of construction or planned for immediate construction?
- (3) How many are being planned for construction in the next 12 months?
- (4) What total number of applicants are waiting for homes?
- (5) What is the average waiting time for Esperance applicants?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) State Housing Commission Stock—
Bedroom
8 x 4 single detached houses;
126 x 3 single detached houses;
28 x 3 duplex;
8 x 2 duplex;
8 x 1 pensioner units;
4 x bed sitting rooms, pensioner units.
Total of 182 units.

(2) Under Construction—

4 pensioner units: 3 bed sitting room,
1 1-bedroom unit: 64 per cent complete at 23rd August, 1977.

(3) Programmed for 1977-78 (tenders accepted for all units)—

Bedroom
6 x 2 duplex;

	5 Bd.	4 Bd.	3 Bd.	2 Bd.	1 Bd.
Caucasian	5	27	9
Aboriginal	9	7

(5) Waiting Times—

Caucasian:

5 bedroom, no applicants;
4 bedroom, no applicants;
3 bedroom, 6 months;
2 bedroom, 1 year and 7 months;
1 bedroom, 3 years and 6 months;
Pensioner couple, 3 years and 6 months;
Single unit, 3 years and 4 months;
Purchase only, 1 month;
Purchase dual, 2 years 4 months;
Purchase in occupation, 5 years 2 months.

Aboriginal:

3 bedroom, 2 years 7 months;
2 bedroom, 8 months.

Apart from Aboriginal families, the 1977-78 construction programme will, together with turnovers, reduce the waiting time of current applicants considerably.

CATTLE

Asian Markets

593. Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Which countries in the Asian area import live cattle?
- (2) How many cattle are involved in this trade?
- (3) What are the specifications of the animal types required?
- (4) How many Australian cattle were shipped last year?
- (5) How many were shipped from Western Australia?
- (6) How did prices to producers compare for those exported live to those sold to the abattoir trade?

6 x 2 duplex;
5 x 3 single detached houses (rental);
2 x 3 single detached houses (purchase),
3 x pensioner bed-sitting room units.
Total 22 units.

(4) Outstanding Applications as at 31st August, 1977—

	Pensioner		Purchase		In occup.	Total
	Couple	Single Unit	Only	Dual		
Caucasian	2	9	1	7	1	61
Aboriginal	16

(7) Are there any quotas placed on this trade?

(8) If "Yes" to (7), who determines the quota allocation?

(9) Which shipping companies are involved in the trade now?

(10) Does the market have great potential?

Mr OLD replied:

(1) to (3) The precise information sought is not immediately available, but will be made known to the member as soon as possible.

(4) Preliminary statistics indicate that 29 440 cattle for slaughter were exported from Australia in 1976-77.

(5) 12 346 cattle for slaughter were exported from Western Australia in 1976-77.

(6) No precise figures are available to my department relating to the prices received by producers who sell cattle for live export.

(7) and (8) There is no formal agreement between industry and the Australasian Meat Industry Employees Union concerning live cattle exports. However, the union has unilaterally determined an overall State quota.

(9) This information is considered to be confidential to the companies concerned.

(10) It is considered that the market has sound prospects.

ROCK PHOSPHATE

Prices, Processing, and Bounty

594. Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the price of rock phosphate f.o.b. Christmas Island?
- (2) What is the price of this material on wharfside at Fremantle?

- (3) If "C" and "D" grade rock were imported, what would be its expected price f.o.b. and wharfside Fremantle?
- (4) Could he—
 - (a) ascertain the costs of grinding to a very fine grade the "C" and "D" grade rock material;
 - (b) calcining to 500° the same material?
- (5) Have studies been done on pelletising or granulating both materials and with what results?
- (6) Is it possible for a pelletised or granulated product of superphosphate and fine ground rock or calcined rock to be produced?
- (7) Under the bounty provisions recently granted for phosphate materials other than super, what would be the approximate amount of bounty paid on—
 - (a) one tonne of fine ground "C" and "D" grade material;
 - (b) one tonne of calcined "C" and "D" grade material?
- (8) Are local superphosphate manufacturers interested or planning to enter this type of operation at this stage?
- (9) If not, are there other organisations who could perform these processes?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) This is not available.
- (2) The latest available figure was for 1975, when the equalised rock phosphate price over all sources into Australian ports was \$46.97. The freight at that time was \$11.70.
- (3) This would depend on quantities and current shipping charges.
- (4) This would depend on throughput as advised in reply to the same question on the 26th May, 1976.
- (5) Pelletising can be achieved although it can affect the availability.
- (6) Yes.
- (7) (a) Virtually no bounty would be payable;
- (b) depending on the calcining process and the conversion to citrate soluble phosphorus, a bounty of up to \$15 per tonne could be payable.
- (8) and (9) This is not known but would depend on the results of current experiments investigating the long term value of C and D grade rock phosphate and calcined rock.

MEAT

Commission

595. Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What powers of trading has the W.A. Meat Commission in stock sent for sale?
- (2) Could he advise—
 - (a) numbers of sheep and lambs purchased during the past 12 months;
 - (b) the time these were purchased;
 - (c) the influence the Commission's activities had on the sale price (if no statistical data is available a general comment would suffice);
 - (d) did the Commission make a trading profit or loss on these operations?
- (3) Has the Commission the power of purchasing live sheep for sale to the Middle East or near East trade?
- (4) What percentage of sheep and lambs slaughtered in Western Australia are—
 - (a) disposed of locally;
 - (b) sold on the export market?
- (5) Can a producer now send sheep or lambs direct to the Commission?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), what is the basis of price determination now used?

Mr OLD replied:

The Western Australian Meat Commission advises as follows—

- (1) Sections 15(2)(b)(vii) and 15(3) of the Abattoirs Act, 1909-1975 provide this power.
- (2) (a) Sheep, 359 289;
Lambs, nil.
- (b) July, 41 592;
August, 19 170;
September, 622;
October, nil;
November, 2 475;
December, 30 902;
January, 33 404;
February, 57 187;
March, 59 579;
April, 39 891;
May, 39 168;
June, 35 299.
- (c) The commission's activities have had a stabilising effect on the market.

- (d) Although a trading loss was sustained on sheep this helped to contain the commission's loss on slaughtering and minimised staff retrenchments.
- (3) Yes. This option has not been exercised.
- (4)
- | | Sheep
% | Lambs
% |
|-----|------------|------------|
| (a) | 17.8 | 49 * |
| (b) | 82.2 | 51 |
- (5) Yes, in respect of sheep. The consignment of lambs is subject to the WA Lamb Marketing Board.
- (6) Price is determined by negotiation taking into consideration export prices at the time and the contribution of the stock concerned to the works' throughput.

