

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 3 November 1982

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair at 2.17 p.m., and read prayers.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY: CHAMBER

*Televising: Statement by Speaker*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Thompson): Mr President and I have agreed to a request to film part of the proceedings of our respective Houses. A local production house is compiling two programmes on Parliament, primarily for use by the Education Department in schools throughout the State.

Filming of proceedings in this House will occur on Tuesday, 9 November, during the first hour of sitting, and I trust that members will not suffer any undue inconvenience from the use of lights and equipment in the Chamber.

## HEALTH: TOBACCO

*Smoking: Petition*

**DR DADOUR** (Subiaco) [2.19 p.m.]: I have a petition in the following terms—

TO—THE HONORABLE, THE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THE COUNCIL AT THE PARLIAMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED:

We, the undersigned residents in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will support the Tobacco Products Advertisements Bill now before the Parliament.

Your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition bears 207 signatures and I certify that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

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

(See petition No. 28.)

## ROAD: CLAYTON STREET

*Petition*

**MR GORDON HILL** (Swan) [2.21 p.m.]: I have a petition from 587 citizens of Western Australia which reads as follows—

WE THE UNDERSIGNED CITIZENS OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA EXPRESS

CONCERN ABOUT THE PROPOSAL TO CUL-DE-SAC CLAYTON STREET IN BELLEVUE WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ROE HIGHWAY AND CALL ON THE GOVERNMENT TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE AND TWO-WAY RAMPS AT CLAYTON STREET.

The petition conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly and I have certified accordingly.

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

(See petition No. 29.)

## WATERWAYS CONSERVATION AMENDMENT BILL

*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced without notice, on motion by Mr Laurance (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

## BILLS (6): ASSENT

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

1. Building Societies Amendment Bill.
2. Lotteries (Control) Amendment Bill (No. 2).
3. Acts Amendment (Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme) Bill.
4. Cancer Council of Western Australia Act Repeal Bill.
5. Gas Undertakings Amendment Bill.
6. Dairy Industry Amendment Bill.

## CITY OF PERTH PARKING FACILITIES AMENDMENT BILL

*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Rushton (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**MR RUSHTON** (Dale—Minister for Transport) [2.23 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the City of Perth Parking Facilities Act to provide the City of Perth with the power to permit, with the Minister's consent, the use of car parking facilities by community associations. Members may be aware of the difficulties that arose earlier this year when a certain fund-raising organisation was refused

permission to continue using one of the council's multistoreyed car park facilities for its monthly activities. Council's action was precipitated by legal advice indicating that it did not have the power to allow other organisations to use the facilities.

This Bill is designed to overcome the legal impediment which presently exists in respect of this matter and will allow the council, with the Minister's consent, to permit a wide range of uses of parking facilities by community associations. The measure before the House is simple both in intent and construction and, as was mentioned earlier, it is designed to overcome a particular problem.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr I. F. Taylor.

#### APPROPRIATION (GENERAL LOAN FUND) BILL

##### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 30 September.

**MR BRIAN BURKE** (Balcatta—Leader of the Opposition) [2.24 p.m.]: The General Loan Fund is the second part of the Budget package and, before developing the major theme with which I will deal today, I want to make one or two points that set out the Opposition's attitude towards this package and make clear those areas in which it would be seeking to take a path different from that chosen by the Government.

It may be hackneyed in that it has been used before, but a detailed analysis of the Budget provokes the application of the term "rubbery" to the figures which have been included by the Treasurer. It is clear to us, and it will become clear to all members in this place as we develop this detail today, that the Treasurer would be aptly named "Rubbery Ray".

**Mr O'Connor**: He is on again. You have been misleading in the figures you have given, as I will show later.

**Mr Clarko**: Instead of being a "Slippery Dick", as you are.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: This will be demonstrated quite conclusively to the House today with a few passing examples that people can digest before we look in detail at specific areas.

Let us consider the State Housing Commission. The Treasurer has boasted that the Budget papers show that 800 houses will be built this year.

**Mr O'Connor**: And that is so.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: There is simply not enough money in the Budget to build these houses.

**Mr O'Connor**: The houses will be built.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: Unless the Treasurer is magically to find more than \$3 million in addition to that which was allocated in the Budget, the SHC will not be able to build the houses the Treasurer says will be built this year.

**Mr O'Connor**: As usual, you are wrong again.

**Mr Wilson**: Check with your own Minister's figures.

**Mr O'Connor**: I know the figures.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: The things I want to discuss briefly before dealing with these areas in any substantial way, include the much vaunted speeding up of capital works programmes. This was nothing but a hollow promise—

**Mr O'Connor**: Untrue.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: —when we consider that the amount involved is less than one per cent of the State's capital works programme—less than one per cent will be speeded up. When we last checked, we found that 30 projects will have their tender dates advanced by between four and 12 weeks.

**Mr O'Connor**: Will you deny then that some weeks ago, prior to the announcement being made, I had also said that the department—and several of them—had already speeded up a number of programmes?

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: How can I deny what the Treasurer said he did?

**Mr O'Connor**: You are talking about things you know nothing about, as usual.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: Does the Treasurer know what I had for breakfast this morning?

**Mr O'Connor**: I know you are immature in your attitude.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: I do not know how the Treasurer can honestly expect me to know what he did three or four months ago unless he has told me.

**Mr Pearce**: And that would not be very reliable.

**Mr BRIAN BURKE**: I do not know what the Treasurer did three or four months ago. I suggest that, if the Treasurer wants people to know what he has done, he should inform them; but he should not, after failing to tell them, expect them to know. If today the Treasurer wants to say that three or four months ago he speeded up things, I accept that; but let him not tell me I am at fault for not knowing when he has not told anyone.

Mr O'Connor: Did you ask?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Of course I did not ask; but I did not ask the Treasurer where he went last Sunday or Monday or three weeks ago.

Mr O'Connor: Did you expect me to tell you?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Last Sunday week on the front page of *The Sunday Times* the Treasurer was busting his neck to tell everyone that he was hurrying things up. Because I did not ask him, he now blames me for his not having told people months ago that he was doing this.

Mr O'Connor: You are misleading again, because I did not blame anyone; I asked you a question.

Mr I. F. Taylor: On the run.

Mr O'Connor: From what?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let me mention these two points in brief: Firstly, the SHC allocation of finance will not build the number of houses in this year that the Treasurer says will be built; secondly, the much vaunted speeding up of capital works programmes refers to less than one per cent of the total capital works programme the Treasurer announced—0.7 per cent, according to information provided by the Government in this Chamber.

Mr O'Connor: Is that including or excluding the SEC amount? You are using some of the figures with and some without.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The 0.7 per cent refers to those matters which, in answer to a parliamentary question, the Treasurer said had been speeded up.

I understand that in answer to that question no mention was made of speeding up the SEC pipeline project. Perhaps the Treasurer can say it is being speeded up.

Mr O'Connor: In the other figures you used yesterday—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: They referred to something else.

Mr O'Connor: You have made the point I was trying to make.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The third brief point I make before moving on to develop in detail the information I want to impart to members, is that which the Treasurer has just mentioned. I refer to the capital works programme of the SEC and the Treasurer's boasting about the so-called massive and horrific increase in capital works expenditure. He has not informed the Parliament and the public that if the amount to be spent by the SEC in its capital works programme is deducted from the capital works programme generally, an actual fall

can be seen in the capital works to be carried out in other areas.

Mr O'Connor: That's untrue.

Mr P. V. Jones: That's untrue.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In a moment I will give the detail.

Mr O'Connor: Whether you give details or not, what you say is untrue. It is false, and well you know it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer can say that this is false, but I will prove it is not.

Mr O'Connor: It is false.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What I say is accurate, and I will give the figures to prove that.

Mr O'Connor: You can get up in this House and say anything you like that is false, and get away with it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer is thin-skinned today.

Mr O'Connor: I don't like the people being misinformed.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: All I can do is quote to the Treasurer the figures he used in his Budget speech. He will have the opportunity to reply, and say what he likes in that reply. I suggest that if he replies in the same manner as he did in respect of the Appropriation (Consolidated Revenue Fund) Bill he will find himself in additional trouble.

Mr O'Connor: There was nothing to reply to.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Mr Speaker, I will deal with that in due course, and I will quote back to the Treasurer some of the comments he made. The third point I make is that excluding the capital works programme of the SEC from the overall capital works programme for this year it can be seen that the overall programme has fallen compared with the programme last financial year.

Mr O'Connor: Can I ask you one question? Does that include taking off the SEC programme for this year and for last year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: From where? If the SEC programme is deducted from the present capital works programme, it can be seen—

Mr O'Connor: And leave last year's in there?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes, of course.

Mr O'Connor: Oh, what a joke!

Mr P. V. Jones: What a fraud!

Mr O'Connor: Yes, what a fraud!

Government members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Mr Speaker, the Treasurer is trying very hard and nervously to get out of his predicament, but he must remember

that the SEC did not build a pipeline last year—that is the point. Unless the Government can convince me that it was involved last year in the same extraordinary expenditure as it will be involved in this year, I will admit that both SEC programmes should be withdrawn from both capital works programmes. But the Treasurer would not know, and I will tell members why. If members on that side have any shame they must accept that what the Treasurer said in his Budget speech—

Government members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE:—indicates that what I have said is correct.

Government members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Treasurer and his colleagues want to carry on in this way, very well; but this is what the Treasurer had to say—

Government members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This is what the Treasurer had to say—

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

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will explain why the Treasurer does not understand. The words I will quote are not mine; they are the Treasurer's—the leader of members opposite—in reply to the Budget debate. He said—

The difficulties in the economy, not only in Western Australia, but also throughout the world, ought not to be our priorities. We must try to introduce measures that will benefit everyone in this State and the only way we can do this is by the correct allocation of those funds.

We have this Treasurer who says that the economic disadvantages of the present recession are not the priorities of this Government. How can we expect—

Mr O'Connor: Are you reading from the *Hansard* transcript?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: How can we expect a Treasurer—

Mr O'Connor: He's not even reading from *Hansard*.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Gosh, Mr Treasurer—

Mr O'Connor: This man is a cheat.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I think he must be very worried; he is carrying on like I have never seen him carry on.

Mr O'Connor: I want the correct information to go to the public.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I remind him that he has the right to reply.

Mr O'Connor: Very well, I will.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not think he is helping anyone by carrying on in the way he is.

Mr O'Connor: Certainly I'm not helping you.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Certainly he is not hurting me. If the economic difficulties facing our economy and the economy of the world generally are not to be addressed by this Government, what will it address?

The fourth point is that despite the high-flown claims of this Treasurer and his Government generally about the creation of jobs in this State, it must be remembered that many of the capital works programme items include large amounts for the purchase of machinery. In particular, the expenditure by the SEC in respect of the pipeline only involves an amount of \$894 million to be exported at once overseas to buy pipe from another country thereby providing jobs in that country.

Mr MacKinnon: What about what I asked you yesterday?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Of the amount to be expended on the project 24 per cent will be exported overseas to create work overseas. The Government tenders the Budget as a job-creating Budget of great marvel, but the Treasurer, on his own admission, indicates he does not know how many jobs will be created, and we have no precise and intelligent idea of what the Government will do. The Government does not seem to have a clue as to how to address precisely or intelligently the difficulties facing the economy. I am not surprised at that because the Treasurer says it is not his job to do so; he does not think he should have amongst his priorities the responsibility of addressing these difficult economic circumstances.

Mr Rushton: You are a boy on a man's errand.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As far as we are concerned, the Budget demonstrates one thing conclusively, and that is this: When we asked the Treasurer earlier about what set of relativities best suited this State, and he said, "All of them", we assumed he had made a mistake.

Mr O'Connor: I assumed you had made a mistake, which you had, and you admitted that later. You didn't know what you were talking about.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I really am trying to make my speech. As I have said twice already, the Treasurer can reply if he wants to.

Mr O'Connor: How about being honest with your speech? Look, be honest.

Mr Pearce: You are getting very close to the unparliamentary wing, and that is a clear reflection on your members.

Mr O'Connor: You must have taught me something.

Mr Tonkin: There is not much point in taking a point of order because probably it would be disallowed.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am comforted by the Treasurer's reaction; that sort of irrationality does not go to good debate in this place, and does not show him up in a good light. If he wants to carry on in this way I will stop for his interruptions.

When we some months ago disputed that the Treasurer had a grasp of economics and financial relationships, and said that he in fact had a loose grasp of those matters, we thought that perhaps we were mistaken and he had simply misunderstood the question. However, *Hansard* nine months further on is replete with examples that demonstrate conclusively he knows nothing about financial relationships between the Commonwealth and the State, he does not understand economics, and he is making a ham-fisted attempt at combating problems which he in general fails to recognise or define.

Mr Laurance: That will rebound on you like it did the other day.

Mr O'Connor: He got it back very quickly.

Mr Laurance: Every time you have tried to lay a charge on the Treasurer it has rebounded on you, and shown your shortcomings. You are large in weight, but have nothing in depth.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I certainly am happy to proceed with the interjections of the Treasurer and his Ministers; those interjections do not worry me one inch. It is of no concern to me that these people carry on in the way they do; I will say what I want to say. If the Ministers want to speak they can rise to do so, and if the Treasurer wants to reply he can do so. However, they will not deter me from saying what I want to say. I repeat that it was clear from earlier answers given by the Treasurer that he was having considerable difficulty understanding Commonwealth-State financial relationships.

Mr O'Connor: I have no problems with them at all. That was an idiotic question.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We then went on to see built up in *Hansard*, example after example of crassness by the Treasurer to a degree that made his own back-benchers squirm when he spoke about a devaluation and about the SEC operating through the CRF. When he said that the differ-

ence between a five and 10 per cent devaluation was twice the State Budget—

Mr O'Connor: It could be.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: He said all those things and had really no intelligent appreciation of them or of the situation.

Mr O'Connor: I want to look at some of the questions you asked. They are so inane it is difficult to understand them.

Mr Laurance: What he really means is that he is not intelligent enough to understand them.

Mr O'Connor: That is right.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We are attempting to demonstrate that the Treasurer has to make up his mind in respect of financial matters if we are to address seriously the difficulties facing the community.

Mr O'Connor: This community is going well under its present leadership.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We will demonstrate precisely and with reference to detail those areas in which the Treasurer really has not made the average in terms of parliamentary questions or of his own speeches in this place.

Mr MacKinnon: Will you now give us your ideas? No!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We want also to point out to the community that this Budget marks a new low in terms of the Budget being seen and used as an economic or fiscal tool. If the Treasurer is happy to say that the economic difficulties besetting the community are not his priorities, we say they would be ours. If the Treasurer is happy to say that the Budget is simply a matter of directing money from one area to another, we say that is not our conception of it.

Mr O'Connor: On what page of *Hansard* did I make that comment? You obviously have it there.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have it here and I will get to it as I develop my points in detail.

Mr O'Connor: Thank you.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I repeat that if the Treasurer wants to say that he views the Budget simply as a tool that involves shifting money from one area to another, that is not our view.

Mr O'Connor: Priorities are important.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is time the Treasurer started firstly to identify the economic difficulties that he says should not be the priorities of the Budget, and it is time he started to try to do something about them. I do not know whether the Treasurer is aware of it, but there is great suffering in the community. I was told today that Chamberlain Holdings Ltd. has announced it is

retrenching 290 workers. While it does that, this Treasurer displays an ignorance about financial management and affairs and says that economic difficulties are not the priorities of his Budget.

Mr O'Connor: What page of *Hansard* is that again? I want to ensure you are not misquoting me.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: So long as that attitude persists, we will not come out of this present trough.

Mr O'Connor: On what page of *Hansard* is it, please?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I said to the Treasurer before that, as I go through and develop my argument, I will give him the reference.

Mr P. V. Jones: He has not got it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Minister for Resources Development says I have not got it; that is up to him. I will not be told when to give references to the Treasurer. He cannot remember what he said.

Mr Wilson: Let him check himself.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Why should I have to give him the reference?

Mr O'Connor: I want to make sure I am not being misquoted.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In due course, when I come to that part of my speech, I will give the Treasurer the reference. The Budget marks a new low in the inability of the Government, firstly, to recognise the difficulties confronting the economy of this State, and, secondly, to make sure that the solutions or the search for the solutions to those difficulties are the priorities which the Budget addresses.