* Australian Meat Board 1975-76 statistics.

RAILWAYS

Meekatharra-Mullewa Closure: Compensation to Employees

596. Mr McIVER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many railway employees are stationed at—
- Mullewa;
 - Yalgoo;
 - Cue;
 - Mt. Magnet;
 - Meekatharra?
- (2) What is the total wages paid each fortnight to these employees?
- (3) In the event of the closure of the Meekatharra-Mullewa line, will the Government make compensation payments to railwaymen who cannot sell their homes or must pay a higher price for another one at some other depot?
- (4) How many railway employees in the following categories will be retained at Mullewa after the closure—
- traffic staff;
 - locomotive staff;
 - station officers?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) The numbers of staff at the 10th August were:
- 50;
 - 7;
 - 8;
 - 16;
 - 10.

However, some of these were already under notice of transfer to other locations for reasons connected with West-rail's normal activities.

- (2) Approximately \$27 000.
- (3) This is a matter for consideration in the light of circumstances which exist at the time action is taken to close the line. At this stage, of the staff involved only 4 own their own homes.
- (4)
 - 7;
 - 9;
 - 6.

In addition, approximately eight Civil Engineering Branch staff will be retained at Mullewa.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Federal-State Tax Sharing

597. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is he aware of a statement by his federal counterpart in the television programme "Four Corners" on 20th August, 1977 that because of the new tax sharing arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States, the States would have an additional 6% in funds for education this year?
- (2) Will the Western Australian State Government have an extra 6% in funds for education this year because of the new tax sharing arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States?
- (3) If "No" to (2), can he say what will be the effect in real terms on education funding of the new tax sharing arrangements?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes, but I do not recognise the figure of 6 per cent quoted by the Federal Minister for Education.
- (2) and (3) Any additional funds available to Western Australia under the tax sharing arrangements add to the general revenue of the State and are

available for all of the services of Government, not only for education. The distribution of these funds is for the State Government to determine and for Parliament to authorise. The member will be advised of the proposed allocation of funds for education in 1977-78 when the State Budget is introduced to Parliament.

PRE-PRIMARY CENTRES

Children under Five: Admission and Levy

598. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are some pre-primary centres taking four-year-old children to fill vacancies existing due to insufficient enrolments by five-year-olds?
- (2) If "Yes" which centres in the metropolitan area are taking four-year olds?
- (3) Are levies being paid by parents of four-year-old children attending pre-primary centres?
- (4) Are the levies based on a percentage of the staff salary at such centres?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), will the parents of four-year-olds pay a higher levy if a trained assistant rather than an untrained aide is employed at such a centre?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) Yes. This is an extremely temporary arrangement undertaken in developing localities where the full potential of five-year-old children has yet to build up. It is a decision made by the local parent committee and is periodically reviewed as the circumstances change.
- (2) Southwell pre-primary centre.
- (3) No.
- (4) and (5) Not applicable.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Enrolments and Teachers

599. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) In view of the possible increase in unemployment amongst school leavers at the beginning of 1978, can he confirm the assertion in his statement published in the North Suburban section of

The West Australian of 24th August, 1977, that secondary school enrolments will be only 150 more in 1978 than 1977?

- (2) Will the employment of the proposed additional 160 teachers in secondary schools, reported in the same statement, necessarily mean an overall increase of that number of teachers in secondary schools in 1978?
- (3) If "No" to (2), what is the anticipated increase in real terms?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) The most recent departmental estimate indicates that the increase in secondary enrolments from 1977 to 1978 will be about 150.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Not applicable.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PROPERTY

Community Use

600. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Are there any legal difficulties which prevent local government authorities contributing funds for the provisions of facilities for joint school and community use on Education Department property?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the difficulties involved?
- (3) Has this matter been taken up by the committee on the community use of schools?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3)—
 - (a) what recommendations has the committee brought forward; and
 - (b) what action does the Government propose?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (4) The Local Government Act provides that local authorities may, with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, expend funds on items not specifically listed in the Act and it is proposed to initially use this power to cover the joint provision of facilities. When further experience has been gained in the implementation of the policy of joint community/school use of facilities, it may be desirable to enact legislation to cover these activities.

ROADS

Yirrigan Drive and Light Street

601. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning:

- (1) Has Town Planning Board approval been sought for the diversion of the proposed Yirrigan Drive into Benara Road West to carry traffic from the proposed Mirrabooka Regional Centre into Alexander Drive?
- (2) Has approval been sought from the same body to extend Light Street northwards to link up with this proposed new road for use as a bus route?
- (3) If "Yes" to (1) and (2) what was the decision of the board?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No, but the Town Planning Board has required as a condition of subdivision that Yirrigan Drive be connected to Light Street.
- (3) Not applicable.

HOUSING

Yirrigan

602. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:
When does the State Housing Commission intend to begin building in Yirrigan for which detailed development plans have already been published?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Subdivisional plans have not yet been prepared for the commission's holdings at Yirrigan.

HOUSING

Dianella

603. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

What plans does the State Housing Commission have for the development of the land bordered by Alexander Drive, Gordon Road and the proposed Benara Road West?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

None at present.

HOUSING

Girrawheen and Koondoola

604. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

In answer to question 53 of 1977, he stated that 89 of the 98 houses available for purchase in Girrawheen and Koondoola had been sold. Can he now say why up to a week ago, there were 78 new houses in this area still vacant?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The position in regard to the houses available for purchase in Girrawheen/Koondoola is—

50 keys have been made available to purchasers.

38 houses have been offered and accepted.

9 are currently under offer.

The question of occupation is dependent on the purchaser, himself.

A further 10 houses have since become available, and are currently being processed for offer.

SILVER GULLS

Number and Poisoning

605. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) What is the current size of the silver gull population in the Perth area?
- (2) (a) Has this population increased in the past few years; and
(b) if so, what is the recruitment rate, i.e., by how much?
- (3) (a) If the answer to (2) is "Yes" what scientific evidence is there of such an increase;
(b) have population studies been conducted; and
(c) if so by whom;
(d) are publications available for critical assessment of methods and data interpretation?
- (4) What effect will the proposed poisoning programme have on the gull population?
- (5) Is the answer to (4) substantiated by scientific data?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) Not known.
- (3) (a) Not applicable.
(b) No.
(c) Not applicable.
(d) No.
- (4) There is no proposed poisoning programme save in the mind of the member.
- (5) Unfortunately, no.

LESCHENAULT INLET

Management Authority

606. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Would the Minister advise the—
(a) names;
(b) expertise and reasons for appointment;
(c) dates of appointment;
of the Leschenault Inlet management authority?
- (2) How many times and on what dates has the authority met?
- (3) (a) Have any decisions been made by the authority as yet; and
(b) what are they;
(c) would the Minister provide me with copies of the minutes of any of the meetings that may have been held?
- (4) Would the Minister provide a map defining the area under the control of the Leschenault inlet authority?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) (a) to (c) See *Government Gazette of Western Australia* No. 54 Perth, Friday, 2nd September, 1977, or answer to question 134 in the Legislative Council.
- (2) The authority has met four times, 2nd May, 14th June, 4th July and 29th July, 1977.
- (3) (a) Yes.
(b) That the management area boundaries, as submitted and amended be confirmed as the management area boundaries for the Leschenault Estuary Management Authority.
That the Department of Public Works be requested to provide

results of recent monitoring of sampling points carried out in Leschenault Estuary.

That the advice of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife be sought with regard to the feasibility of dredging spoil from the mouth of the Preston being deposited to create an island-type bird sanctuary. That the Department of Public Works be approached with regard to erosion on the north side of the "cut" and that data or reports on the effect of the erosion on surrounding dunes, be sought.

That the State Energy Commission be requested to advise the authority of its plans for the disposal of fly ash in the Turkey Point area and of the type of effluent, if any, that could enter the estuary.

(c) No.

- (4) A map defining the area under the control of the Leschenault Inlet Management Authority can be viewed at the office of the Secretary of the Harvey Shire Council, Harvey.

WATER BORES

Singleton-Baldivis South Area

607. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is his department responsible for the tests on private bores in the Singleton-Baldivis South area in the last two weeks?
- (2) Is it a fact that from at least one bore a reading of 36 grains was taken?
- (3) Do the department's records show, as do mine, that readings from the same bores only two years ago showed 8 grains?
- (4) As this represents a 400% increase in two years, will the department take immediate steps to implement a management plan to try to ensure the trend is not continued?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) No.
- (4) 8 grains per gallon would be an exceptionally low salinity for underground water and would not normally be expected to be maintained with pumping from any bore. Such an increase alone, therefore, would not warrant implementation of management controls.

HEALTH

Radium and Thorium

608. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) (a) Does he know what radium isotopes are present in the uranium waste in Western Mining Corporation's tailings dam at Baldivis;
- (b) would he please list them and indicate the radioactive half life of each isotope?
- (2) (a) Does he know what thorium isotopes are present in the uranium waste in Western Mining Corporation's tailings dam at Baldivis;
- (b) would he please list them and indicate the radioactive half life of each isotope?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) (a) Yes;
- (b) the following radium isotope would be present in the tailings from the uranium pilot plant:
Radium 226 half life 1 620 years.
Radium 223 half life 12 days.
The following would also be present from the natural thorium also present in the dam:
Radium 228 half life 6.7 years.
Radium 224 half life 3.6 days.
- (2) (a) Yes;
- (b) the following thorium isotopes would be present in the tailings from the uranium pilot plant:
Thorium 234 half life 24.1 days
Thorium 230 half life 80 000 years.
Thorium 231 half life 25.6 hours.
Thorium 227 half life 18.2 days.
The following thorium isotopes would be present from the natural thorium present in the dam:
Thorium 232 half life 14 000 million years.
Thorium 228 half life 1.91 years.

LEGAL AID

Commission, Divorce Fees, and Scotland Conference

609. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Attorney-General:

On 1st October, 1976, fees were set at \$60 for divorce applications by the

Federal Attorney-General; his second reading speech indicates his intention to use those fees towards legal aid costs:

- (1) How much has been so raised in Western Australia since 1st October, 1976?
- (2) Has that money been applied to legal aid in Western Australia?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), how and when was it disbursed?
- (4) If "No" why has not that money been made available for legal aid in this State?
- (5) How much money has been allocated by the Commonwealth for the legal aid commission?
- (6) How much money is the State providing to the commission?
- (7) Will the Attorney-General table the agreement with the Commonwealth on funding?
- (8) (a) What amendments are to be introduced in this session of Parliament to the Legal Aid Commission Act; and
(b) will the Government allow adequate discussion to take place before proceeding with the amendments?
- (9) What is the reason for the apparent delay in operating the commission?
- (10) Would the Minister table a copy of the paper on legal aid which he delivered to the Commonwealth Law Conference in Scotland?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The \$60 fee is not segregated from other revenue collected by the Family Court. The total amount collected is offset against the States' quarterly claim upon the Commonwealth.
- (2) to (4) I assume that the Commonwealth have applied the funds directly or indirectly towards its legal commitments in the Family Court.
- (5) None. The commission has not become operative.
- (6) Funds for incidental expenditure will be provided for in the budget. Until the operative date of the commission the Law Society Legal Aid

Scheme will continue to operate under the existing funding arrangements.

- (7) The agreement has not yet been signed. I am not therefore in a position to table it at this stage.
- (8) (a) These have not yet been finalised.
(b) Yes.
- (9) Negotiations have not yet been finalised.
- (10) As this is not a Government document it is not appropriate for it to be tabled. If the member would like a copy I will gladly make one available to him.

HEALTH

Radioactive Substances

610. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) When was the first time tests were done at the Baldivis Western Mining Corporation tailings dam to determine if radioactive waste had seeped into the water table?
- (2) When was the first time the Public Health Department became aware that radioactive waste had been dumped in the dam?
- (3) (a) Are the results of the tests in (1) above available yet; and
(b) will he table the results?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) August, 1977.
- (2) July, 1973.
- (3) (a) The results are not yet available;
(b) Yes.

The results were tabled (see paper No. 242).