In brief, the Government touts the Budget as a job creator—it is not that—and the Government really does not come to grips with the problems that we are confronting. One of the first priorities of a Labor Government would be a complete and comprehensive review of State Government taxes and charges. Secondly, we would set about renegotiating Commonwealth-State financial relationships so that what emerged took the form of a negotiated financial contract and that that security and predictability underpinned our efforts to ensure that recovery occurred.

We would also seriously set about the task of trying to find a replacement or a substitute or to achieve the abolition of payroll tax. We would be restructuring the Budget. The Budget proposed would take into account all those efficiency problems to which I have referred previously. We would be pursuing policies and priorities that exist

as the fundamental holy grail in the pursuit of economic growth.

Mr O'Connor: Where would you get the money to pay for your election promises or the promises you made? Where would you get the money for this?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let us go into some detail in the areas to which I have briefly referred. At the end of 1982-83, receipts and expenditure will total \$3 367.3 million, \$2 335.5 million of which will be in the CRF and \$1 021.8 million in the capital works programme. We see the Budget as a test of the Treasurer's initiative and ability as an economic and financial manager. We also see the Budget as being a guide to economic priorities and directions. On the second of those two criteria, the Treasurer said he does not believe that those difficulties and those new directions are the priorities to which the Budget should address itself.

Mr O'Connor: Inaccurate again. I said priorities were of importance to us, and the Leader of the Opposition knows that because he said it a while ago.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In his reply to the Budget, the Treasurer said that the economic difficulties confronting us were not amongst the Government's priorities, and we say that they would be amongst our priorities.

Mr O'Connor: I am waiting for you to let me have that page number.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: As far as the Budget reply delivered by the Treasurer is concerned—and I will deal with that only briefly—it demonstrated an abysmal understanding of taxation matters and it also demonstrated wild and inaccurate criticism of the Opposition's position, the sort of wild and irresponsible criticism the Treasurer indulges in when he is under pressure, as he was today, and when we saw the same sort of spontaneous reaction.

We suggest that the Treasurer has been responsible on this occasion for bringing down a Budget which is a bookkeeping exercise, lacks economic leadership, and fails to address economic difficulties.

Mr MacKinnon: Can you present an alternative?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Budget fails to institute tax recovery. Let us look in detail at the capital works programme.

Mr MacKinnon: Can you suggest an alternative?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Bill seeks \$161.1 million for the purposes of the estimates and ex-

penditure that will be found in the General Loan Fund. The General Loan Fund moneys come from two sources; firstly, they come from the general purpose borrowings and the capital grants approved by the Loan Council and, in addition specific purposes grants for capital purposes. The notable feature of the capital works programme on this occasion is the change in the source of spending that will be taken into account in the capital works programme. The change in the source of the spending mirrors the lack of success of this Treasurer and his predecessor in dealing with the Commonwealth Government.

In 1975-76, 38.2 per cent of this funding came from State sources and in 1982-83 that percentage had increased to 80 per cent. The change in the nature of the funding reflects on that change in source, because as the State has shouldered a much greater burden of the funding of the capital works programme, so, too, we have seen an increase in the borrowings for which we are liable. In 1975-76, 35.3 per cent of the funds came from borrowings. In 1982-83, that percentage had increased to 53 per cent. As we would expect, a massive and corresponding cutback has occurred in Commonwealth funding. In 1975-76 Commonwealth funding amounted to 61.8 per cent of the total. In 1982-83 the percentage was just 19.4 per cent.

General and specific purpose funding has fallen in constant dollars from \$438.7 million in 1975-76 to \$197.4 million in 1982-83. So, during this period of Liberal Governments in this State, despite the fact that in Canberra there has been a Government of the same political complexion—political brothers of the State Government, they work together—we see the cutback in constant dollar terms to be \$241.3 million. That is a dismal performance by anyone's standards.

Mr MacKinnon: Do you think we should tie ourselves much closer to the Federal Government's funding?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not think this Government could tie itself much closer to the Federal Government. This Government is recognised as being amongst the strongest supporters of the Federal Government's economic policy.

Mr Pearce: The only supporter.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer has said constantly that he supports the Fraser Government's economic policies and the Liberal Party in this State has never taken exception to what the Fraser Government does, except the matter concerning the margin in the cost of tax avoidance.

If one wishes to be seen to be different from the Fraser Government, one must sound different and

say things in a way different from the way in which things are said by that Government. However, this Government does not.

This State Government is wedded to Fraser's economic policy, a policy which is sending this country down the drain. This State Government supports that policy.

I wish to address myself to the composition of the capital works programme. In 1981-82 the capital works programme totalled \$672.1 million. This financial year the capital works programme outlined by the Treasurer totalled \$1 021.8 million; that is, an increase of \$349.1 million, or 52 per cent.

If we look specifically at the composition of the State Energy Commission and understand that in 1981-82 its capital works programme amounted to \$201.6 million, and note that in 1982-83 the capital works programme announced is \$597.9 million, we realise that that is an increase of \$378.3 million, or 196.6 per cent.

What I have demonstrated is that, firstly, in terms of comparison with the situation last year, the capital works programme has increased by 52 per cent. That is part of the capital works programme which outlines the works to be undertaken by the SEC and it has increased by 196.6 per cent. The large part of that increase in the SEC activities is represented by the \$400 million which is devoted to the Dampier to Perth pipeline.

That is an extraordinary expenditure that quite properly could be considered in isolation—not downgraded or criticised, but considered in isolation—to obtain a picture of what the remaining capital works programme comprises. Let us do that exercise. Let us take the SEC expenditure from the capital works programme.

Mr O'Connor: For one year and not the other.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Not for one year and not the other! I am getting very short-tempered with the Treasurer, because it is not my job to do what a primary school teacher should have done. I am willing to take the Treasurer, step by step, through the whole process for his illumination. I suggest he should write down the figures.

Mr O'Connor: Before you start, do not take off one year and not the other.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am taking off the SEC expenditure for the Treasurer's illumination.

Mr O'Connor: I asked the question because what you stated is contrary to what you said before.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am doing what the Treasurer thought it was important to do. Can the Treasurer understand that?

Mr O'Connor: Yes, I can.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In 1981-82, take off the SEC because that is what the Treasurer thought should be done, and the capital works programme is \$470.5 million. In 1982-83, take \$597.9 million that the SEC is spending for the capital works programme from the total of \$1 021.8 million to get \$432.9 million.

Mr O'Connor: The total programme in 1981-82 was \$561.3 million less the State Energy Commission figure of \$201.6 million, leaving a balance of \$359.6 million.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer is making it worse for himself.

Mr O'Connor: In 1982-83, the figure was \$1 021.8 million and if we deduct the SEC figure of \$597.9 million it leaves a balance of \$423.8 million.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer is making it worse for himself, but I was erring on the side of generosity.

Mr O'Connor: You were doing nothing of the kind.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let us first consider the 1981-82 capital works programme figure—

Mr O'Connor: For the total programme, \$561.3 million.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I gave the Treasurer the figure of \$672.1 million.

Mr O'Connor: I said it was incorrect.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Can the Treasurer understand that he will be spending much less than I am claiming?

Mr O'Connor: Yes, I can.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am happy to use the Treasurer's figures if he wants, but we believe our figures are correct. Our figures are more charitable to the Treasurer.

Mr O'Connor: You are wrong again.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Last year the capital works programme was \$470.5 million, and the Treasurer said it was \$359.6 million. I do not think the Treasurer follows.

Mr O'Connor: Yes, I do.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am putting in the Treasurer's figures as well.

Mr O'Connor: I understand.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let us go to 1982-83 where we say the capital works programme is \$1 021.8 million.

Mr O'Connor: Right.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If we say the SEC expenditure is \$597.9 million—

Mr O'Connor: Correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE —and, if we take one from the other, we get \$432.9 million.

Mr O'Connor: Your figures are wrong.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes, they were; it should be \$423.9 million. On the Treasurer's figures we are saying there has been a decrease in real terms of \$110 million in the capital works programme, but the decrease is much greater.

Mr O'Connor: There has been an increase this year.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We have taken off the SEC expenditure of last year, \$359.6 million.

Mr O'Connor: \$1 423 million happens to be an increase.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am talking in real terms.

Mr O'Connor: Were your figures in real terms?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: These are the figures we have and the Treasurer may reply at a later stage if he wants to.

In 1981-82, excluding State Energy Commission expenditure, the capital works programme was \$470.5 million. In 1982-83 the same figure, excluding the SEC once more, was \$423.9 million in real terms. I tried to explain to the Treasurer that if we use his figures there is a greater difference.

Mr O'Connor: You just admitted that your figures were wrong.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The difference is greater and, in fact, the \$110 million less in real terms becomes bigger than \$110 million. The point we are making, leaving the Treasurer's figures alone, is that in real terms, excluding the SEC, the decrease in capital works expenditure is \$110 million or 23.4 per cent.

Apart from the SEC, we are spending less on our capital works programme and I will tell the Treasurer where we are spending less. These are the areas of reduction in the capital works programme: Capital expenditure in Westrail is to be decreased in real dollars by \$18.3 million; capital expenditure on hospitals is to be decreased in real terms by \$7 million; capital expenditure in the area of technical education is to be decreased in real terms by \$4.4 million.

Mr Rushton: You need to look at the whole issue. You are putting forward a false impression in relation to Westrail.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The capital expenditure figures shown in the Budget indicate reductions in



these vital areas and I will go through them again as the Minister for Transport leaves the House. In Westrail, the reduction in capital expenditure is \$18.3 million; in hospitals, the reduction is \$7 million; in technical education, the reduction is \$4.4 million; in marine and harbour works, the reduction is \$1.2 million; and the Minister for Water Resources can rest assured his department has been cut back by only \$3.1 million.

What we have tried to demonstrate to the Treasurer is the massive accommodation which is having to be made within this State's economy for the North-West Shelf project. That is all we have tried to do—to explain about the diversion of resources and the fact that funds are being taken away from vital areas. It may well be beyond the Treasurer's comprehension, but—

Mr O'Connor: You keep on, don't you?

Mr BRIAN BURKE:—one cannot take out of the economy an amount of \$597 million and expect that money to be made available in other important areas. What we are saying is that the North-West Shelf project is distorting the economy of this State. That still may not mean the project is desirable or undesirable, but the exact form of the capital works programme, is something of which the Treasurer needs to be aware and to which he should pay some attention when explaining the situation. For him to say we have a massive capital works programme and not to explain that, apart from the one area of expenditure, it is actually a reduction across other vital areas, is not being as straightforward as he should be.

I refer now to the State Housing Commission and I am glad to see the Minister for Housing is present because he can confirm the situation. After the Treasurer had said that the building programme for 1982-83 was to build 800 houses, and other Budget papers said that 800 houses would be built, the Minister for Housing said that \$4 million would be made available to build 250 purchase homes with the average cost being \$21 250 excluding land.

Simple arithmetic indicates that as many homes as promised cannot be built with that amount of money. In fact, only 188 homes can be built from the money available; that statement is based on the money which the Treasurer says is available and the average price the Minister says it costs to build the houses.

Members need to look at the way the Treasurer, the State Housing Commission, and the Minister for Housing programme their buildings. What would they find? When they look at the way in which the new SHC purchase homes are programmed, they will find that the homes

will not be built in one year at all. They will not be built in the year in which the Treasurer said they will be built. In fact, the SHC informs us that the houses will not be completed at the end of the financial year and that is how the Government can build those homes with less money than it takes.

Mr O'Connor: What about those homes that were started last year and completed this year?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is true; I do not deny the existence of those homes, but it is dishonest for the Government to say that it will build 800 homes this year. The fact is that not enough money has been made available and in addition the SHC confirms that the houses will not be completed this year.

Mr Shalders: Are you saying the SHC will not complete 800 homes this year?

Mr Wilson: Not according to your figures.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What I am saying is that the SHC does not have in the figures announced by the Treasurer sufficient funds to build 250 purchase homes that he said would be built this year. Further, the Budget papers indicated that the homes would be constructed this year.

The SHC's normal practice, as confirmed by the Treasurer's interjection when he said, "What about those started last year and completed this year", is that a certain number of houses will be left uncompleted at the end of the financial year. It is simply not true to say that 250 purchase homes will be built this year.

Mr Mensaros: The connotation of the word "built" does not necessarily mean "completed".

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let me put to the House this position. The Minister for Water Resources now tries to draw the difference between "built" and "completed". The Treasurer said that 800 houses will be built this year.

Mr O'Connor: Does that mean completed? I want to try to find out what you are trying to misconstrue now.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I understand, when the Treasurer says 800 homes will be built this year, that they will be built—not half finished, or three-quarters finished, but completed. That is my understanding. If they can be completed, and I am not saying they cannot be, the Government will have to find more money than the Treasurer says is required to build the homes and more money than he says has been made available for purchase homes. The Minister says that \$400 million has been made available to build 250 purchase homes. We have demonstrated that for that amount of money, using the average cost of con-

struction the Minister uses, only 188 homes can be built. This means that 62 homes will be left unstarted if the other homes are paid for completely. It also could mean far more than 62 homes will be left uncompleted because it could be that 100, 200, or 150 homes—all part of the original 250—are completed to a certain stage, but not paid for completely. That is the situation. If ever I have heard of rubbery figures this is a perfect example of them.

The Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for Housing have been caught out building houses for which money was not made available in the Budget. They are forced to rely, for the difference, on the weak claim that when the Government says it is going to build 800 houses, it is not to say it is going to complete them! In addition to that, let us compound that dereliction—

Mr Shalders: They'll be built.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —with the Premier's own much vaunted policy of speeding up the capital works programme. He said, "We are going to speed everything up", but he cannot even complete this number of houses. How can he speed them up if money is not there for them to be completed this year?

I urge the Government to make more money available from another source, to fund the amount required to complete what was promised to the people of this State—the 250 purchase homes that the Treasurer said would be provided in the Budget.

If that was not bad enough, the Treasurer and the Minister for Housing compound the problem when they talk about building 425 rental units. The Minister for Housing, when asked about the amount of money made available to build this number, said that \$12.2 million would be made available, and he went on to say that the average cost would be \$37 526 per unit. Simple arithmetic once again shows clearly that the Government cannot build 425 rental units costing that much each for the amount of money the Minister says is available. In fact, instead of 425 family rental units, that amount of money will build 325. So there is another 100 houses that will remain unstarted if the 325 are paid for.

Mr Wilson: What a rot!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: But if they are not paid for, and if a start is made on the whole 425 houses, it will mean that perhaps as many as 200 houses are left unfinished.

The Treasurer was keen to say so much previously, but I wonder how he explains away these rubbery figures that allow fewer homes to be built than he stated would be built when he delivered

the Budget. It is simply not acceptable to the Opposition for the Treasurer to say, "What about the houses left over from last year?" I am sure that if the Treasurer had thought of them earlier, he would have added them to the 800 to make the total higher still.

I want to talk briefly about the State Energy Commission's programme, and to sound a note of serious warning to members in this place. The SEC borrowing programme and its financial management are leading this State into perilous waters.

Mr Sibson: What about New South Wales?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The alarm bells are ringing loud and clear, if members on the Government side of the House would only take the trouble to try to listen. The signs are spelt out very clearly in the detail of this Budget and in the vast programme which the SEC is undertaking in doubtful and shaky circumstances in terms of its commitment to the North-West Shelf. The SEC is plunging this State into massive indebtedness, and it is being quite clearly seen that a massive accommodation is needed to allow the North-West Shelf gas project to proceed.

Let us look at the programme of the SEC. It is for \$597.9 million; that is, 60 per cent of the total capital works programme. Of that 60 per cent of the total programme, \$400 million will be accounted for in private and public borrowings. What sort of a financial millstone is the SEC hanging around the neck of this State?

As I said previously, it is clear that the SEC is leading this State into perilous financial waters. The biggest component of that \$597.9 million capital works programme to be undertaken by the SEC is the \$350 million allocated in this Budget to the Dampier to Perth pipeline. I understand that the SEC has allocated 70 million cubic feet per day of natural gas to be sold to the Pilbara—none of which, or precious little of which, I understand so far has been sold.