WHALES

Mercury Levels

611. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are tests done on the whales caught at Albany and processed through Cheynes Beach to determine mercury levels?
- (2) If "Yes", will he provide me with the results of such tests over 1976 and 1977 to date?
- (3) Do the tests show higher mercury levels than acceptable under the Public Health Department regulations?
- (4) If the answer to (1) is "No", why are tests not done?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The results for 1976 are—
Number of tests, 414 (excluding one foetus).
Mercury content in mgms per kilogram of whole flesh:
Mean, 6.135;
Variance, 6.234;
Range, 0.8-12.2;
95% confidence interval 5.894-6.376.
1977 results are not yet available.
- (3) Sperm whale meat is inedible and unsuitable for human consumption. Sperm whale or its products are not covered under Food and Drug Legislation and there is therefore no acceptable level of mercury content.
- (4) Not applicable.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS AND "STOP" SIGN

Hawker Street-Rae Road Junction

612. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) (a) Is he aware of any accidents that have occurred at the junction of Hawker Street/Rae Road, Safety Bay, and
(b) if so, how many?
- (2) Will he please give consideration to arranging for a STOP sign to be placed at the corner of Hawker Street junction with Rae Road, Safety Bay?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) Yes;
(b) three accidents have been reported during 1977.
- (2) Investigations will be undertaken to determine whether sign control is necessary.

VAPECH HOUSE

Tenants and Conditions

613. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is Vapech Building at 638 Murray Street, currently occupied by several Government Departments?

- (2) What Government Departments occupy it?
- (3) (a) Is the ceiling of an asbestos based fibrous material; and
(b) is it currently flaking very badly?
- (4) Is it a fact that at least one petition from the workers in the Education Department section of the building has been presented to their Minister in an effort to have something done about it?
- (5) In view of the recent public outcry as a result of knowledge of the possible health hazard caused by this substance, would he take immediate steps to alleviate the situation?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Probation and Parole Officer (Crown Law Department) and Education Department.
- (3) (a) Yes;
(b) No.
- (4) I understand a petition regarding this matter has been addressed to the Minister for Education.
- (5) Testing of air samples from Vapech House by the Government Chemical Laboratories has established that a health hazard does not exist.

CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Northern Swan Coastal Plain

614. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister representing the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) Has the Environmental Protection Authority commissioned the W.A. Museum to do a survey of the northern Swan coastal plain?
- (2) What is the precise area involved?
- (3) What length of time is the survey expected to take and how much will it cost?
- (4) What date did or will the survey commence?
- (5) How many officers are involved and who are they?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No. A survey has been commissioned by the Department of Conservation and Environment.
- (2) That area of the northern Swan coastal plain extending from an east-west line through Morley, northward to the Moore River and from the coast eastward to the Darling scarp.
- (3) One year, at a cost of \$30 000.
- (4) January, 1977.
- (5) A number of members of the staff of the Western Australian Museum for varying periods, under the direction of the Curator of Mammals and Survey.

MT. NEWMAN MINING COMPANY

Iron Ore Prices and Royalties

615. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Premier:

Will the Premier advise Parliament of the new agreement entered into involving the Mt. Newman Mining Company and in particular advise Parliament in relation to new iron ore prices and iron ore royalties which will be received?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The company is conducting its iron ore mining operations pursuant to the Iron Ore (Mt. Newman) Agreement Act of 1964 and amendment of 1967.

The royalties are paid in accordance with that Act.

The company has recently re-negotiated prices for a range of products for a relatively small part of its total contracts with Japanese steel mills.

Details of the many Mt. Newman iron ore sales contracts are not available as they are treated as confidential, commercial information.

WELLINGTON WEIR CATCHMENT AREA

Mr Whittington's Farm

616. Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Following his recent inspection of Mr Whittington's farm and other properties at Brookton, will he please advise—

- (1) As a result of the inspection, should similar experiments be carried out in the Wellington Weir catchment area?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes", would he please advise of the Government's programming and the finance that will be made available to Mr Whittington in view of the possible urgency involved?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Consideration is being given to a trial on Wellington catchment using techniques similar to those used by Mr Whittington and possible areas for the trial have been selected. A decision can be expected in the near future.
- (2) If a decision is made to proceed with the trial, it will be carried out with the full collaboration of Mr Whittington, the Agricultural Department and CSIRO. The experiment would be funded by and under the control of the Public Works Department and the necessary works constructed prior to the 1978 winter.

TRAIL BIKES

Legislation

617. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Does he intend to proceed with the prepared legislation to control trail bikes which was not proceeded with during the last session of Parliament prior to the 1977 State elections?
- (2) If "Yes" when?
- (3) If "No" why not?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) New legislation is in the course of preparation.

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS

Licensing Board

618. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Who are the members of the Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board?

- (2) What remuneration is paid to them?
- (3) How often does the board meet and what is the usual duration of each meeting?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Members and deputy members appointed to the Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board are as follows—

William John Robinson (Chairman),
John Eversley Shillington (Deputy),
Clifford William Houghton (Member),
William Frederick Harry (Deputy),
Kenneth Eric Robinson (Member),
John David Bonar Foulkes (Deputy),
William John Solloway (Member),
John Owen Dewan (Deputy),
Francis Ernest Platell (Member),
Thomas Holmes Burgess (Deputy).

- (2) Remuneration paid to board members is fixed by the Public Service Board and is in line with that paid to members of other Government boards, committees, etc. From the 1st July, 1977, fees were fixed as follows—

Chairman: \$72 for full day, \$48 for half day.

Members: \$54 for full day, \$36 for half day.

- (3) The board usually meets every third Tuesday or more often if required. Meetings normally last half a day, although full day meetings have been held.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Production Methods

619. Mr TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Government Printing Office is becoming petrochemical orientated in its production methods, either with respect to the printing of Hansard or other operations?

- (2) If so, what are the details?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) Some petrochemical derivatives are being used for cleansing purposes, but the use of these has not increased to a marked degree in recent years.

HOUSING

Government Policy

620. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Housing:

Adverting to question 434 (2) of 1977 will he now state when the present policy was adopted?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I am advised that since the immediate postwar period, the State Housing Commission has been prepared to purchase subdivided allotments suitable to the housing of its applicants, having regard to work locale, availability of services, and price, and this policy continues to the present day.

However, during the early 1950's it became evident that the commission needed to also hold broadacre holdings which could be subdivided and developed according to programmes set by the commission as to timing and scale of the operations.

Since the late 1950's, the commission has had building allotments available for purchase by private individuals, project builders, and small builders wishing to build their own homes in the majority of its metropolitan and country estates, in the interests of social diversity, architecture, etc.

USED MOTOR VEHICLES

Unlicensed Dealers

621. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Has he received a submission(s) relating to an alleged lack of control of unlicensed dealing in used motor vehicles?
- (2) (a) Is there a great deal of unlicensed dealing; and
(b) what are the details?
- (3) How many prosecutions have there been to date in 1977 relating to unlicensed dealing?
- (4) Who is at present responsible for the policing of the requirement that all dealers have a licence?
- (5) How many officers are at present employed full time in policing that requirement?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) (a) Not according to observation by the Bureau of Consumer Affairs;

- (b) evidence has been taken in two cases and one other is currently under surveillance.