Mr P. V. Jones: Which do you understand?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: For the Minister's benefit, perhaps he can tell us—

Mr P. V. Jones: You said "none or precious little". Which do you mean?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am prepared to say that precious little has been sold.

Mr P. V. Jones: That is different from none.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Minister is prepared to say more than that has been sold, I am prepared to give him the chance to interject to tell us about it.

Mr Pearce: Sudden silence!

Mr P. V. Jones: I'll tell you about the SEC and where your figures are wrong. You keep going.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am willing to let the Minister interject to say we have sold more of this gas.

Mr P. V. Jones: I am going to tell you what the SEC is doing.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Minister is so keen to tell us about the SEC; if he wants to answer my question, I will give him the opportunity. However, if he wants to prattle on, he can do that in his own time!

The massive accommodation is something to which I have referred, as I have referred to the massive part of the capital works programme that is constituted by the Dampier to Perth pipeline. Seventy million cubic feet are to be sold in the Pilbara and precious little has been sold; 314 million cubic feet are to be sold to the SEC's other customers in the south-west and to date 157 million cubic feet are contracted for by Alcoa of Australia Ltd., and most of the rest is unsold.

That is the situation in respect of the gas, and that is bad enough. However, we must consider also the financial burden of the Dampier to Perth pipeline—I understand the added burden that it imposes on the community is absolutely frightening.

In addition to the commitment for the gas that the SEC has undertaken, there is a commitment to the pipeline, and that commitment is serviced according to the gas that is sold. So the frightening situation in which the SEC finds itself is amplified and compounded because it will have so much extra gas on its hands. It is facing also the problem of servicing the massive cost of the pipeline, knowing that it will operate at about 55 or 60 per cent of capacity if present projections are correct.

Mr Sibson: I'll bet Nifty Neville would like to hear you say that!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If it is true that the cost of the pipeline is to be serviced by the addition of a certain amount of money to the cost of the gas piped from Dampier to Perth, let the Minister explain how much this State will have to find unless this Government gets off its backside and starts to show some leadership.

It is an absolutely frightening prospect to understand that in 1982 the SEC is leading this Government by the nose into a situation such as the one I have outlined. In passing, I have stated previously, that of the \$350 million allocated for the Dampier to Perth pipeline, \$84 million

straight off the top goes overseas to pay for the pipe; that is, more than 23 per cent of the total.

Mr Trethowan: Would you have had the pipe made in Western Australia?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I suspect that since, under this Government's administration, BHP has almost completely left the State, it would not be possible. Certainly I would like to know the details of the money spent on that project.

Mr P. V. Jones: You should know that BHP did not even tender. How is that?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The capital works and employment programme—

Mr Sibson: He is not interested in that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am interested in listening to the Minister's reply, but he is very selective. Can he tell me how much of the gas devoted to the Pilbara we have sold?

Mr P. V. Jones: Just a minute—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Do not "just a minute". If it is good enough for the Minister—

Mr P. V. Jones: You just made a comment about the pipeline, which was wrong.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What was the wrong comment I made?

Mr P. V. Jones: You selectively suggested the proportion of the work that went overseas—you implied that work could have been carried out by an Australian firm. I just want to tell you that never at any time did BHP even tender.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not contradict what the Minister says; but I do say that if that is true, it is certainly not satisfactory to say, with this amount of money that will create all this work, we will set about this expenditure by implication in this State. The Minister has an obligation to say, about that expenditure, that it will not create work in Western Australia.

Mr P. V. Jones: What about the Steel Mains job? Do we not get credit for that?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I make the point again that it will not employ Western Australian or Australian workers directly.

Mr P. V. Jones: Yes, it will. Steel Mains are rolling the pipe.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The expenditure of the \$84 million paid to overseas pipe manufacturers will not directly create work in this State. Having heard the Minister's interjection, I ask him—

Mr P. V. Jones: That is not true.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —how much of the gas devoted to the Pilbara has been sold?

Mr P. V. Jones: Your other statement is not true, because we bought—

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Minister will not answer the question.

Mr P. V. Jones: I will answer your other question. You made a comment by saying that 73 million cubic feet has to be sold in the Pilbara. That is not true.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I did not say it has to be sold. I said it has been devoted to the Pilbara. They were the words I used.

Mr P. V. Jones: Okay, you used the words. It does not have to be devoted to the Pilbara. This State gave an allocation for use in the Pilbara; but it could be used even in the south-west.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If we could not sell it in the south-west and they had an excess of 100 million cubic feet, the question still remains: How much of that allocation set aside for the Pilbara has been sold?

Mr P. V. Jones: I would rather give you the other figure.

Mr Wilson: Yes, of course.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let us move on. Capital works and employment relate to the area in which we saw one of the Treasurer's better efforts—in two weeks, two different policies. The first policy was a bringing forward of the capital works programme. We already have seen that that was a bit funny. The second policy was the 10-point plan, and that really was a quite outstanding effort.

However, let us look firstly at the bringing forward of the capital works programme. I admit, in essence, that is quite a sensible thing to do. I would not deny it is something that we should look at. However, when we consider what was actually achieved, we realise that the whole idea smacks more of a publicity stunt than it does of anything seriously intended to create extra employment or earlier employment.

This information was provided to the Opposition in answer to parliamentary questions. We were told, firstly, that 30 projects were the subject of the advancement of tender dates involving between four and 12 weeks. We were told that the tender dates of 15 projects were advanced by four weeks. We were told that the total value of the projects affected was \$6.8 million, or 0.7 per cent of the capital works programme. We were told that the average value of each project was \$226 000. We were told that in the metropolitan area—the area of most concentrated unemployment—only 13 projects were involved and they totalled, in value, \$1.4 million. We were told also

that in many of the projects, the big amounts involved the purchase of equipment.

The information provided by the Government does not define a massive spur to earlier employment or extra employment, as the Treasurer implied, and indicated more directly than implication, was about to take place. Today, when the Treasurer was confronted with that information, we heard him saying, "Do you know that I did that a few months ago—a similar thing and brought things forward?" Of course we did not know, and we were not to know. However, two weeks ago—not two months ago or three months ago—the Treasurer boasted about this massive advancement of the capital works programme when it really was not massive and when it really was disappointing in its scope. As has been outlined, certainly it does not amount to the provision of earlier jobs in any substantial or real sense.

For the 5 000 workers in the building and construction industry who are unemployed, there is no significant impact in the metropolitan area of the expenditure 12 weeks earlier of the sum of \$1.4 million which was originally intended. It seems to us that the 6 000 unemployed people in the wholesale and retail trade will not be affected directly by the Government's advancing an insignificant part of the capital works programme—less than one per cent of the total expenditure—by a period of between four and 12 weeks. It will not help the 7 000 people unemployed in the manufacturing industry, and the 19 300 unemployed young people who are aged between 15 and 19 years. This terrific job provocation or creation programme will not even replace the jobs lost in the last 12 months. We have said consistently, and we say again, that we need to target employment creation measures in a strategic way to maximise employment opportunities.

Mr Sibson: Those fancy words won't create employment.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This imprecise, haphazard approach does not reach the areas where the problems arise. There is no precision of effort and nothing that appears to indicate that in certain areas the Government will create jobs because that is where the unemployment is.

The Treasurer really has no idea where the jobs will be created. He said as much himself. Apart from bricklayers, plumbers, and electricians, he said, "I don't know how many jobs \$1 000 million will provide."

Mr O'Connor: Well, you tell me how it will work.

Mr Brian Burke: I have no idea. It is not even \$100 million.

Mr O'Connor: How much will \$25 million provide? How many jobs?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have no idea.

Mr O'Connor: Which is exactly as I said. I agree with what you said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer does not appear to understand that I am saying it is not even \$1 000 million that the Government would pay for imports. I am sure the Acting Speaker (Mr Watt) agrees with me that a lot of the \$1 000 million has been used to pay for imports; but it is not \$1 000 million.

Mr O'Connor: It is not misleading to say I do not know how many jobs it will provide.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is not what the Treasurer said. In *The Sunday Times* of 24 October, when he was asked how many jobs \$1 000 million would provide—

Mr O'Connor: Correct, and neither do you.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is not \$1 000 million.

Mr Wilson: He is paying for imports.

Mr Pearce: You are creating jobs overseas. That is what you are doing.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Anyway, I have pursued that question far enough.

Mr O'Connor: Will you quote me the page out of *Hansard*?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes. I will come to that. We have time.

Let me make my point again. In *The Sunday Times*, the Treasurer made the following comment—

I don't know how many jobs \$1 000 million will provide but it should provide a lot of work for bricklayers, plumbers and electricians.

What we have said is that \$1 000 million simply does not stand up as a figure. In large part, as illustrated by the pipeline from Dampier to Perth, the \$1 000 million will pay for imported materials.

Mr Sibson: That is ever such.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It may be "ever such", but the Treasurer apparently did not know when he said that. Why did he say that if he knew?

Mr Sibson: It will still create jobs.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes, in Korea.

Then we have the *piece de resistance* of the Treasurer's employment-producing plans. This is his new plan—employment production mark II.

The Treasurer suggests that employers, firstly, should accept that past profit levels are unable to be maintained; secondly, should be frank when dealing with employees; thirdly, should try to maximise productivity in marketing; fourthly, should give special thought for maintaining breadwinners; finally, should look at ways of expanding sales and cutting costs before retrenching workers.

Conversely, we also have as part of this employment-producing package, some advice for employees. The Treasurer suggests employees should co-operate with plans to improve productivity; should modify wage demands; should approach negotiations with employers openly; and should avoid strike action and work bans. I do not know anyone who would not say that approach is oversimplistic.

Mr Rushton: Is your objective in making this presentation to destroy opportunities for Western Australians or just for political gain?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is for neither of those reasons. Which members on the Government benches would claim ownership of an employment plan like that? Where are the jobs in that sort of programme? If those businesses were not already doing those things, they would be out of business or unemployed or both.

What sort of announcement is it to say, "Be frank when dealing with employees?" Who would deny that? I could add another 10 points such as: We should start the day with a prayer; we should all be honest and kind to each other; and we should be good to our grandmothers. That is the sort of nonsense one finds in that employment programme.

The second employment programme shows the Treasurer is not to be taken seriously when he does not stop to think about the sorts of public statements he makes in respect of employment. It is clear he has a poor understanding of labour market economies and does not seem to understand that maximising labour productivity will not of itself stop unemployment increasing in this country. The Treasurer seems to think the solution to the problem is simply to maximise productivity. He does not have any apparent notion of demand in the marketplace itself or of competition—

Mr Trethowan: Don't you believe that increasing productivity creates wealth which, in turn, makes the community better off and generates employment?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In certain circumstances, that might be true, and that is one of the resources which, if used most efficiently, can con-

tribute to increased wealth. What does the member for East Melville think about the employment programme?

Mr Trethowan: I wonder what you think of it. You are either knocking it and saying it is irrelevant and not workable, or you are saying it is a truism. Are you saying you do not agree with it?

Mr Wilson: You aren't saying much.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for East Melville is not saying much at all. As an employment programme, it really is not worth much.

Mr Trethowan: I think it will get to the nub of the issue.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for East Melville is incredible!

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am glad the member for East Melville seems to think it gets to the nub of things. It is a load of nonsense. We do not disagree with it; we are happy that people should be frank with each other and should try to increase productivity, but what sort of economic strategy has that as an employment programme?

Mr Rushton: But it is spelt out in relation to human beings being involved.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In all circles in which I have mixed in the last week or so, it has been treated with a great deal of mirth.

Mr Trethowan: I can quite understand that, because it promotes co-operation and restraint rather than attack and disruption.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for East Melville would be interested to know that most of the circles in which I have been mixing support the Government.

Mr Sibson: We know that!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This was not taken seriously by anyone.

Mr Trethowan: I understood that, in your Budget speech, you were promoting many of those values.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: But I was not promoting those values as an employment programme; that is the point I am trying to make and which seems to escape the member for East Melville. If one intends to promote an employment programme, one needs to look further than merely shallow rhetoric such as those points contain.

My speech on the Budget dealt with many of those matters, but it was not an employment programme. This employment programme is a statement of motherhood and it contains no detail.

Mr Trethowan: I thought you were disagreeing with it.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I said that it was oversimplistic and if that is to be regarded as an employment programme, it is difficult to take the Treasurer seriously.

Mr Pearce: It will not create any jobs, that is why.

Mr Trethowan: I believe it will create jobs. It will create co-operation and you will get better productivity.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Oh yes!

Mr Rushton: You don't understand private enterprise.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I would hate to argue, as does the member for East Melville, with concepts of which I was not convinced.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I said that the Treasurer had a very poor understanding of labour market economics and seemed to think that maximising labour productivity solved employment problems.

Mr Sibson: It will help.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is simply it; it may be something which assists, but it cannot be said that it is a total programme.

Mr Sibson: No-one said it was.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer illustrates consistently that, in the totality of his mind, that is the programme.

Mr Rushton: Your understanding is very limited when you have to go to our supporters to get their advice. You go to transport people to get your policy.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I thought the Minister for Transport would be pleased that we went to people in the industry for advice.

Mr Rushton: I am not disagreeing with that point, but it just shows you have nothing of your own.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know where the Minister for Transport goes for his advice; I would say that perhaps he goes to the member for Bunbury.

Mr Sibson interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Let me move on from the point that it is simply not true to say that maximising productivity solves the unemployment problem. The Treasurer failed to understand in anything that he said that, as of today, sectors of

the labour market are seriously depressed; for example, in the 15 to 19 years age group, a total of 19 300 young people are unemployed and yet the Treasurer shows no sign of understanding that that sector of the labour market is extremely depressed. A total of 20 per cent of those eligible to work in that sector are unemployed.

Mr Sibson: There is a great deal of pressure and much of that pressure comes from demands for more wages. Even the kids themselves accept that. The kids and the workers themselves know it is the high pressure for greater wages.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The two employment policies announced by the Treasurer were really *ad hoc* efforts. I do not think anyone would maintain that the two policies brought out within two weeks of each other, both of them very shallow efforts at attacking a serious problem, were anything more than *ad hoc* responses to political difficulties.

The second employment programme—the 10-point plan—was really extremely shallow. It showed no understanding of the problem. The first employment programme—the advancing of less than one per cent of the capital works programme of this State—was something which the Treasurer could profitably do. However, I do not believe it amounted to what he claimed for it which was the magical creation of jobs earlier than they would normally be available, and, somehow, the creation of more jobs.

I shall spend a few moments talking about the Treasurer as a financial manager. After holding the position of Treasurer for approximately 11 months it is clear that the present incumbent does not have a firm grasp of financial management and I shall attempt to demonstrate that to the House.

Mr Rushton: Would not you agree that your advisers should have said that personal attacks don't give you much benefit? It will put egg back on your face.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: On today's effort, the Treasurer has been particularly hard on me while I have not really responded to his interjections.

Mr O'Connor: Wait till I get up and reply.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am perfectly happy to mix it with the Treasurer; we will have no problem there.

But let us return to the fundamental problem which is that the Treasurer is a poor financial manager. He does not have a good understanding of the financial management of this State; more particularly he does not display any idea of know-

ing where we are heading or the path along which we are travelling.

I refer firstly to the question of the suggested devaluation. I accept there will be those people who would argue for and those who would argue against a devaluation at this time. It would certainly assist those industries where we operate efficiently at the present time and would be a great boon for primary industries; but I can accept there may be people who, for a number of reasons associated with the cost of imports and other things such as the repatriation of debts, would maintain that a devaluation is something we should think about seriously.

Let us consider what the Treasurer had to say as reported in *The West Australian* of 18 October—

Firstly, the State Government can do nothing about devaluing the dollar.

I agree with that, although I should qualify my agreement by saying the State Government can do something about enunciating policies which are desirable and by seeking Federal Government implementation of those policies. The Treasurer is not quite correct to say he can do nothing about it. He then said—

Secondly, the difference between devaluation by 5 per cent or 10 per cent is a sum of money greater than our entire State Budget.

That does not make any sense whatever.

Mr O'Connor: Are you saying there is no difference between five and 10 per cent?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There is a difference; it is a difference of about five per cent.

Mr O'Connor: Five per cent of what money would be involved in a devaluation in Australia?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Believe me, it makes no sense. Does the Treasurer want to speak about the devaluation of the amount of money in this State or the amount of money in the whole of Australia?

Mr O'Connor: A devaluation would apply to all of Australia.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes; and how much money does the Treasurer think is circulating in Australia?

Mr O'Connor: Many thousands of millions.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Federal Budget is in excess of \$42 billion.

Mr O'Connor: There would be another \$30 billion between the States, I would say.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I would think more than that. So if the Treasurer is to say a devaluation of between five and 10 per cent involves an amount

greater than the entire State Budget, he is right, but he is wrong; I would say it was three or four times greater. If that is the basis on which the Treasurer is making the comparison, I do not see the purpose for it; there is no logic in that comparison.

Mr O'Connor: It shows you don't know what you are talking about when you say you would re-value by between five per cent and 10 per cent; it must be five per cent or 10 per cent.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Not at all. I said a devaluation of between five per cent and 10 per cent.

Mr O'Connor: You didn't; you said five per cent or possibly 10 per cent. They were the words you used.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know whether the Treasurer understands by that that I am excluding everything between; I do not mean to. To say five per cent or possibly 10 per cent indicates we are talking about a figure of between five per cent and 10 per cent. But what is the point of comparing this with the State Budget?

Mr O'Connor: If I said to some fellow that I would reduce his wages by five per cent or 10 per cent, there would be a fair bit of difference for him, and this reflects back in the same way.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: But we deal only with the value of one dollar when we talk about its comparative value in respect of other countries. The Treasurer is getting mixed up with the value of the dollar and the value of all the dollars in Australia.

Mr O'Connor: You don't look only at the State and Commonwealth Budgets. I spoke about the effect in Australia. Look at the companies that have agreements written overseas.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: But that is not what the Treasurer said and I have just countered that argument when I said earlier that some people might argue that we should not embark on a devaluation without specific and exhaustive investigations. It really does not make any sense to be saying that the difference between devaluation by five per cent or 10 per cent is a sum of money greater than our entire State Budget.

Mr O'Connor: I disagree with you; but there is no point in my arguing.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not think there is room for disagreement.

In explaining his position on that devaluation, and in referring to the relationship between the CRF and the devaluation of the Australian dollar, the Treasurer said—

The Leader of the Opposition asks how this affects the CRF. As members know, the State Energy Commission is a large borrower, and much of its money comes from loan funds; but we are borrowing overseas in yen and in American dollars. In this particular area, if there was a devaluation of the dollar, it would have some effect.

The State Energy Commission has never operated through the CRF and I do not see how the Treasurer could be convinced that it did.

Mr O'Connor: It has borrowed from overseas.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I accept that, but that has nothing to do with the CRF.

Mr O'Connor: It has something to do with devaluation.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: But the Treasurer was talking about how it affects the CRF.

Earlier this year the Treasurer, when talking about the 1981-82 State Budget and referring to an amount of \$2061.9 million—his comments were recorded in *Hansard* of 4 August—said, "I had a balanced Budget and a little surplus." Naturally, the Opposition asked how we could have these contradictory things, to which the Treasurer replied—

The balance to which the member is referring is the moneys made from investment of Treasury's day-to-day balance which would run into about \$31 million. If he wants any further detail on this matter, he should put the question on notice and I will be quite happy to answer it.

Mr O'Connor: We had a surplus of about \$8 million which we transferred to other areas to balance it, and some of it went to housing.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: After asking a few more questions, I began to understand what the Treasurer meant; but what he has said does not mean he had a balanced Budget with a little surplus.

Mr Sibson: He is rather pathetic!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I would not have used those words of the Treasurer.

Mr Sibson: Listening to you is pathetic.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I intend to go through all these things, if not for the member for Bunbury's illumination, then certainly for those capable of being illuminated.

On 12 August, the Treasurer explained what he meant by saying he had "a balanced Budget and a little surplus". I quote as follows—

The actual outcome was a balanced Budget. We did it by transferring some sur-



plus funds we had to other areas, which balanced it in the long term.

What we say is that, in declaring a balanced Budget, the Treasurer actually concealed an amount of \$39.4 million.

Mr O'Connor: I didn't; I made very clear all the money that was there.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That \$39.4 million was unallocated accumulated revenue. In fact, \$31 million of that revenue which was derived last year has been added to this year's CRF Budget; the Treasurer himself says that is the case. I quote from his Budget speech as follows—

Departmental revenue is expected to increase by \$62.6 million substantially due to the proposed payment to Treasury revenue of \$31.0 million of interest earned in 1981/82 on the investment of Treasury cash balances.

Let us turn to another example that we say illustrates the Treasurer's inability to understand some of the difficulties facing this State. On 12 July, the Treasurer was reported in *The West Australian* as saying—

The slow-down in Western Australia's resource development may be a blessing in disguise. The slow-down which resulted from the weakening of overseas minerals markets, had given the State a chance to avoid what could have been an indigestible surge of resource development in too short a time.

Today I think the Treasurer could bite his tongue for having said that because today we have learned that 290 employees of Chamberlain Holdings Ltd. have been retrenched and thrown out of work; we see unemployment figures escalating to levels that no-one accepts or believes are appropriate. Yet the Treasurer says that the slow down in resource development could be a blessing in disguise.

Mr I. F. Taylor: He continues to support the economic policies that lead to these disasters.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Kalgoorlie makes an apt point; while all this is going on, Mr Fraser has no stronger an economic management ally than this State Government.

Mr Bertram: Exactly!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Previously we asked questions seeking from the State Government an indication of some divergence from Fraser's economic policies, and the Treasurer always defended those policies. He defended the policies causing unemployment at record levels and inflation that is high and rising—in fact, as high as it was some time ago.

Mr O'Connor: Do you say I have always supported all of Fraser's economic policies?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What I said was that in response to questions we asked the Treasurer about Fraser's economic policies, the Treasurer indicated his support for those policies. That is my position; I can remember asking the questions. As far as we are concerned, this Government stands side by side with the Fraser Government and is as responsible as that Government for the hardships being experienced by the people of this country.

On the question of *per capita* relativities, I asked the Treasurer, prior to this year's Premiers' Conference, which set of tax relativities best reflected Western Australia's financial needs, and he replied, "All of them." Clearly, it is just not possible that each of the three different sets of relativities that were the subject of discussion and negotiation could be acceptable as reflecting Western Australia's financial needs.

Mr O'Connor: There was no discussion of relativities at that time.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Was there no discussion of relativities at the Premiers' Conference?

Mr O'Connor: The relativities had been set well before, and well you know that. You were asking a question that couldn't be answered.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Three different sets of relativities were being discussed.

Mr O'Connor: There were not, and well you know that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There were three different sets. The first was the proposed set to be applied from the publication of the Grants Commission report; the second was that which had operated until the operation of the Grants Commission report; and the third was a suggested set that combined each of the other two. Each set was totally different.

Mr O'Connor: That was not relevant to the question asked.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: There were three different sets of *per capita* relativities.

Mr O'Connor: Unbelievable!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: What I have said is true.

Mr O'Connor: I will come back to that later, because again you are off beat.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You are out of touch.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer did not do as well at the Premiers' Conference as we thought he might have.

Mr O'Connor: I did better than you would have done.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Ample evidence is available of why he did not do as well as he might have. I refer to the transcript of the Premiers' Conference. The Treasurer said about his granny bonds—

The scheme I put up would do that and it would not take much money, I am sure. If needs be, I will be prepared to pull back on my own borrowing in this way, if that will assist.

We did not obtain the granny bonds, but we suffered a cutback in borrowings.

Mr O'Connor: Not getting the granny bonds, on the basis of what I said there, had no relativity to the cutback, and well you know that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: All I know is that he offered to cut back on his borrowings.

Mr O'Connor: I understood we would get more in the housing area to provide work for the work force.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer had made specific reference to granny bonds.

Mr O'Connor: Don't you like people to get jobs?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do. He offered to cut back on his borrowings. I could be mistaken that he said that, but those words appear in the transcript. I do know we did not obtain the granny bonds, but we did receive a cutback in borrowings after the Treasurer had said he was prepared to cut back on borrowings if the granny bonds scheme was introduced. Obviously the Prime Minister thought he was on to a good thing.

To indicate how the Prime Minister took the Treasurer at his word, I will quote the capital works funds figures for 1980-81 and 1981-82. The general purpose capital funds in 1980-81 were \$120.9 million, and in 1981-82 they were \$133 million, with \$6.1 million provided for welfare housing. This has meant that \$127 million, or \$10 million less in real terms, has been provided in general purpose capital funds.

Mr O'Connor: How did that compare with the previous five years?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I cannot answer that question.

Mr O'Connor: It was better, and well you know.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know well.

Mr O'Connor: I thought you would.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If I knew I would tell the Treasurer what the figures for the last five years mean. The point is that in 1980-81, \$120.9

million was provided, and in 1981-82, \$133 million was provided less \$6.1 million for welfare housing, which left \$127 million for general purpose capital funds, or \$10 million less than the previous year in real terms. The Treasurer's offer to cut back on borrowings cost this State \$10 million.

Mr O'Connor: That is wrong; it is absolutely incorrect and misleading.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer invited the Prime Minister to cut back on this State's borrowings.

Mr O'Connor: If you look at the previous five years, I think you will find—I would have to check these figures—that the total improvement for those five years was in real terms much less than the improvement for that particular year.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not know what the Treasurer means about the improvement in previous years being less. The point is that this year we went backwards. He does not seem to understand that we did not improve in real terms on the previous year.

Mr O'Connor: We were further back in the previous five years, if that is easier to understand.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I really do not follow.

Mr O'Connor: We got a 10 per cent increase for that year, which you have just said, and which is correct, but for the previous five years I think the total increase was 15 per cent.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am trying to say to the Treasurer that in real terms we did not receive a 10 per cent increase.

Mr O'Connor: What is the figure you quoted?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We received \$10 million less in real terms; we did not receive an increase.

Mr Young: Is this in money terms or in real terms?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is in real terms.

Mr O'Connor: I am talking in money terms. We received a \$10 million increase, which you said we received.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I did not say that.

Mr O'Connor: Well, what was the increase in money terms?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will repeat my point.

Mr O'Connor: If you did not say that, and you are going to repeat them again, you must be wrong one of those times.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will repeat what I said before. It happens that I did not say what the Treasurer said I said. Is he interested in hearing me?

Mr O'Connor: Yes.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In 1980-81 we received \$120.9 million, and for 1981-82 we received \$133 million provided that \$6.1 million was made available for welfare housing.

Mr O'Connor: It was an increase of something over \$10 million in actual terms, not in real terms. What I was saying was that in the previous five years the increase in the same terms was about three per cent a year.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Does the Treasurer now want to say that the increase was three per cent?

Mr O'Connor: No; you can't comprehend—it's unbelievable!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I agree!

Mr Rushton: It's frustrating.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: An amount of \$133 million less \$6.1 million for welfare housing is not difficult to understand.

Mr O'Connor: So we didn't get the money for welfare housing?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Yes, we did.

Mr O'Connor: That's good!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am saying the Treasurer invited a cutback in borrowings, and he received one. That is why it is probably not wise to say to Mr Fraser, "I am willing to cut back in borrowing." If one says that to Mr Fraser, he will take one at one's word.

Mr Young: The Treasurer said that in the previous five years the increase totalled 15 per cent.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: He did not say that.

Mr Young: That's exactly what he said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: He started off saying the increase on last year was more than the increase in previous years. I say to him that, excluding the welfare housing funds, we did not receive an increase this year.

Mr Young: You were wrong.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Hang on! He said that the decrease this year was less than the decrease in the last five years.

Mr Young: If you want to convert it to real money terms, he is entitled to convert it to real money terms. If you want to talk in dollar terms, what he said was in the previous five years the increase was only 15 per cent, and this year it was eight or nine per cent, so therefore the increase was greater than the increase in the previous five years put together.

Mr O'Connor: It is simple to understand.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Grants Commission report proposed that State factors as adjusted

would cost the State about \$134 million in cumulative revenue loss. In April and March, remembering that the Grants Commission recommendations posed a loss of \$134 million, the Treasurer said, "There will be no way in which we will be prepared to accept a cut of \$162 million by the Grants Commission in funds to this State, because we cannot afford it." In *The Sunday Times* of 20 June, the Premier spoke about a different figure, and he said, "We cannot afford nor will we accept a cut of \$134 million." So we have a situation in which the Treasurer's figures are changing drastically; not to worry, because in the final analysis whatever the figure, it was one that, prior to the conference, the Treasurer found completely unacceptable, but, as we had forecast prior to the Premiers' Conference, the Grants Commission recommendations were simply phased in.

There is an interesting interchange between the Premier and the Prime Minister as revealed in the Premiers' Conference transcript. It reads as follows—

Mr. Malcolm Fraser: "I still believe that they are the fairest overall that can be envisaged, especially in the light of the last table that was passed around."

Mr. O'Connor: "I would hate to see the worst then".

Mr. Malcolm Fraser: "I said that I believed they were the fairest proposals, overall, that could be established—"

Mr. O'Connor: "I am sorry."

Mr. Malcolm Fraser: "—in the light of the recommendations that have been made."

So what we said previously is that the Premier needs to stand up more to the Prime Minister.

Mr Rushton: How can you tell that when you take one or two words out of a transcript?

Mr Pearce: You can take a few other words out.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Premier has the transcript. It was tabled the other night, I understand.

Mr Rushton: I happen to be the only person who was there with the Premier and I know the fight he made.

Mr I. F. Taylor: It was a weak effort.

Mr Sibson: The feedback that came in was that he was as tough as the previous Premier.

Mr Clarko: Hooray for Western Australia!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Not even the member for Bunbury would expect us to believe that.

Mr Sibson: It is a fact of life.

Mr Rushton: We have two witnesses to the events on that occasion and you have got none.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will now refer briefly to one of the things the Treasurer said in talking about the Cain Government in Victoria. It is simply a misstatement of the position by the Premier. He said—

“This year the Budget deficit in Victoria is \$97.7 million”.

In the first place the Cain Labor Government inherited a current account deficit of \$53 million when it deposed the aging Thompson Liberal Government in April this year.

Mr O'Connor: That is incorrect, according to the information I have. There was a surplus of \$23.4 million.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I suppose the Treasurer can say what he likes.

Mr Sibson: You are saying what you like.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The current account deficit inherited from the Thompson Government was \$53 million, but the end result on the current account that was in Parliament when it was elected to office—

Mr Pearce: Well through the financial year.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: —was that there was a surplus of \$6.1 million in the current account; so the Cain Labor Government was elected inheriting a current account deficit of \$53 million in April, and the result at the end of the financial year was a surplus of \$6.1 million. An amount of \$18 million was transferred from the works and services account.

Mr O'Connor: What are their policies that have caused that variation?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Amongst the policies that have caused the variation is the rationalisation of State Government taxes and charges.

Mr O'Connor: It applied before 30 June?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: No, there was a transfer from the works and services account of \$18 million which, in practical terms, made a major difference to the current account surplus, but what the Cain Labor Government has done is something that for I don't know how many months we have been advocating this Treasurer should do, and that is to embark upon a comprehensive review of State Government taxes and charges to see whether or not they can be more equitably raised. The Premier does not bother to say these things when he sails into criticism, but in 1982-83—

Mr Court: Cain's adjustment included payroll tax.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not sure of that. In 1982-83, one of the major changes made was the raising of a broadly-based tax on financial transactions, and I think that was widely acclaimed by all sectors of the business community as well as by those clients who involve themselves in hire-purchase contracts not now liable to the extra 1½ per cent interest which was attracted when the interest rates involved were above a certain amount.

For 1982-83, the Cain Government has budgeted for a surplus of \$33 million in the current account—that is, the Budget that was brought down for 1982-83—and not a deficit, as the Treasurer said. I do not know where the Treasurer got the figure from.

Mr O'Connor: Treasury got these figures from Treasury in Victoria.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This year the Budget deficit in Victoria is \$97.7 million. The truth is that in 1982-83 the surplus for which the Cain Government has budgeted is \$33 million. I do not think the Premier is right, but assuming he is, how can he blame the Cain Government for the result of the last financial year, when it has only had two months in office?

Mr O'Connor: I do not blame the Cain Government so much. I blame the New South Wales Government for its severe deterioration over the last five, six, or seven years.