- (3) One. It is currently in progress and is on adjournment.

- (4) The Bureau of Consumer Affairs, Road Traffic Authority, and Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board.

- (5) None. Each of the authorities mentioned in (4) have officers who maintain licence surveillance as part of their normal duties.

FURNITURE MANUFACTURERS

Code

622. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Adverting to question 366 (1) of 1977 is it also true that there is nothing to prevent a retailer from removing the manufacturer's name from the furniture?
- (2) Is this a common practice?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) It is an offence against the Factories and Shops Act, section 79, to remove, erase, deface, or otherwise interfere with any stamp on any furniture purporting to be a stamp of a manufacturer under the Act.
- (2) No complaints have been received from consumers by either the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops or the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Rent and Lease

623. Mr TONKIN, to the Treasurer:

Adverting to question 367 of 1977—

- (1) Will he state the amount of rent per time period being paid by TVW Enterprises Ltd.?
- (2) Will he table the instrument of lease?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) \$250 000 per annum, payable quarterly in advance.
- (2) No.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Credit Laws

624. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister representing the Attorney-General:

When is it expected that the Bill dealing with credit laws will be introduced into the Parliament?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

It is not known.

The matter is still before the standing committee of Attorneys-General which has not received a final draft of the Bill. The member should appreciate that the standing committee merely makes recommendations to the Commonwealth and State Governments.

PINE PLANTATIONS

Plantings and Programmes

625. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What area of pine trees has been planted in the south-west by the Forests Department in each of the past five years?
- (2) What is the area of pines which the Forests Department proposes to plant in each of the next five years?
- (3) By how much will the reduction in funds for softwood planting as indicated in the recent Federal Budget reduce the original target of the Forests Department for the next five years' planting programme?
- (4) (a) Is pine planting to continue in the Donnybrook sunklands in the next three years; and
(b) if so, what area in each of these years is expected to be planted?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) The information relating to 1972-73 and 1973-74 was supplied to the member in answer to his question 17 of the 3rd October, 1974. The information for the other years is as follows—

	ha
1974-75	2 218;
1975-76	2 728;
1976-77	2 931.

The member's attention is drawn to the fact that answers requested except for 1976-77 are contained in the published

annual reports of the Forests Department.

- | | ha |
|-------------|--------|
| (2) 1977-78 | 2 800; |
| 1978-79 | 2 800; |
| 1979-80 | 2 900. |
- (3) The Government aims to establish the area designated in the general working plan approved in January, 1977, subject to the availability of funds.
 - (4) (a) Yes;
(b) 200, 600, 1 200 hectares.

RAILWAYS

Pemberton-Northcliffe

626. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it proposed to close the Pemberton-Northcliffe railway line?
- (2) If so, when will the closure take place?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) There is no proposal at the present time to close the Pemberton-Northcliffe line.

ABATTOIRS

Capacity

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

- (1) What is the present annual capacity of export standard abattoirs in Western Australia to handle—
(a) cattle;
(b) sheep;
(c) lambs?
- (2) What is the estimated turn off of—
(a) cattle;
(b) sheep;
(c) lambs,
in Western Australia in each of the next three years for export?
- (3) (a) What is the total number of—
(i) cattle;
(ii) sheep,
in Western Australia at present;

- (b) What is the expected number of sheep and cattle in Western Australia expected to be in each of the next three years?
- (4) What numbers of—
- (a) cattle;
 - (b) sheep;
 - (c) lambs,
- will the proposed abattoirs at Esperance be able to handle each year?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) (a) Cattle, 720 000;
 (b) and (c) Sheep and lambs, 7.3 million.
- (2) (a) to (c) Estimated turn off including stock available for live export is in the order of—

		Sheep and Lambs
	Cattle	million
1977-78	720 000	5.7
1978-79	670 000	6.2
1979-80	670 000	6.5

Turn off destined for export and the domestic market cannot be assessed accurately. In 1975-76 45.4 per cent of beef production, 82.2 per cent of mutton production, and 51 per cent of lamb production was exported.

- (3) (a) and (b) Numbers at the 31st March, 1977, and estimates for the following three years are—

	Cattle	Sheep
	million	million
1977	2.51	31.35
1978	2.45	31.0
1979	2.4	31.5
1980	2.4	32.0

- (4) The potential of the proposed abattoir is expected to be in the order of—
- (a) Cattle, 34 000;
 - (b) and (c) Sheep and lambs, 450 000.

TEACHING HOSPITALS

Government Subsidy

628. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Health: What was the total amount of State Government subsidy for the teaching hospitals for the year 1976-77?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

Total subsidy to the teaching hospitals in 1976-77 was \$119 488 485.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

Busselton

629. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Health: With reference to question 7 of the 19th October, 1976, regarding fluoridation of Busselton's water supply, can he advise the result of investigations and the subsequent decision made?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

The subject of the fluoridation of Busselton water supply is on the agenda for the next meeting of the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies Advisory Committee due to be held shortly. The member will be advised of the outcome.

STATE FORESTS

Crown and Private Land

630. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Lands:
- (1) How much Crown land has been vested in the Forests Department as—
 - (a) State forest;
 - (b) timber reserves,
 in the past 18 months?
 - (2) How much private land has been purchased by the Forests Department in the south-west of Western Australia in the past 18 months?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) 20 611 hectares;
- (b) timber reserves (Forests Act) 1 375 hectares.
- (2) 1 372 hectares.

FROZEN POTATOES AND POTATO PRODUCTS

Imports

631. Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:
- (1) What quantity of frozen potatoes or frozen potato products have been imported into Western Australia in each of the past 12 months?
 - (2) From what source have these products come?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) Bureau of Statistics states that information is not available as frozen potato products are included with beans, peas, and other vegetables. Classification has been accepted to separate potatoes from September quarter onwards.

The only indication of local usage can be assessed from a feasibility study into processing conducted by the PA Management Consultants in 1976 on behalf of the Potato Growers Association.

This report indicated that known sales through major supermarkets total 1 300 tonnes per annum.

Sales to fast foods and institutions could increase this figure up to 3 000 tonnes equal to 6 000 tonnes of fresh potato equivalent. No actual figures are available, however.

- (2) Unknown.