Mr Davies: How about the New Guinea group?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer cannot blame the New South Wales Government for the Budget deficit in Victoria.

Mr O'Connor: I never tried to do that.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I think the Treasurer is wrong in his figures, but assuming he is right, how can he blame the Cain Government after it has been in office for only two months?

Mr O'Connor: I can blame any Government which says that, if it becomes the Government, it will reduce charges, and then immediately increases them, as that Government did.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not aware of this.

Mr Pearce: You are changing it around. Come back to the point you were on originally.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I still think it is incumbent upon the Premier to face up squarely to what appears to have been a gross error; firstly, the deficit is not of the nature that he indicated and, secondly, even if it were of that nature, how can he blame a Government that has been in office for one-sixth of the total of the financial year?

Mr O'Connor: You are giving it credit for a surplus. Can you not blame it on the same basis for a deficit?

Mr Clarko: Very good.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The surplus is for 1982-83, this year.

Mr O'Connor: You said in 1981-82 when the Cain Government came into power it had a deficit of about \$40 million or \$50 million.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You should take lessons in listening.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: In 1981-82 the current account deficit was \$53 million. That was in April. The size of the deficit was realised and the Government ended up with a result which was a surplus of \$6.1 million in the current account. The change was made in that case between when it took office and the end of the financial year.

Mr O'Connor: You have got to show what it did to convert that into a current account deficit.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Certainly, but it does not detract from my major point that the figures quoted by the Treasurer were not correct.

Mr O'Connor: The information I was sent is correct. I will recheck the figures again.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If they are right, does not the Treasurer think it is unfair to blame the Cain Government which had been in office for only two months?

Mr O'Connor: I said that in that period of time the Government had turned a surplus into a deficit. The main attack I made was on the New South Wales Government.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Treasurer said that Victoria had a Budget deficit of \$97.7 million and he criticised the Cain Government for its performance.

Mr O'Connor: In what way did I criticise?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I do not have the exact detail, but I can look it up in *Hansard*. The amount of \$97.7 million is wrong.

Mr O'Connor: I believe it is not.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If it is not wrong, then how fair is it to blame a Government which has been in office for only two months?

I would like to refer to the comments made by the Treasurer and Ministers in this place when they asked, "Where is the money coming from?" I do not know the reason that this Government does not consider its own performance when it talks about promises. The Government has promised to electrify country railway lines, including the Kalgoorlie-Kwinana railway, by 1985. Does that promise still stand?

Mr Rushton: You have not been reading the releases. The actual commitment was after the preliminary review of the electrification of the Kwinana-Bunbury line first and then the Kalgoorlie-Koolyanobbing second. The timing is based on the oil prices and the evaluation of the situation.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We are hearing a major readjustment to Government policy because that was an announcement which was made by the previous Premier.

Mr Rushton: That was a policy statement based on a preliminary study at the time.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It was said the Treasurer has pledged to electrify the Kwinana-Kalgoorlie railway by 1985 and the electrification of the Kwinana-Bunbury line will follow by 1990.

Mr Rushton: Since then there has been an announcement from the Premier and statements have been made that the situation has changed.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is the nub of the point I am making. When this Government asks the Opposition, "Where is the money coming from", it should take into account what the previous Premier had to say. When talking about these massive plans, there was no estimate made of the cost. That policy was introduced and the work was expected to run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr Rushton: You will find it was a 10-year programme.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It may have been a 10-year programme, but the Government did not know how much it would cost or where the money would come from. When we propose to find \$600 000 for a specific purpose, we are told we are being irresponsible.

I would like to ask: With the railway to the Pilbara, where is the money coming from? This Premier has announced a railway to the Pilbara.

Mr O'Connor: I did not agree to it and I have not announced a railway to the Pilbara.

Mr Rushton: Up the creek again!

Mr O'Connor: Again, a falsehood.

Mr Rushton: Misleading the House.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Perhaps the Treasurer can enlighten us on that statement by way of interjection.

Mr O'Connor: I will give details when I reply.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: How much would the railway line to the Pilbara cost?

Mr Rushton: There are estimates of tonnage to make it worthwhile. We do our sums.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Where will the money come from?

Mr Rushton: It will come from a viable operation. It could be defence money.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Where will the Government get the money to set up the viable operation before it starts to pay for itself?

Mr Rushton: You obviously do not understand how to fund these things. You raise the funds and they are recoverable from the operation.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If I can follow the Minister for Transport further down the line: Is the money borrowed by floating a loan?

Mr Rushton: It could be from a number of sources. That is the difference between us. You would retain the railway and spend millions of dollars when we are doing an exercise with Westrail to Bunbury which would be self-generating.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If I understand correctly, the money will come from a number of sources.

Mr Rushton: It could come from the Commonwealth.

Mr Tonkin: It could come from Father Christmas, too.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If the Opposition were to adopt that sort of reasoning to support its proposals, it would be cut to ribbons by this Government. It would say, "Where is the money coming from? How are you going to support it?" The Minister for Transport does not know where the money would come from. I wonder whether he knows how much this railway will cost.

Mr Rushton: I know the estimates and I know the tonnage needed to make it a viable operation.

Mr Tonkin: What is the estimate?

Mr Rushton: It has not reached that stage yet.

Mr Coyne: Roughly \$200 million.

Mr Rushton: That is the member for Murchison-Eyre's estimate.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Do we have any advance on that from anyone else? This is a serious business. The Minister does not know how much he has to find and from where he has to find the money, except to say "from a number of sources."

I happen to know a few facts. I happen to know that the estimate on 1981 prices is \$320 million. When talking about this, the Treasurer went into great detail and said that Western Australia would push the Commonwealth for assistance for the railway. Whenever we say we will push the Commonwealth for assistance, the funny little Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development says, "You are being unrealistic."

Mr Clarko: Don't be rude!

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is true.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: If members of the Opposition say we will approach the Commonwealth, everyone is up in arms.

Mr Sibson: You sell out to the Commonwealth; we don't.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This Government has outlined a pic-in-the-sky Pilbara railway and does not know where the money will come from. To insulate itself it says, "We will approach the Commonwealth to help us". Let us note how this Government changes its tune. The Opposition has outlined how it will finance some of the programmes which are necessary and desirable in this community.

Mr Sibson: Your party is dedicated to selling out the railway.

Mr Carr: Your party is dedicated to giving them away and closing them down.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I wish to refer to the reputation of the Treasurer as an economic manager. There is an essential difference between the way in which the Opposition would approach the job of economic manager and the manner in which it sees the role being played. The present Government's attitude towards its role as economic manager is best illustrated by the Treasurer's reply to the Budget debate when he said—

I believe the ingredients for a Treasurer to bring down a good Budget are sincerity and honesty. The State Budget is a declaration of priorities as to where they will be best used for the benefit of the community.

Mr O'Connor: Those words again have been taken out of context.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Here is the reference—

Mr O'Connor: You are shocking at this.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Perhaps the Premier can put them in context and tell me what he means.

Mr O'Connor: I have not got the *Hansard* here.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: His words were, "I believe among the ingredients for a Treasurer to bring down a good Budget is sincerity and honesty."

Mr O'Connor: I quoted something about the Opposition and I said there were other things apart from oratory, and while Opposition members were good orators they needed honesty and sincerity. You are quoting out of context.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am happy for the Treasurer to put them into context, but I cannot cope to read that speech again.

Mr O'Connor: You cannot cope.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We are not doing too badly.

Secondly, the Treasurer said, "the State Budget is a declaration of priorities as to where they will best be used for the benefit of the community". That statement does not make any sense. It is in the *Hansard* in the Treasurer's Budget reply which was last Thursday. Further the Treasurer said—

The difficulties in the economy not only in Western Australia but also throughout the world ought not to be our priorities. We must try to introduce measures that will benefit everyone in this State and the only way we can do this is by the correct allocation of available funds.

In my view apart from what the Treasurer said in the first sentence—that is "the difficulties in the economy not only in Western Australia but also throughout the world ought not to be our priorities"—being total crass I cannot see how the Treasurer can say that.

Mr O'Connor: What page is that on in *Hansard*?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Mr Speaker, you will be interested in this. Here is an uncorrected copy of the Premier's speech where it says—

The difficulties in the economy not only in Western Australia but also throughout the world ought not to be our priorities.

#### *Points of Order*

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Speaker, on a point of order, are members allowed to quote from uncorrected copies of speeches?

The SPEAKER: It is a fact that members cannot quote from uncorrected copies of the *Hansard*.

Mr TONKIN: On a further point of order, it is possible for a member to rise on a matter of privilege if the member is falsifying a *Hansard* speech. The Treasurer has made a direct negative of what he has said. Why should he quote from a corrected copy of *Hansard* rather than a doctored version?

The SPEAKER: It is not within the province of a member to quote from an uncorrected copy of *Hansard*.

#### *Debate Resumed*

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is sufficient to say that the word "not" has been taken out.

Mr Tonkin: The *Hansard* report has been falsified.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is disappointing to the House that the "not" has been taken out.

Mr O'Connor: Are you saying that you have never made a correction to *Hansard* with a quote like that?

Mr Tonkin: It is sufficient to say there is one correction on the whole Budget and that the word "not" has been taken out and nothing else has been touched.

Mr O'Connor: There is nothing wrong with that; it is what I said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It is a shocking thing. Another thing I would like to say—

Mr Clarko: It is not the first time that *Hansard* has put down statements that are in direct negatives to what was said.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: This is not the subject of cross-Chamber conversation. I am happy to let members make up their own minds and all I can say is that the correction of the exclusion of the word "not" which negates the previous meaning is not satisfactory, particularly when it involves the Treasurer.

I would like to make one or two final points.

Mr Clarko: You said that a quarter of an hour ago.

Mr O'Connor: When I agreed to let this debate come before the House did you give any indication on the timing of it?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I said it would go for three quarters of an hour.

Mr O'Connor: I agreed to let the Leader of the Opposition go on with the debate on that basis.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: At the start of my speech, there was a plethora of interjections which seemed to indicate considerable interest in what I was saying.

Mr Pearce: He does not have to estimate how long he will speak.

Several members interjected.

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

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is hardly fair. I remonstrated with the member for Gosnells for defying the authority of the Chair only to find when I sat down that the first person to offend is

a Minister. That is not right. I ask that there be some respect for the authority of this Chair.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: Just to return to that interjection of the Treasurer when he said I have taken something out of context: He said, "I believe among the ingredients for a Treasurer to bring down a good Budget are sincerity and honesty and they are the qualities that have been lacking by some members of the Opposition in this debate. The performance of the Opposition" etc.

Mr Parker: That does not change the context whatsoever.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: That is exactly what the Treasurer said.

Mr O'Connor: What you read then was correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I thought it was.

Mr O'Connor: But the other was not.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: About what?

Mr O'Connor: The other points made in connection with the same point.

Mr Parker: It is the same thing.

Mr O'Connor: It is not the same.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: We would in Government be about the job of implementing projects and new and particular policies in relation to economic management.

Several members interjected.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The member for Whitford is at it again, interjecting and winking.

These new policies include—

- (1) A review of the State's taxation system and revenue raising including a review of expenditures from the taxation system in the form of exemptions and concessions.
- (2) Renegotiation of Commonwealth-State financial arrangements in the form of a negotiated contract.
- (3) The progressive phasing out and eventual abolition of payroll tax.
- (4) A fundamental restructuring of the Budget process.

As far as the Opposition is concerned it is incredibly important that the Government start to grapple with some of these specific problems. We believe those areas of activity to which we have referred are the ones in which the Government should be active, not in putting aside problems, but in seeking solutions. All of the major indicators including demand conditions, pricing, earnings, employment, unemployment, building, and construction indicate that we are on the brink of a

serious situation in respect of an economic recession.

This is not the sort of subject with which the Treasurer can deal in a cavalier and unintelligent fashion; there needs to be some substantial, intelligent commitment to detailed policy.

I wish to put forward in good faith a proposal the Treasurer might consider. It will be detailed and specific and we believe would result in the creation of thousands of jobs. In formulating the 1982-83 State Budget, a Labor Government would have sought to implement a genuine and effective job creation scheme. Included in our priorities would have been employment, training, and retraining. Specifically, in the present economic circumstances, a State Labor Government would have implemented a special work force programme designed, firstly, to establish effective and comprehensive work force planning and labour market research in Western Australia—

Mr Coyne: What about the cost?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I will go through the costs in a moment. Secondly, the programme would be designed to provide a wide range of training and retraining opportunities, especially in the area of apprentices; thirdly, it would provide direct assistance for employment creation and maintenance; and, finally, it would moderate the effects of recession on the Western Australian labour market.

The programme we envisage would commence on 1 January 1983, to coincide with the seasonal peak in new labour market entrants, comprising mainly school leavers. In the first instance, the duration of the programme would be 20 months, from 1 January 1983 to 30 August 1984.

The programme would be financed from an initial allocation of \$25 million from the Consolidated Revenue Fund over that 20-month period; it would not be borrowed from four of five different sources, or sought from the Commonwealth. The funds would be derived solely from the investment of Treasury cash balances which, during the period of operation of this scheme, will net the Treasury about \$60 million. So, we are not talking about using even half of the amount the investment of the cash balances will produce over that 20-month period. Additionally, the programme would not result in any additional taxation.

Initially, in line with present labour market conditions, the programme would be targeted at two groups in the private sector; namely, full-time adult employment and full-time and part-time youth employment.



The types of schemes we would consider would be payroll tax concessions to provide additional employment; employment and wage subsidies to private employers; a major youth training programme; and, additional apprenticeships in Government departments.

We estimate that the special work force programme I have just outlined would create between 2 000 and 3 000 additional employment opportunities.

When we compare our scheme with the employment created by the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on the Dampier-Perth natural gas pipeline, it seems to us our proposal is much more employment efficient. We have outlined precisely where the money can come from, how much it would cost, what sort of schemes would be introduced, and the specific target areas we would seek to serve with the money allocated to the scheme. It is an entirely workable scheme, which does not involve the imposition of additional tax. The Opposition believes the scheme is something to which this Government should turn its early attention.

Mr Speaker, I am sorry if I have delayed the House inordinately. However, you can understand that when time and time again in this place the Treasurer trumpets about the Opposition's not understanding financial management, not being good economic managers, and being this and being that, he must expect the Opposition to defend itself and bring back to the Treasurer everything he has said. The Opposition does not like to delay the House for the period of time we have spent on the first speech in reply to this debate; however, the Treasurer has only himself to blame.

When the Treasurer talks about the economic irresponsibility of other people, he should keep a weather eye out on his own flanks, because today I have gone through only about 10 per cent or 15 per cent of the occasions on which the Treasurer has disclosed his primitive knowledge of financial management; his knowledge of this subject is nowhere near the standard needed to set some sense of purpose and direction in this State.

Mr O'Connor: Yours is, I suppose?

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I have never said I have all the answers to all our difficulties. However, if the Treasurer sees fit to accuse the Opposition of being financially irresponsible, he must be prepared to take criticism in return. As far as the Opposition is concerned, that reply will be couched in terms similar to those used by the Treasurer in describing the Opposition as delinquent. That is the way it is going to be. The Op-

position can cop it, but its members also can hand it out.

Mr O'Connor: I will hand it out, too, at the appropriate time.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am happy for the Treasurer to do as he likes. However, the Opposition does not accept many of the things he has said, because they do not make sense.

Mr O'Connor: Most of what you are saying does not make sense, and a great deal of it is misleading, as I will point out in due course.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: The Opposition does not intend to oppose this Bill. However, it does say the Treasurer needs to lift his game in terms of the financial and economic management of this State if we are to maximise the rate at which we recover from the present recession. The Opposition believes the Budget contains too many rubbery areas which cannot be stretched to the degree necessary to accommodate claims made on its behalf by the Treasurer.

MR SIBSON (Bunbury) [4.38 p.m.]: We have just heard a great deal of rhetoric from the Leader of the Opposition in an endeavour to show to the House that the current Budget will not have a beneficial impact on the economy of this State. I believe it is one of the best Budgets ever put forward in the way it seeks to inject funds into the community, which will have the effect of assisting our economy. I agree with the Treasurer that as a follow-up to the Budget, Government contracts must be let as quickly as possible to allow these benefits to flow through to the community.