ROBB JETTY AND MIDLAND ABATTOIRS

Bonestock Pty. Ltd.: Beef Bones and Fat

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

- (1) Is Bonestock Pty. Ltd. to obtain supplies of beef bones and fat from—
 (a) Robb Jetty abattoirs;
 (b) Midland Junction abattoirs?

- (2) If "Yes"—

- (a) what amount is to be provided by each abattoir;
 (b) when will supply commence?

Mr OLD replied:

The WA Meat Commission advises—

- (1) No decision has yet been made.
 (2) Not applicable.

HOUSING

Aborigines

633. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What sums of money were—
 (a) allocated;
 (b) received,
 for the provision of Aboriginal housing for the year ended the 30th June, 1977?
 (2) From what sources did the finance come?
 (3) What amounts from each source were actually spent?

- (4) (a) From what source(s); and
 (b) what amount(s)
 are expected for the current financial year?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Funds allocated—year ended the 30th June, 1977:

	\$
(a) 1975-76 Approved carryover	187 455
1976-77 General housing	2 083 197
1976-77 Village housing	1 394 973
	<hr/>
	3 665 625
1976-77 State grants	650 000
	<hr/>
	\$4 315 625

- (b) Funds received year ended the 30th June, 1977, \$4 315 625.
 (2) Commonwealth grants \$3 665 625;
 State grants, \$650 000.
 (3) Commonwealth grants, \$4 671 403
 (\$1 005 778 overdrawn);
 State grants, \$206 017.
 (4) (a) and (b)—
 Commonwealth grants \$3 250 000;
 State grants, \$650 000.

HOSPITALS

Mt. Henry and Sunset

634. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Health:
 What is the total cost per bed per week at—

- (1) Mt. Henry?

- (2) Sunset?

for—

- (a) intensive care;
 (b) ordinary care?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

The average cost per occupied bed per week in 1976-77 at Mt. Henry Hospital was \$244.58 and Sunset Hospital \$218.26. Separate costs for intensive care and ordinary care are not available.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

Amendment of Section 37

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

- (1) For the general convenience, information and assistance of members, will he table all reports, legal opinions and information in his possession and/or in the possession of the Perth City Council relative to the facts and law said to give rise to the Bill to amend section 37 of the Local Government Act?
- (2) How many councillors in this State are currently disqualified by the provisions of section 37 of the Local Government Act?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No. I believe matters affecting questions of law should not be tabled.
- (2) Number not known.

HOUSING

Mrs W. Walker

636. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Was he approached by a Mrs. W. Walker of Derby about proposed work on her home?
- (2) What was the nature of the approach?
- (3) What decision was taken?
- (4) What "local" advice was taken in reaching this decision?
- (5) Will he please review all aspects of this case?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Mrs Walker requested that part of the upgrading work to her GEHA home, i.e. enclosure of the cyclone shutter to the left-hand side of the house, be deferred whilst she was in occupation.
- (3) It was initially decided to decline the request as a programme had already been implemented to carry out the work on all similar designed houses in the town (25 were involved). However, following a further approach from Mrs Walker it was agreed to defer the work while her family is in occupation.
- (4) Advice from the local supervisor.
- (5) The case has already been reviewed as indicated in (3) above.

POLICE

Bikie Incident at Tammin

637. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Was an incident involving "bikies" at Tammin or any nearby town, on the 31st June, 1977, reported to the police?
- (2) At what time was any report made?
- (3) To which police station was it made?
- (4) At what time did police attend the scene of any incident reported?
- (5) What was the nature of the incident?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No incident involving bikies is recorded in police records on or near the date mentioned.
- (2) to (5) Answered by (1).

LIQUOR

Public Drinking Places

638. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What was the increase in the number of public drinking places, authorised by the Licensing Court in each of the past seven years?
- (2) Are statistics covering the above matter no longer contained in annual reports of the court?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) These figures until the 30th June, 1976, appear in each of the annual reports of the Licensing Court which have been tabled in Parliament.

Figures for the year ended 30th June, 1977, are as follows:

Hotels	14 lapsed	none granted	-14
Taverns	none lapsed	27 granted	+27
Limited Hotels	none lapsed	1 granted	+1
Canteens	1 lapsed	4 granted	+3
Winehouses	4 lapsed	2 granted	-2
Packet	1 lapsed	1 granted	0
Restaurant	3 lapsed	11 granted	+8
Australian Wine	5 lapsed	none granted	-5

- (2) Statistics covering these matters appear in the annual reports of the Licensing Court which have been tabled in Parliament.
- (3) Not applicable.

WATER CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

Representation

639. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What is the representation on the water conservation committee?
- (2) Does the Vegetable Growers Association have a representative?
- (3) How many members does this association have?
- (4) Does the Market Gardeners Association have a representative?
- (5) How many members does this association have?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) It is assumed the member is referring to the Western Australian Water Resources Council. This council has 14 members (6 Government and 8 private). The Government members are—

Director of Engineering, Public Works Department.

Conservator of Forests, Forests Department.

Co-ordinator, Department of Industrial Development.

Chief Engineer, Metropolitan Water Board.

Assistant Director, Department of Conservation and Environment.

Deputy Director, Department of Agriculture.

Private members include—

Mr P. F. Booth.

Mr R. K. Cheetham.

Mr G. Cohen.

Mr T. S. Emanuel.

Dr C. Georgeff.

Mr S. C. Glassford.

Mr D. W. Partridge.

Mr W. R. Stevens.

- (2) to (5) Mr Stevens is Secretary of the WA Vegetable Growers' Association (Inc.) but he, together with the other members, does not sit on the council representing any particular organisation or interest.

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries by Minister for Housing

640. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has he, at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) No.

(2) See answer to (1).

RETIRED MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Medibank Deductions

641. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Treasurer:

- (1) Is it possible for retired members of Parliament to have payment for Medibank extras "A" and "B" deducted and forwarded by the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund officers?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If not, will the Treasurer please cause this situation to be reviewed?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) It is possible, but not necessarily desirable.

The policy has been to confine deductions from superannuation payments generally to taxation deductions.

If an exception were made for Parliamentary superannuation fund payments, it would lead to demands from others of much wider ramifications which could hardly, in the circumstances, be denied.

I do not think any inconvenience is caused to retired members of Parliament under the present system.

G. A. COOPER AND
R. P. JOHNSON

CIB Investigations

642. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Is the Criminal Investigation Bureau investigating activities of certain persons concerning the removal of papers from the West Perth business office of Mr

Peter Leslie Rose a Councillor with the City of Stirling?

- (2) Are two of those persons being interviewed by the CIB Mr G. A. Cooper and Mr R. P. Johnson?
- (3) Was the said Mr G. A. Cooper the same person who was an unsuccessful candidate in the local government elections held by the City of Stirling in May of this year?
- (4) Was Mr Cooper a candidate for the Hamersley Ward against Mr Peter Rose?
- (5) Will he disclose the nature of the activities being investigated by the CIB?
- (6) Are the activities related to a letter written by Mr R. P. Johnson of 25 Haley Street, North Innaloo and dated the 11th August, 1977 to the Mayor of the City of Stirling?
- (7) Will he disclose whether charges have been preferred, the nature of the charges and against whom?
- (8) (a) If "No" to (7) when will charges be preferred;
- (b) if not, why not?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The Criminal Investigation Branch has investigated a complaint by Mr Rose concerning the obtaining of papers from his office by a man allegedly representing himself as Mr Norm Marlborough.
- (2) Mr Cooper and Mr Johnson were interviewed during the course of the enquiry.
- (3) and (4) Yes.
- (5) Answered by (1).
- (6) Yes.
- (7) No charges have been preferred.
- (8) (a) and (b) A charge of assuming a false name will be preferred against the person representing himself as Mr Marlborough if and when the identity of that person can be established and sufficient evidence is available.

JOHN DEARLE

Employment by SEC

643. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Is Mr John Dearle presently employed by the State Energy Commission?
- (2) When was Mr Dearle appointed to the State Energy Commission and what at that time were his duties?

- (3) (a) When the present Commissioner of the State Energy Commission, Mr B. J. Kirkwood, took up his appointment in 1975, did he make any direction or issue any instructions concerning Mr Dearle's employment with the State Energy Commission;
- (b) what were the full details of that direction or instruction;
- (c) how soon after Mr Kirkwood took up his position was that direction or instruction given?
- (4) What is Mr Dearle's present position at the State Energy Commission, his duty statement, and where is he situated?
- (5) Prior to such direction or instruction from the new Commissioner was not Mr Dearle employed as a public relations officer with the State Energy Commission and situated at Head Office in 365 Wellington Street, Perth?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Employed as Public Relations Officer for the State Electricity Commission on the 14th April, 1971.

Point of Order

Mr BRIAN BURKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I am reasonably close to the Minister—and I do not mean to be rude—but I am having terrible trouble with hearing him. I wonder whether he could speak up.

Mr O'Neil: The member will get a printed copy of the reply.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to speak up please.

Question on Notice Resumed

Mr MENSAROS: To continue—

- (3) (a) Yes.
- (b) Mr Dearle would be appointed to the position of Liaison Officer—Marketing in the newly formed Residential Marketing Section. The duties of this position involve the development and preparation of marketing, public relations, and other commission literature and brochures, together with general assistance to the marketing officer responsible for the operation of the Residential Marketing Section. Mr Dearle has acted as marketing officer on two occasions and is currently acting in that position.

(c) Immediately as part of the initial re-organisation.

- (4) Liaison Officer—Marketing, the duties are as above.

Has been situated at the East Perth depot and will be relocated at head office together with the Residential Marketing and Public Relations Sections when the present building alterations are completed at the end of this year.

- (5) Yes.

P. E. MULLALLY

Tresillian Hostel Controversy

644. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Did he express to any commissioner of the State Energy Commission that the Government was embarrassed by the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) Was part of that embarrassment said or implied to be Mr Mullally's employment at the State Energy Commission and his involvement as a private citizen in the Tresillian controversy?
- (3) Was it ever suggested to the commission by him or any other person on his behalf that Mr Mullally's involvement should be discouraged?
- (4) What was such discouragement directed at?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not to my knowledge.
- (4) Not applicable.

P. E. MULLALLY

Tresillian Hostel Controversy

645. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Did he receive any advice from the Commissioner of the State Energy Commission, Mr B. J. Kirkwood, in about August 1976 concerning Mr P. E. Mullally's involvement with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) What form did such advice take?
- (3) What caused any such advice to be given?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) Yes, one advice in July.
- (2) A private minute to the Minister written by the commissioner as a reflection of his concern in the matter.
- (3) My question put to him whether the said P. E. Mullally is employed with the State Energy Commission.

P. E. MULLALLY

Tresillian Hostel Controversy

646. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Fuel and Energy:

- (1) Was he told by the Commissioner or any other person from the State Energy Commission that the involvement by Mr Mullally in the Tresillian controversy was as a private citizen and he had not publicly involved the State Energy Commission?
- (2) What were the full details of his discussions with the State Energy Commission concerning Mr Mullally's involvement in the Tresillian controversy?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) I was advised by the Commissioner that was his understanding in general terms.
- (2) There were no discussions other than my question as to Mr Mullally's employment.

WANNEROO ROAD

Street Lighting

647. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Is he aware of the deficiency in street lighting along Wanneroo Road?
- (2) Is he further aware that the local authority has set aside no funds for improving this situation?
- (3) What will he do to alleviate this problem?
- (4) If he is not aware of these things will he investigate and advise of action that can be taken?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (4) The State Energy Commission has made recommendations to the local authorities for the upgrading of street lighting in Wanneroo Road between Charles Street and Mullaloo Drive turn off. To date no reply has been received authorising further action.

COLLIER PINE PLANTATION

Australia-Italy Club Hall

648. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Referring to question 561 of 1977 regarding Crown grant for land, can she advise please—
 - (a) the total area of the land;
 - (b) the area built on?
- (2) Are the terms of the change of ownership—
 - (a) formally registered;
 - (b) binding?
- (3) Can a copy of any agreement in possession of the department be tabled, please?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) 3 723 square metres.
 (b) Not known but believed to be a relatively small proportion of total area.
- (2) (a) and (b) The change of ownership, by virtue of the surrender of the original Crown grant and the issue of another, is registered and binding. The department has no copy of any registered agreement giving terms of change of ownership.
- (3) Answered by (2).

BIRDS

Confiscation

649. Dr TROY, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife:

- (1) How many birds have been confiscated by the Fisheries and Fauna Department in the last two years?
- (2) (a) Would the Minister give details of the species confiscated;
- (b) from whom they were confiscated; and
 - (c) where they went?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) and (2) Statistics of confiscated birds and other fauna are not kept.

P. E. MULLALLY

Tresillian Hostel Property

650. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Who were the signatories to the writ seeking an injunction to prevent the then Minister from disposing of the property of Tresillian?