With this in mind, I draw members' attention to an article in today's *Daily News* under the heading "Steel contract for Kwinana". Some 250 tonnes of steel costing \$107 000 will be purchased from Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. for the construction of steel spikes at Westrail's Midland Workshops, for use in railway development. The point is that the run-on from that contract is another contract which is currently being negotiated for sleepers to the value of \$1.5 million. That will inject very welcome income into the flagging timber industry, when the Opposition, through its policy of locking up the Shannon River basin, would cause a disastrous effect in that industry. The small headline in the paper tonight about the contract at Kwinana will lead to a great impact with a contract for \$1.5 million-worth of sleepers. That money will flow into the south-west, and it will help the timber industry.

Mr Grill: Where will they all be exported from?

Mr SIBSON: That contract will help the mills in particular. It will have an effect on the forestry industry, and the transport industry which is having difficulties at the moment. The contract for \$107 000 sets off many other initiatives that will do the things which the Leader of the Opposition is criticising the Government for not doing.

We heard an awful lot of words this afternoon which were strung together in long sentences—very involved strings of words which basically said nothing. The speech was intended by the Leader of the Opposition to tear apart the General Loan Fund Budget brought down by the Government and the Treasurer; but we have a small example in which the contract for sleepers will lead to the repair of some railway lines and the construction of other lines; and the expenditure by Westrail will inject a lot of money into the economy. That has been done in a very short time; and it will have an effect on the steel industry, the Midland Workshops, the timber industry, and then later in the construction industry. They are the major areas affected by the present downturn in the economy. That statement was made by the Treasurer in the Budget; and it was supported by the speakers from this side.

The steel contract is only a small one, but it will have a significant input into the community and into the economy. The small start of \$107 000 will create many millions of dollars-worth of worthwhile and effective involvement in the community.

Basically that is what it is all about. The debate this afternoon about having all sorts of programmes and schemes, particularly in the way it was put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, smacked of the schemes that were put up by the Federal Government during the Whitlam era. Of course, they were a great disaster for this country, and particularly for this State.

What was said by the Leader of the Opposition was contradicted absolutely by what appeared in the paper about a small start that will have results throughout the community. If members go through the General Loan Fund Budget, they will find many examples of this.

In Bunbury, a contract already has been let for work in the Leschenault Inlet and the cut. That contract is worth \$503 000, and the dredge is already working. The contracts for roadworks have been let, and also for associated works; and those contracts will begin shortly. That is another small example of an amount of \$500 000 which will be fed into the community through that project. It will have an almost 100 per cent direct ef-

fect on the community with which I have a fairly close association, and in which I am interested.

It is not fair to say that the Budget is not doing what it set out to do. The evidence is before us. I could go on further—

Mr Parker: And I am sure you will.

Mr SIBSON:—and talk about the involvement of Collie, and the amount of money that has been spent there. I am speaking specifically about the south-west, because that is where I am involved. Members from other areas would be only too happy to debate the effect of the Budget on their own areas.

Before dealing with some of the other comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, and while talking about the Budget as it affects my electorate and the areas surrounding it, I would like to add a few words to what I said in my speech on the Consolidated Revenue Fund Budget previously. This is in connection with the works programme for the Bunbury Senior High School. I announced—

Mr Pearce: Incorrectly.

Mr SIBSON:—a Budget allocation by the Government in excess of \$1 million—

Mr Pearce: You said \$1 million was provided in the Budget.

Mr SIBSON: *Hansard* does not show that.

Mr Pearce: We had better have a little look at *Hansard*, because that was what was said in this House.

Mr SIBSON: In fact, the amount for the upgrading and further development of the Bunbury Senior High School is \$1 470 000.

Mr Pearce: How much is provided in the Budget?

Mr SIBSON: It has been made clear, because it is quite clearly pointed out in the Budget, that the initial amount is \$20 000. There has never been any argument about that. The member for Gosnells tried to make some mystery out of it, unsuccessfully. In fact, he was so concerned that he dipped out on a day in Parliament yesterday to go down and check the local scene in my electorate.

Mr Pearce: Dead right! It was not too promising for you, either; I can tell you.

Mr SIBSON: That has been said at every election since the turn of the century.

Mr Terry Burke: We are getting serious now!

Mr Pearce: It is part of my programme of checking out schools in country areas.

Mr SIBSON: The job of this House now is to discuss and debate the Budget, and not to be concerned with the will of the electors in my electorate and in other electorates.

Mr Terry Burke: That is a dreadful attitude to take. You do not care what they think.

Mr SIBSON: That is typical of the Opposition. Members opposite are scraping the bottom of the barrel in looking for arguments, and anything will do. What I said was that the decision on who will win the various seats and who will be the Government is the prerogative of the electors and not one for debate in this House.

Mr Tonkin: Why did you cheat, then, in drawing the electoral boundary in such a way? If you are prepared to let the people have a say, why did you rig the metropolitan area boundaries?

Mr Carr: Why are you deliberately keeping people off the rolls?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBSON: That argument has been raised in this House on many occasions. I might tell a beautiful story—

Mr Barnett: You usually do.

Mr SIBSON:—about the gerrymandering of boundaries so far as the current Bunbury electorate is concerned.

Mr Old: You are not trying to get on the roll there, I hope!

Mr SIBSON: Since the boundaries were changed at the request of the Labor Party, we have not heard one word in the *South Western Times*, which used to give it a run about every month, about the gerrymandering of boundaries. If anyone is interested—

Mr Tonkin: Are you saying the commissioners gerrymandered the boundary down there?

Mr SIBSON: Not at all.

Mr Tonkin: You say the actual town boundary—

Mr SIBSON: The boundary of my electorate—  
Opposition members interjected.

Mr Watt: Let him make his point.

Mr SIBSON: They are running scared.

Mr Tonkin: You are talking about gerrymandering by the Chief Justice.

Mr SIBSON: No, I am not. If the member for Morley would only contain himself for a moment, I would round off this point. I said that if anyone wants to relate an interesting story about gerrymandering of boundaries—bearing in mind the Labor Party almost has produced a monthly paper on this in the years since I have been in

Parliament—it is interesting to note that since the first announcement of the boundaries last year and since the Labor Party lodged an appeal with the commissioners and had the boundaries changed—

Mr Tonkin: Who changed them?

Mr SIBSON: The boundaries were changed by the commissioners, and as it turned out the change has meant my seat is a little safer than it was previously even if by only a few votes. But the point is, we have not heard one word about gerrymandering of boundaries since that time. I make that point so that any person listening can draw his own conclusion.

Mr Parker: The whole State is a gerrymander.

Mr SIBSON: I was rudely interrupted half way through my comment on the Bunbury Senior High School. I trust that the member for Gosnells is now quite enlightened as to the real position.

Mr Pearce: There is an allocation of \$20 000 in the Budget and you are queued up with seven other schools, all of which have been promised some, up to \$1 million.

Mr SIBSON: We must remember that there is an ongoing project with which the principal, the staff, the PCA, the students and the people in the areas—the school has a large catchment area which involves more than my own electorate—are all pleased. Further, the Treasurer saw fit to commit the Government to a \$1.147 million project at the school, one of the oldest high schools in the State and one with a lot of tradition; many of the people who have gone through this place were educated at this high school or its predecessor. I want to outline the work to be done so that the member for Gosnells will not need to go to Bunbury again to check out the situation.

Mr Pearce: I will be back in a couple of weeks; I still have some schools to visit.

Mr SIBSON: If the member did not get through the few schools in my electorate yesterday, he was not working very hard. Work at the school will include the following: four classrooms, a music room, a practice room, a drama room—perhaps we should put the member for Gosnells there.

Mr Watt: We should put him in the music room; he would make a one-man band.

Mr SIBSON: To continue the list: painting and pottery rooms, extension of staff room—this is very important because staff rooms provide an area where the staff can get together and discuss problems in the school in order to work out ways to run the school more effectively. In the main this is what happens, although in some instances

staff rooms might be used for other purposes; generally speaking they are used in a very constructive way, and it is important we keep them up to scratch. To continue the list: the conversion of rooms for home economics, two science rooms, two business economics rooms, a machine room, staff offices, and photographic rooms.

When this work is completed, it will have cost in excess of \$1 million and brought the Bunbury Senior High School to a very high standard. This is in line with the ongoing policy and programme laid down by the Government over previous years to ensure that the older high schools do not lag too far behind their more modern counterparts.

Mr Pearce: Why is there no money for it in the Budget if this programme is so far down the track?

Mr SIBSON: If the member for Gosnells has not grasped the nettle after all the debate we had a couple of weeks ago, after having spent all yesterday in Bunbury, after having pored through the records, after having been in touch with the department and discussed the matter with many people, and after having heard the comments made tonight, I am afraid I am not able to help him. I must leave him lamenting by the roadside.

Mr Pearce: The fact is that you and your colleagues have been sold a glorious con and you hope to keep it going until the election.

Mr Tonkin: \$20 000 to build a school; it would be nice if you could build a school for that amount.

Mr SIBSON: If wages were not so high, perhaps we could.

Mr Tonkin: You would have the workers living on rice.

Mr SIBSON: The point I wish to make now is a fairly important one in the light of comments made by the Leader of the Opposition about the economy and particularly about unemployment. He said the Government should co-operate and inject money into the economy and get together with everyone to overcome unemployment. The very real problem confronting the economy today, particularly as it affects employment and especially the employment of young and untrained people, was not mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition; he did not give it the time of day and just brushed over it.

The big problem is the continual pressure for high wages. It is known by everyone in the community that, as wages are pushed up well ahead of inflation, jobs are lost; this is happening every day. If we speak to people in the community, even

those who are losing their jobs, they say categorically that they understand they are losing their jobs because of the downturn in the economy and the escalation, beyond all reasonable bounds, of the pressure by many workers to get more money out of the system than is there.

Profits are dropping, and the Treasurer brought forward a 10-point plan which stated that, as profits are receding, he wanted employers to understand this and to accept they will have to work within these conditions for some time. But added to all this is the pressure for more and more increases in wages and conditions being loaded on to the economy.

This is causing devastation not only within large industries such as the steel, alumina, timber, and rural industries, but also within the ranks of small business employers, who are the people who employ the majority of workers in this country. Every time they are faced with a higher wages bill, whether they are employing five or 100 people, their costs are increased and, on a *pro rata* basis, a number of people will have to lose their jobs. It is not possible for small businessmen to increase their sales sufficiently to meet the continuing wage demands.

On page 6 of tonight's edition of the *Daily News* we read that Mr Cliff Dolan, the President of the ACTU, has said, "A freeze on wages will later on cause a wage explosion." I do not think anyone in this State has said that we should apply an absolute freeze. What we are saying is that the workers and particularly the heads of unions should be more responsible and should talk to their members and say that the best they can expect in three to five years is to have kept somewhere within the bounds of the inflationary growth.

Mr Gordon Hill: What about the comments of your former Premier about wage reductions?

Mr SIBSON: It is not sensible to say, in a failing economy and a failing market, that we can continue to have wage rises and better conditions such as shorter working hours—and this idea is an absolute disaster at any time, let alone now. Yet the Leader of the Opposition told us he is interested in and concerned for young school leavers who do not have jobs, and for other people who are unemployed.

Mr Williams: Do you remember what Frank Crean said in 1974?

Mr SIBSON: Yes, I do—one man's pay rise is another man's job.

Mr Williams: Yes, one man's pay rise is another man's job.

Mr SIBSON: That was proved then and it has now been proven that that is correct. Employers, employees, politicians, and presidents, secretaries, or advocates of unions, should realise that we are in a situation where profits and markets are falling and costs are increasing, almost entirely due to the wage pressure demands being placed on the particular industry concerned. In the manufacturing industry, there are not only pressures from the people working in that industry, but also pressures from the other industries from which goods are purchased. Therefore, continual pressure is applied, and, as Frank Crean said, one man's pay rise is another man's job. This will continue to be the case. All we are asking and all that any reasonable person could ask is that the workers, the rank and file, be given a bit of a lead from their hierarchy.

Mr Tonkin: They are part of the hierarchy.

Mr SIBSON: Yes, the Australian Labor Party is the other part of the hierarchy, of course; we all know that.

Mr Tonkin: No, the rank and file are part of the hierarchy.

Mr SIBSON: I am not going to worry about defining which section of the hierarchy it is, but unless everybody in the labour market is concerned we will not make improvements in this area. I will put it more simply so the member for Morley can understand it better. Unless the people in the labour market in the next three to five years are prepared to accept that there has to be a substantial change in attitude and an understanding of what is being done in the work force by these pressures for higher wages, better conditions, and shorter working hours, there is no way in the world that the present situation will ease itself out or blow out overnight.

We have some indications of falling interest rates and other factors that give us at least a little bit of light at the end of the tunnel. Why keep stoking the fire at the other end? If there is a bit of light at the end of the tunnel, why not hold back and let the light come closer? We must try to bring better stability into the economy and in turn into the work force. We must all put in more effort. If a company is producing 500 sleepers a day, it would be good if production could increase by even one sleeper per man per day. If that were done right across Australia with a genuine and common approach that it was necessary to improve the economy, one sleeper per man per day—or whatever product is being produced, even down to the spikes that are being made for Westrail—the situation would improve. If a person who now produces 10 items per day, could in-

crease it to 12 or 13 items a day, this would make a lot of difference to our economy.

To give an example of this, I will relate what I saw when I was in New Zealand recently and I visited a plastics factory. It was very interesting. Over 300 people worked in this factory. The company had seven factories throughout the southern hemisphere, producing something like 100 different products, but the interesting thing was that the staff on the production lines were paid on incentive. They had to meet a certain quantity to earn their wages each week and that quantity represented a profit for the company and allowed the employees to earn their wages. Any production over and above that quantity was paid at the same rate per hour per 100 units produced. Most of the people in that factory were earning very high wages, the company was making very good profits, and the overflow of that into the community was absolutely unreal, particularly in light of the fact that about 90 per cent of the products made were exported. This was vital to New Zealand and, of course, it is vital to Western Australia.

Generally we aim to sell most of our products overseas. If only we would accept that there is a need to look at our economy, not only from the point of view of the employer and the business entrepreneur who has to inject the capital into the business, but also from the point of view of the worker, we would benefit. Both the employers and the workers lack in this area. The employers have not sought to offer incentives to encourage their employees to work harder. They have not negotiated face to face with their employees to get their message across that the continued push by the unions for higher wages is affecting our economy. It is not good enough for someone to say, "We are not pressing for higher wages." It is not good enough for employers to say, "We can do nothing about it". We must all remember that there are wage cases before the courts in this country. It is hoped that conditions will improve and reduced working hours will result. All sorts of factors create a loss of profit and loss of production. Everyone must realise that because it is time. We have this crazy idea of flow-ons automatically applying throughout the community. It behoves every person who is in a job or is seeking a job to have a hard look at where we are going and make some decisions to ease up on demands for higher wages.

Mr Bertram: Does that include members of Parliament?

Mr SIBSON: Of course it includes members of Parliament. The member for Mt. Hawthorn obviously did not listen to me. I said that it behoves

every person, and I mean every person, who is depending on the economy for a living.

Mr Bertram: What about increasing the number of members of Parliament?

Mr SIBSON: We should ease up on these demands for higher wages. Other members may wish to add to the debate later; that is their prerogative.

I will outline a simple plan which will help overcome this problem. Firstly, we must ease up on the pressure being applied for more wages, better conditions, and shorter working hours, and, secondly, we should make a pledge with ourselves and our employers to work out problems. I believe employers have a definite responsibility to talk with their employees in an effort to solve problems.

Mr Pearce: They could talk to their employees, if they have any.

Mr SIBSON: More production can be obtained from greater manpower output within a business.

Mr Bertram: Do not increase staff unnecessarily.

Mr SIBSON: This will increase the profitability of a company.

Mr Jamieson: As you are so knowledgeable, what should the wage level be set at?

Mr SIBSON: One does not have to be knowledgeable to work those things out.

Mr Jamieson: Don't you? Evidently the court does not have to be knowledgeable.

Mr SIBSON: This system has been used on dairy farms, timber mills, and also on wheat farms, as Mr Acting Speaker (Mr Tubby) would know, and incentives for production of grain are applied and the employer and employee get together and decide on a suitable wage together with an incentive for the crops to be planted on time. The crop must be harvested as quickly as possible and the grain must be put onto the market. There is nothing new or complicated about this; it is simply an attitude of mind.