- (2) If one of the signatories is P. E. Mullally, is this the same Mr Mullally who was employed by the State Energy Commission at the time the writ was issued?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

- (1) A writ in relation to Tresillian Hostel was issued by Julie Rosamund Easton as plaintiff and was signed and filed by P. E. Mullally as solicitor for the plaintiff on the 29th June, 1976.
- (2) On the date of the issue of the writ a person by the name of P. E. Mullally was employed by the State Energy Commission as assistant legal officer.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION

Tabling of Reports

651. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

Will he table the reports of the Industrial Commission to which he referred in the third paragraph of his speech of 18th August, 1977 (page 710 Parliamentary Debates) and which indicate those bodies which the commission believed it could not include in the various orders referred to?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The information is tabled as requested.

The information was tabled (see paper No. 226).

UNEMPLOYMENT

Western Mining Corporation

652. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

In view of his statement that the Government is doing all in its power to alleviate unemployment, would he advise—

- (1) How many workers are involved in dismissal from the employment of Western Mining Company which is scaling down its operations?
- (2) (a) Will this affect the employment opportunities in ancillary industries of the nickel industry; and
 (b) if so, what are the estimated numbers of workers who will become unemployed because of the shut down?
- (3) How many workers who have lost their jobs are to be given the opportunity of accepting re-training programmes?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) At this immediate time it is difficult to arrive at a precise figure in regard to the number of workers involved in dismissals. This is for a number of reasons, including the fact that the matter is still before the WA Industrial Commission. Talks are also currently taking place between unions and the employer about the terminations. In addition, I understand that some workers who were given notice of termination have been offered reinstatement as a result of other employees resigning. However, it was initially estimated by the company that 670 employees, consisting of 154 staff and 516 wages employees, would be dismissed.
- (2) It is not possible at this time to say whether these dismissals will affect employment opportunities in ancillary industries of the nickel industry.
- (3) All workers who have lost their jobs are welcome to apply for re-training under the National Employment and Training Scheme.

FISHERIES

Southern Ocean Fish Processors Pty. Ltd.

653. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

In regard to Southern Ocean Fish Processors Pty. Ltd., which is situated in Albany, would he advise—

- (1) What is the total loan commitment of the Government to this Company?
- (2) What are the amounts involved?
- (3) When were the loans negotiated?
- (4) Is the company able to trade profitably in view of the fact that three of its trawlers are at present out of action?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

There are two sets of loans all guaranteed to Southern Ocean Fish Processors Pty Ltd and I will deal with each separately.

(1) All up liability \$2 300 000 of which \$2 000 000 has not yet been released.

(2) (a) Old loan—

(a) Southern Ocean Fish Processors Pty Ltd \$50 000 now reduced to \$40 000.

(b) Southern Ocean Trawlers Pty Ltd.

(i) \$337 500—now reduced to \$260 000.

(ii) \$99 750—repaid in full.

(b) New loan. This relates to the joint venture arrangement with British United Trawlers Ltd.

(i) Processing Factory at Albany \$1 500 000.

(ii) Australian Shareholders contribution to the joint venture \$500 000.

As yet neither have been released.

(3) (a) Old loans—

(a) 12th March, 1975.

(b) (i) 12th March, 1975.

(ii) 6th February, 1976.

(b) New loan 1976-77—Cabinet's approval was given on the 7th April, 1977.

(4) At the present time the company is not trading profitably and it was obvious from results that it could not trade profitably based on the old fleet of three side winder trawlers due to their inability to catch sufficient fish.

Under the joint venture—three larger stern trawlers will be utilised on lease from the UK and the figures presented indicate that provided there is adequate wet fish stocks in the area to be fished, which has never been systematically explored so far, the venture will be profitable.

The existing fleet will continue in service and its catch will be used to complement that of the stern trawlers.

654. *This question was postponed.*

BUILDING BLOCKS

Swan Electorate

655. Mr SKIDMORE, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Would he provide a map of the Swan electorate showing thereon all land that is at present held in ownership by the State Housing Commission and is available for development?
- (2) Of the land available for development, has any of it in the last 12 months been sold to private developers?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), what are the names of the private developers who have secured tenure over the said land?
- (4) What is the area of the land involved in any of the transfers?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) It is long-standing policy of the commission, and endorsed by Housing Ministers of both persuasions, that this information is confidential to the commission until such time as plans for development of land are approved by the local authority, and the planning authority.
- (2) to (4) No.

ARMADALE SCHOOLS

Remedial Reading Teachers

656. Mr PEARCE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) (a) Is the remedial reading teacher for Neerigen Brook primary school and other schools in the area who recently resigned to be replaced;
(b) if not, why not?
- (2) How many other remedial teachers have not been replaced this year?
- (3) What replacement support is being given to classroom teachers to compensate for the loss of specialist remedial teachers?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) (a) No.
(b) Staffing has risen from 26 to 29 since February. The extra staff allows, among other things, for a general remediation programme on a continuous basis.
- (2) Three.
- (3) Replacement support is as above. As well, the department has supported a

series of courses during this year to assist classroom teachers to increase their competency in remedial work.

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries by Minister for Fisheries and Fauna

657. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) Has he, at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes", what are the details of each case?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries by Minister for Local Government

658. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has he, at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See answer to (1).

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries by Minister for Health

659. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has he, at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr O'Neil (for Mr RIDGE) replied:

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

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Minister for Agriculture*

660. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr OLD replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Minister for Police and Traffic*

663. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Police and Traffic:

- (1) Has he at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See answer to (1).

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Minister for Transport*

661. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Minister, at any time, caused inquiries to be made directly or indirectly into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

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

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Minister for Labour and Industry*

664. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Has he at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

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

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Attorney-General*

662. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister representing the Attorney-General:

- (1) Has the Minister, at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See (1).

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Minister for Lands*

665. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Has she, at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Premier*

666. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Has he at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

My understanding is this question is inadmissible according to Enskine May. However, as you have allowed it to appear on the notice paper, Mr Speaker, I will answer it.

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

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Minister for Education*

667. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the

activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?

- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

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

TRESILLIAN HOSTEL CONTROVERSY

*Activities of Public Servants: Inquiries
by Minister for Industrial Development*

668. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Has he at any time, caused inquiries to be made, directly or indirectly, into the activities of any public servant in connection with the Tresillian controversy?
- (2) If "Yes" what are the details of each case?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