Mr Barnett: You didn't answer my previous question.

Mr SIBSON: I am not interested in answering the member's question.

Mr Barnett: What about your previous Premier and his son?

Mr SIBSON: If those simple things were understood and practised we would solve most of the ills experienced in this country. It is a fairly simple request for me to make and it is one which simply requires promotion through the media in

an effort to educate people about incentives. Perhaps everybody will try a little harder.

Mr Bertram: Accepting a pay rise!

Mr SIBSON: We should promote that sort of thinking and ensure that this stupid nonsense is stopped.

Mr Barnett: Did you get a pay rise?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tubby): Order!

Mr SIBSON: That could cost somebody a job. I do not intend to go on much longer, but I want to comment on the Leader of the Opposition's speech.

Mr Pearce: You were winding up 20 minutes ago.

Mr SIBSON: The Leader of the Opposition rubbished—I do not like using that word—the Treasurer and the Government for the way in which they had—

Mr Pearce: Coals to Newcastle!

Mr SIBSON: —abandoned any attempt to alleviate the problem of unemployment in this State. The North-West Shelf gas project was torn to shreds by the Leader of the Opposition. That project is one of the greatest things ever to happen to this State. I admit there will be problems. It has a terrific demand on expenditure. I suppose it could be likened to the Kalgoorlie pipeline, if we put it into perspective. At that stage the same thing happened when C. Y. O'Connor eventually met his death because the Opposition tore his scheme to pieces.

Mr Tonkin: *The Sunday Times* mainly.

Mr SIBSON: Yes. If the politicians had not turned the story around *The Sunday Times* would not have had anything to put into the article. Let us put the blame where it should lie. We have an aspiring leader of this State which is involved in one of the best schemes we have—the North-West Shelf gas project—tearing it to shreds and criticising the Government for its not being sound enough in its thinking into the future. There are many other projects.

He said that this Government had done nothing to alleviate the unemployment situation, which is very untrue. Employment has increased in this State. Queensland is the only other State where employment has increased, but by about half the amount of the increase in Western Australia. Some 1 200 new jobs have been created in Western Australia and yet the other States of Australia have failed dismally in that area. We have an aspiring Treasurer—I will not say he is the logical person to be in that position—standing up in this place and vilifying this Government for not doing anything about the employment situation

and yet we are one of only two States which have increased employment. Western Australia is the leader in that situation and we have the smallest population.

Now, for goodness sake, surely the Leader of the Opposition on that basis alone could have conceded that point, but he chose to tear it apart to try to gain headlines in the Press, which headlines would give an impression that this Government had failed in that area when, in fact, it has the best track record of any State in this nation. I would go so far as to say it would be one of the better records around the world at this time, yet this is the sort of thing that happens.

Another point to which I would like to refer is the source of the jobs. The Leader of the Opposition appeared to say that the only way we could create jobs in this community was by the Government's initiating programmes. He used a string of rhetoric which said nothing. Jobs do not come from within the Government sector, and, when they do, they are never very successful.

Mr Pearce: That is a contradiction if ever there was one.

Mr SIBSON: I knew the member for Gosnells would come in on that one. He is absolutely tripping happy.

Several members interjected.

Mr SIBSON: What he was going to say was that, as I was praising the Government because of the initiatives it had created through the Budget, I was supporting the fact that jobs came from the Government sector. That is all very well and, of course, the works programme used properly by any Government will do that.

The real strength, development, and production of jobs must come from the private sector. That is exactly what it is all about, and what the Government has to do is to encourage the private sector by doing the things it has done—for instance, the energy programme for which the Leader of the Opposition tore the Government to pieces and said that it was sending the country bankrupt with the energy programme.

Surely the future of the State lies with its energy programme, whether it be coal, electricity, gas, or whatever. I am certain that anyone with any sense of responsibility or understanding of the economy would have to agree with the energy programmes of this State with all its burdens of borrowed capital and uncertainties. Western Australia is in a much better situation than is New South Wales. At the moment, New South Wales has a debt larger than ours, but the project itself is in tatters. The energy programme and the energy commission of New South Wales are

deeply in debt and the situation is in absolute tatters. However, the Leader of the Opposition, who again would love to be the Premier of this State and thus be Premier over the State Energy Commission, is standing here today tearing the SEC to pieces.

That commission, despite any faults it has—and every facet of Government and private enterprise has some faults—stands high and tall and is well respected within the energy commissions not only in Australia, but also around the world.

It is terribly important that we do not print in our newspapers, comments that vilify our energy programme when the future of the State has to rely on its energy programme. Unless we have a proper energy programme, we will not attract new industries and we will not be able to support the ones in existence.

I support the Bill before the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Tonkin.

## JUSTICES AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 12 October.

MR BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.20 p.m.]: This is a rather small and non-contentious Bill. It already has been dealt with by the 32 members of the upper House and has been supported by all parties. The second reading speech in this House was a repeat of the second reading speech in the other place, where the Bill was thoroughly discussed and resolved.

Mr Tonkin: It provides employment.

Mr BERTRAM: Is it thought we need more members of Parliament?

Mr Tonkin: If we had three or four Houses of Parliament, it would be better because it would provide more employment.

Mr BERTRAM: There is no point in our debating the Bill further. The second reading speech adequately covered the purpose of the Bill, which involves an administrative matter. No contentious points or anything of party political significance is involved. As all members would be aware already, the Opposition supports this Bill.

MR RUSHTON (Dale—Deputy Premier) [5.22 p.m.]: I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill. What the honourable member has said is consistent with what has taken place in the other House—

Mr Tonkin: You mean the Legislative Council.

Mr RUSHTON: —relating to the acceptance of the Bill, which I commend to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Rushton (Deputy Premier), and passed.

**EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 19 October.

**MR PEARCE** (Gosnells) [5.24 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to do two things, one of which is to put into the legislation power of suspension which can be exercised in many areas, but which may be in doubt now. One should pause briefly to consider whether many of the other department's regulations may be challenged in a court of law, because the regulations have grown like Topsy and do not relate to the powers that were originally granted. Many of the amendment Bills which have come before this Chamber in relation to education have tried to put into the legislation certain regulations which would otherwise be subject to legal challenge.

This Bill deals with the power of schools to suspend students.

Mr Davies: There is nothing retrospective in this legislation, is there?

Mr PEARCE: Not unless going back 100 years is retrospective.

The more serious thing the Bill seeks to do is to allow the Minister, on the recommendation of the Director General of Education, and subject to a review panel, to expel students from schools; that is, to make suspensions permanent. In relation to that, the Opposition has nothing to oppose. We support the proposition that there are students in schools who are so disruptive that in the best interests of all concerned it is necessary to expel them.

The Opposition believes that the Government cannot wash its hands of expelled students after expulsion has taken place. We are prepared to accept that severely disruptive students need to be taken out of the school situation, but there needs to be some other provision made for them. The Bill does make some provision, but it is a laughable one and I will deal with it later. We need to take into consideration the reason that students become so disruptive that expulsion is necessary.

The Minister did not explain that fact. From the way in which the Bill is drafted, the Minister could not have cared less why those students are the way they are and what happens to them after they are expelled.

My experience and study would lead me to believe that most students who are severely disruptive in this way suffer from severe emotional or psychological disturbances and are in need of specialised treatment to modify their behavioural patterns. The school is not the proper place where those types of children can obtain assistance. In fact, the students and teachers would breathe a sigh of relief when the disruptive students move out of the school. What is the Government doing to assist these children? Unless some provision is made for them, the problem is merely being handed on from the schools to the Police Department.

I am talking about very young children in many cases. Attendance at schools is compulsory up to the age of 15 years and it is well known that students can leave school in the year they turn 15 years subject to mutual arrangement between the parents and the school. After that, the schools can exercise some degree of selectivity as to whom they take back into the school for further courses. I am really talking about children who are 14 years of age and younger because these are the children who are likely to find themselves up for expulsion. My guess is that they are children in their first or second year of high school; that is, years eight and nine, the children between the ages of 12 and 14 years.

Mr Tonkin: Why not children in year 10?

Mr PEARCE: That may well be the case, but the children who are severely disruptive in the school environment are those who do not want to be in that environment. Any year 10 student is, under the Act, able to leave school at the end of the year he turns 15. In the past even children who were 14 years old could get exemptions from attending school in order to do something else and that is the way some severely disruptive students have been dealt with in the past. It could be the case that some 15-year-olds could be disruptive students.

Unless proper provision is made for these disruptive children, they go on the streets. It is not fair to suggest that the problem should be handed back to the family, because often the reason the child has become emotionally disturbed is that the family situation is not satisfactory. I cannot attempt to suggest the types of family structures that will lead to problems in a large way.



For example, a severely emotionally disturbed student might come from a one-parent family where the single parent is working; perhaps the parent is working long hours or shift work in order to make enough money in a fairly lowly paid occupation to keep body and soul together. No thought appears to have been given to the supervision of that child. Who is to look after that person who has been expelled from school? It is not enough to say, "Let us put the problem back on the family, where it belongs." The problem in this case will end up on the streets. Expelled students in this category may go from spending their time disrupting the school to spending it disrupting society. Someone who is making life hell for teachers and students could well end up making life hell for policemen and innocent passersby on the streets. He may become involved in breaking into houses and committing a whole range of crimes.

As I say, the Opposition does not oppose the expulsion provisions; nevertheless, some provision needs to be made within the social structure to cater for these children. It is at this point that the Bill becomes fairly laughable because the single suggestion of the Minister in his second reading speech is that students in this category may continue to receive their education through correspondence. I put it to him as a one-time teacher himself that that must be one of the most unlikely suggestions ever made in a second reading speech in this House. It is absurd and ridiculous to say that students who are so disruptive and so lacking in a desire to receive an education within the school system successfully will be able to cope with the requirements of correspondence education which involves greater motivation and, presumably, a much greater degree of supervision than in the normal classroom situation. No suggestion has been made as to how this system may work, and I believe it is a very unlikely thing to happen.

Effectively, students in that category will be deprived of an education by virtue of their expulsion. I hasten to say that in some ways that is not tremendously serious, because to leave such students within the school system will be to deprive them of an education as well, because the severely disruptive practices in which they engage almost always mean they are not getting anything from the school in an educational sense, anyway.

In addition, the correspondence education suggestion made by the Minister in his second reading speech does not appear in the Bill. The Bill itself contains some rather strange provisions. The Minister seeks to give himself the power to make an order with respect to the education of a

child who has been expelled; that is to say, the Minister can make any order he sees fit. Presumably, he can order that the child undertake correspondence education; or, that the child should watch educational films four times a week. I do not know whether the Minister believes he is seeking to give himself the power to order severely disruptive students to attend classes of the type conducted by the Department for Community Welfare for people who are subject to community welfare orders; that is not clear in the legislation. However, if the Minister thinks he is giving himself the power to deem a disruptive student to be an offender of some type, he should realise such a provision would be unlikely to survive legal challenge.

However, having given himself that authority to make such orders, the Minister required the inclusion of punitive clauses to make sure the ministerial order was enforceable, and this is where the Bill assumes the status of farce. New section 20G (7) states—

Where . . .

- (b) the child fails to comply with such directions without an excuse that is deemed a reasonable excuse under section 14 of this Act.

the child is deemed to be habitually absent from school for the purposes of section 18 of this Act and the provisions of that section apply accordingly.

Of course the student will be habitually absent from school; after all, he has been expelled! It seems quite strange the truancy provision should be invoked against people who are permanently truant from school by action of the Minister.

Mr Tonkin: That will teach him to get himself expelled!

Mr PEARCE: According to new section 20G, if a student does not do what the Minister tells him to do after he has been expelled, he will be treated as a truant. I suppose this new section does not mean what it appears to mean. Under the present legislation, the main thing which happens to truants is that they are ordered to attend school and their parents are subject to penalties if the children fail to attend. I am not suggesting expelled students will find truant officers visiting them to find out why they are not at school, and serving orders on their parents; that would be too ridiculous to contemplate.

However, it points up the fact that the Bill is far from satisfactory in its attempt to deal with what will happen to expelled students. Not to put too fine a point on it, I suggest that many students who are emotionally disturbed have at

least the possibility if not the probability of turning into young delinquents or young criminals if some form of treatment is not made available to them to help them overcome their problems. It is no answer to turn them loose on the streets and let the police try to catch them after crimes—perhaps serious crimes—have been committed. That is a serious weakness in the legislation.

The Opposition supports the proposition that severely disruptive students should be expelled, but in taking them out of the school system, the Government places on itself an obligation to make some proper provision for them. "Proper provision" is not merely the ability of the Minister to say, "You will do correspondence lessons and if I do not like the way you are doing them or the frequency with which you send in your homework, I will find ways of punishing you." That is not a satisfactory way of dealing with a severely emotionally disturbed student.

On the whole, this is an unsatisfactory piece of legislation. While we support what it tries to do, we believe a more thoroughgoing approach to the whole matter is required. Provision should be made for expelled students, and real attention given to dealing with the problems of these children, rather than treating them as delinquents and taking them out of the schools and putting them on the streets—where sooner or later, I suppose, they would appear unless something is done. It is not a particularly responsible approach on the part of the Government. Members opposite are the first to leap to their feet and decry the level of violence and crime on the streets and in our society. However, in some ways, this Bill may contribute to an increase in that area.

**MR TONKIN (Morley)** [5.37 p.m.]: I support the Bill. When we are talking about the expulsion of students from schools, we are speaking about a very small number of students who, probably, are pathological. We certainly are not speaking about naughty boys or girls, but about children who, in some cases, are hardened criminals. Obviously, teachers are not equipped to deal with these students in the classroom situation; nor should the vast majority of students have their education jeopardised by this very small proportion of severely disturbed children remaining in the normal school situation. So, we believe the school is not equipped or able to deal with these children and, for the sake of teachers and for the sake of students and their parents, action needs to be taken.

However, like the member for Gosnells, I am rather concerned that insufficient attention appears to have been given to this matter by the

Government. This may not be within the aegis of the Minister for Education; perhaps consultation needs to take place between the Minister for Education and the Minister for Community Welfare or perhaps some of his other colleagues, so that proper provision will be made for people who are severely disturbed.

What may be needed is some kind of residential place where these people can receive proper treatment. I have heard some very good reports of the kind of treatment carried out at Clontarf; however, that is only a small institution.

Perhaps the Government should be looking at in-depth psychiatric assistance for some students rather than simply saying, "They are not fit to be in our schools so we will not worry about them."

I hope that when he replies, the Minister for Education may be able to give some idea as to what steps will be taken to ensure students who are expelled from school are cared for. Just as the population of our schools needs to be protected from these people, so society generally needs to be protected, and it is no solution simply to take them out of the school situation and let them run wild in the streets. So, I would like to hear from the Minister whether—perhaps in consultation with some of his colleagues—he has any plans to help these people who are severely disturbed.

The Opposition supports the Bill. When we look at it in the narrower educational area, we find it is obvious the average classroom teacher is not trained or equipped to deal with this kind of person. The teacher may have 30 or so other students to teach and obviously cannot deal at length with the kind of depth needed to assist these young people. In giving support to the Bill, I reiterate that the Opposition trusts the Government will give consideration to the real needs of this tiny proportion of students.

I still take every opportunity to speak to school students because, frankly, I miss the contact I had in my many years as a secondary school teacher. I enjoy talking to students. I emphasise we are talking about only a tiny proportion of school students. The vast majority are fine young Australians who show a great deal of interest in society, and a lot of responsibility.

I visited a high school today, and had the opportunity at first hand to observe the tremendous responsibility and maturity of these young people. Last Monday night I was at a high school where once again I had the opportunity to see the tremendous type of young person our school system is developing. So, I would not like anyone to think we are talking about large numbers;

probably, we are talking about only 0.5 per cent of the total school population.

Mr Davies: Do you believe that in that respect teacher training is inadequate to deal with that kind of situation?

Mr TONKIN: I do not believe teachers can be trained to deal with that kind of student. Those students do not require educational assistance; they require psychiatric assistance. This kind of student should not be in the classroom at all; however, he does need proper psychiatric help. I am not talking about students who are naughty, but otherwise normal; I am talking about children who, in many cases, are psychotic. Quite obviously, teachers have not been trained to deal with such children; indeed, teachers cannot be so trained because these young people are not part of the normal system of our society.

Mr Davies: Has the department a role in initiating any assistance or treatment for such students?

Mr TONKIN: Certainly, these students can be referred to the guidance section of the Education Department; however, the department is rather thin on the ground in respect of the availability of qualified clinical psychologists or psychiatrists to deal with these people. So, really, the Education Department is not properly qualified to deal with these severely disturbed students.

With those reservations, the Opposition supports the Bill.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup—Minister for Education) [5.43 p.m.]: I thank the members who have spoken on this Bill for their generous support. I feel the member for Gosnells was well wide of the mark when he suggested—to use his own words—that I could not care less about the students who will get kicked out of school. That suggestion is totally inaccurate and false, and I reject it.

We are dealing with a very serious matter and, apart from that point, I accept all of the points raised by the two members. As they would be aware from my second reading speech, if not otherwise, Western Australia will be the last of the mainland States of Australia to introduce a provision which really amounts to expulsion. The New South Wales Act does explicitly include an expulsion provision. However, that power is assumed, and it has been confirmed by the courts.

#### *Leave to Continue Speech*

Mr CLARKO: I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage of the sitting.

Leave granted.

Debate thus adjourned.

(Continued on page 4664)

### “HANSARD”: TRANSCRIPT

#### *Statement by Speaker*

THE SPEAKER (Mr Thompson): Earlier today there was a difference of opinion over what had been recorded in *Hansard* in respect of a speech made by the Premier. My advice is that the *Hansard* reporter dictated her turn using the words, “ought not to be our priorities”. The Premier crossed out the words. However, the *Hansard* reporter did not allow the correction because she believed that the words she had dictated were the words used by the Premier.

When the paragraph in proof form was read by another reporter, as is the custom, the second reporter felt that the word “not” did not make sense and did not fit in with the general nature of the speech both before and after the sentence under question. She consulted the reporter responsible for the turn, and it was agreed that the “not” should be deleted to make sense of the speech.

When the matter was raised today, I sought a report from the Chief Hansard Reporter. It has now been revealed by a closer examination of the shorthand note that the words actually used by the Premier were “and need”, not “ought not”. The words “and need” will be recorded in the bound volume of *Hansard* because they were the words actually used.

I regret any inconvenience caused, and I would like to say that this and other similar situations that have arisen, not only recently but over a period of time in this House, highlight the fact that we need a backup recording facility.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: This would assist the *Hansard* staff to do their work. The Joint Printing Committee is actively considering the prospect of installing some sort of recording system so that these inaccuracies—which do give rise to problems in the House—can be eliminated.

#### *Points of Order*

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I am not sure, Sir, whether it is appropriate under our Standing Orders to rise on a point of order. However, I would like to say one or two things about the matter you have just raised.

The SPEAKER: You may proceed on a point of order.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: On a point of order, Sir, it seems to me that the original fault lay in the correction which was made.

Mr O'Connor: The transcript was not correct.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: It was not correct, that is right. I simply want to draw attention to the fact that it makes things difficult if members correct their speeches to make them sound better.

Mr Hassell: You are trying to justify the disgusting allegations which you made earlier.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! How can I be expected to listen to a point of order and to give some sort of intelligent response if the point of order is interrupted with interjections? The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BRIAN BURKE: I wanted to make this point: What I said today about the *Hansard* transcript having been corrected—and I did not pursue the point—turns out to be true. The exclusion of the word “not” has been demonstrated by reference back to the *Hansard* reporters and the word “need” should have properly had a place in the transcript. The point I am making is that, in my view, if members of this House are to delete words which they actually used, we must have a backup system to record the speeches made because we cannot expect that debate will continue sensibly if speeches are to be changed to correct errors made in original submissions.

The SPEAKER: The Chief Hansard Reporter went to some pains to show me the shorthand symbols actually recorded. The symbols for the words “and need” are very similar to the symbols for the words “ought not”. Clearly the *Hansard* reporter made a mistake initially in that the incorrect words were dictated to the typist. That fact has been made clear to me by the Chief Hansard Reporter. The events that followed subsequently compounded the original error. I want to make it clear that I do not blame the reporter for the error—it is a human one and these mistakes can occur. Clearly it was a matter that could have been rectified easily had there been access to a tape recording.

Mr O'CONNOR: On a point of order also, Mr Speaker, I want to make my point perfectly clear to this House. When I received the transcript from *Hansard*, I was aware that I had not used the words “ought not”. The sentence did not make sense containing those words. I tried to rectify the matter using the other words that I had said. Members will realise that when one speaks for 20 minutes or half an hour, it is sometimes difficult to recollect all the words used.

Mr Hassell: Impossible!

Mr O'CONNOR: In view of this, I deleted the words I knew I had not said. As you said, Mr Speaker, the original error was then compounded. I accept that these things can happen. However, I hope that Opposition members will apologise for the implications they made about what I had said.

Mr Brian Burke: That is not right. The Speaker said the word “not” goes in.

Mr TONKIN: I am sorry, Sir, but I became rather confused with all your references to quote this and unquote that. Could you please tell me the actual sentence which will appear in the bound volume of *Hansard*?

The SPEAKER: The actual passage to go into the bound volume will use the words “ought not”.

Mr Brian Burke: That is the point. Would you now apologise to us?

The SPEAKER: I am now becoming a little confused.

Mr Brian Burke: I am not confused at all, Mr Speaker. I have the transcript here.

The SPEAKER: The words “and need” were the words actually stated by the Premier, and it will be those words that are included in the bound volume.

Mr Tonkin: Could you read the actual sentence?

The SPEAKER: I am afraid I am not in a position to read the whole sentence. I have here a memo which was given to me by the Chief Hansard Reporter. I will make copies of that memo available to the Opposition.

Mr Tonkin: And copies of the sentence which will appear in the bound volume?

The SPEAKER: I will ask the Chief Hansard Reporter to supply that.

## QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage during which the sitting was suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

## MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: OFFICES OF PROFIT

### *Joint Select Committee: Report*

MR HARMAN (Maylands) [7.30 p.m.]: I have for tabling the report of the Joint Select Committee inquiring into offices of profit of members of Parliament and members' contracts with the Crown.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Crane): I direct that the report be tabled.

Mr HARMAN: I move without notice—

That the Report of the Joint Select Committee inquiring into Offices of Profit of Members of Parliament and Members' Contracts with the Crown, together with the minutes and the transcript of evidence, be received, and that the Report be printed.

Question put and passed.

*The report was tabled (see paper No. 548).*

## EDUCATION AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**MR CLARKO** (Karrinyup—Minister for Education) [7.31 p.m.]: As I said earlier, I agree, as was pointed out by the speakers for the Opposition, that the step taken by this legislation is a serious one. I mentioned that if this legislation is passed, every mainland State in Australia will have legislation to empower the expulsion of school students.

I was interested to hear the member for Morley indicate that he thought the number of children likely to be expelled would be less than 0.5 per cent. I agree, and 0.5 per cent is a small percentage. However, if we are talking about even only one or two pupils at each high school, it can be appreciated that the percentage is miniscule—one-quarter or one-eighth of one per cent of our students.

The students to be expelled would have gone through a lengthy process of attempts at rehabilitation already. As the member for Gosnells quite rightly said, attempts at rehabilitation are most important.

Mr Pearce: It might be only one or two students at each high school, but accepting that there are possibly 60 high schools—

Mr CLARKO: The number would be closer to 80, depending on the type of schools taken into account.

Mr Pearce: You would still be looking at 80 to 120 students.

Mr CLARKO: Officers of my department have told me that the number would be in the range of 50 to 100. As members would appreciate, in my experience I have not struck any of these students. I wonder whether the member for Morley in his experience has struck any of them.

Mr Tonkin: I struck one or two.

Mr CLARKO: I must qualify my comment by saying that I have not physically struck these students, or any students, although I must admit that there were times that I thought of striking

these types of students, and even students a long way off suspension or expulsion.

It is important that the step provided in this legislation is taken. The capacity of the correspondence school must be considered. As we all know, it has been expanded in recent years, and for various reasons a child may obtain his education through that school. A child may have a certain illness—and various illnesses are listed—that prevent him from attending a school. The correspondence school has a system of teachers visiting homes to give appropriate assistance to children taking correspondence courses. Clearly that assistance would need to be continued for expelled children.

As the member for Gosnells said, we will need to pay particular attention to the education of these students. It is just not a matter of a child of student age not attending a school; we have a responsibility as far as we can to try to give as much assistance as we can. It is significant that this legislation will bring us into line with virtually the whole of Australia.

It is important that we have a process with many checks and balances. I could not have agreed to this legislation if it had not included the appropriate steps, checks, and balances. It is quite a long process to be followed before a child can be expelled and certain steps as spelt out in the clauses must be followed in regard to how the Minister of the day can modify any order he might apply. It is particularly noteworthy that on this matter we have a high degree of agreement between teacher and parent organisations and educators.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr Crane) in the Chair; Mr Clarko (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 20G inserted—

Mr PEARCE: This is the key clause; it is the one which will provide the expulsion power, and it is also the one that raises the area of concern taken up by the member for Morley and me. It seems to us that before the legislation is implemented it is necessary that a clear scheme is laid down for what will happen to expelled students.

As I told the Chamber during the second reading stage, the legislation places a responsibility on

the Minister of the day to make such orders as he sees fit with regard to the education of expelled students. The Minister may not make an order; I presume that if he simply does nothing, the child will be out of school, and that will be the end of the matter. No compulsion is placed on the Minister to make an order.

The Minister could make an order of the type that the pupil shall carry out correspondence lessons. Very often—it is not universal—the student who is emotionally disturbed to the point where he or she becomes disruptive, is not remarkably literate because he has through his school career shown a pattern of disruption, and has not learnt a great deal. Those students have the least capacity to cope with correspondence courses, and are motivationally less able to cope with those courses than others. Correspondence courses require a degree of motivation in order that the student might obtain a proper education greater than that required for an education to be obtained in the schoolroom where the student is face-to-face with a teacher.

Some teachers may go around the city assisting with correspondence lessons, but we could be merely transferring the responsibility for these disruptive children in the classroom from a teacher in a classroom to a teacher in the correspondence section of the department, the teacher who, presumably, is less trained to cope with the situation than would seem necessary.

However, the Minister may make some other form of order, but he has not suggested to us what form any such other order may take. The member for Morley outlined clearly what could be done. Provision could be made for psychiatric help to be given to the severely disruptive child so that his behavioural patterns are reshaped, a reshaping which cannot be carried out in the school environment. The Minister did not in his second reading speech or in his reply say that such alternatives have been thought out in the department. It seems that nothing has been thought out to assist these children.

We in the Opposition are in a difficult position. We support the Bill, but we fear that when it is put into law and children are expelled, nothing will be done for those children, other than to provide them with correspondence lessons. Clearly that is unsatisfactory to us. The clause is deficient in that regard, but it is not our place to presume to devise appropriate schemes for the Education Department or the Minister by way of amendments. We will not attempt to enshrine alternative schemes in the Bill, because clearly a degree of experimentation and deliberation will be needed for each student expelled.

It seems that 100 or more students will be expelled each year, so it cannot be said that we are talking about the odd one or two. I am sure the people of Perth would not be happy to know that there may be 50 to 100 expelled 13 or 14-year-olds walking around the city without any supervision because they have been put out of schools as a result of their social disruptiveness. Surely that situation will not be welcomed by the citizens of this metropolis, or for that matter, citizens of country towns.

Of course, the number of 13 or 14-year-olds in this situation in country towns will be much smaller. We have in country areas the pastoral care arrangements under which a disruptive child is catered for. It may be that in country towns the social problems that lead to disruptive behaviour by 13 or 14-year-olds is not as prominent as it is in the metropolitan area.

We are not happy with this clause. It seems from the Minister's reply that no clear scheme to assist these children has been thought out, and no format of what will happen to them has been developed. I suggest that, before this legislation becomes law, the Minister obtain a clear understanding of what will happen to any student expelled.

Mr TONKIN: I must confess I was a little disappointed by the Minister's reply. He did not seem to listen to our reservations about this legislation, and if he did, he did not reply to them as I thought he would. As the member for Gosnells and I suggested, it is all very well for our education system that, where necessary, students be expelled, but we must consider what will happen to those students. Certainly they would need psychiatric attention. It will be no good our just sending these children to their so-called homes to obtain an education. As suggested earlier, we may need some kind of residential place to which they can be sent, and I mentioned the Clontarf Boys Town. I accept it is not a Government agency, but it does a great deal of good work for young people, and some disruptive youngsters from Government schools have been taken in by that home.

As I said before, it is not so much a matter of the Minister for Education's making an order, but rather of his working in co-operation with some of his colleagues. I would like to know what is envisaged for the severely disturbed and, perhaps, psychotic students to be expelled. They will need a great deal of professional care and education, which would not be the main concern of the Education Department—it is a matter of social and personal welfare.

Mr CLARKO: I acknowledge the points made by the two members. As far as I am concerned, if I am given the job of making an order, I will take great note of the members' comments. It is my view that people such as my colleague, the Minister for Health, who is concerned at this very minute with adolescent psychiatric clinics and the like, would be asked for advice. In addition, the Minister for Community Welfare would provide assistance to the Minister of the day.

As members would appreciate, a great deal of interaction would occur. It would be foolish in the extreme if the Minister of the day were not to take note of these points. As members would know, many students already wander the streets. A few of them have been suspended. It is our responsibility as educators not to do a Pontius Pilate, and certainly it would not be my intention to do a Pontius Pilate. It is intended that this legislation will not allow that to occur.

The members' comments are noted.

Mr PEARCE: That is all very well, but—if we are to make some progress in this regard—the Minister should know that, if he made an order that an expelled student should attend one of the community welfare arrangements or one of the mental health arrangements, the student may not attend. I believe if we are to commit someone to do that it would be necessary to do so through the courts.

Mr Young: I was shaking my head because it is not necessary, with psychiatric counselling, that they go through the courts.

Mr PEARCE: If it is on a voluntary basis.

Mr Young: I am making the assumption that, if you are talking about this possibility of rehabilitation, it would be likely to be on a voluntary basis rather than a non-voluntary one. If you were to place someone in one of the mental health institutions on a non-voluntary basis, that person would probably go there in any event without the need of the Education Act.

Mr PEARCE: That is possible, but the Minister is considering students who would not be amenable to anything at all. The people we are dealing with in this Bill are not people of that order; they are people who have been forced out of school. The point is that some of these students need to be grouped in classes of the type run at Nyandi by the Department for Community Welfare. The teachers there work with small groups and deal mostly with people who are disturbed. The education system is structured around that. I know people who have taught at Nyandi. I believe that, and may be it is an incorrect belief, that the Minister could not on his own signature expel

students from school and then make an order that they should attend a facility such as that if room in such a facility were not available. The facility at Nyandi caters for about 20 people.

The cost per student is astronomical when compared with the cost of educating a student in a high school. Maybe it is a cost the community should bear. The member for Morley and I feel there must be some recognition of the need for the provision of proper facilities for students who under this legislation have been expelled from schools.

The Minister may say it would be foolish in the extreme for him to sign orders before facilities are set up to fill the need. The question the member for Morley and I wish to emphasise is: What will the Minister do when the first order lands on his desk, and he realises we had a good point when we discussed the matter in Parliament? If the facilities are not there, what can he do? He can send the students to a correspondence course, which is the only facility open to them. The member for Morley and I hope the Minister takes account of the point that, unless the facilities are established before the expulsion of the students, there will be nowhere for them to go.

Mr CLARKO: I acknowledge the points made by the member for Morley and the member for Gosnells. They are matters I have been contemplating for some time and I agree with what has been said. I am sure members understand that we are talking about totally recalcitrant students, the sort of people who are wandering the streets and doing the things the members have mentioned.

I do not believe that, if the Minister directed them to a place, there would be any likelihood of their going there. That sort of person is not the type of pupil one normally has doing correspondence courses.

Mr Pearce: Ironically one of the small groups that do get treated consists of those who have taken themselves out of school and have committed crimes. They have gone to the Children's Court which has sent them to Riverbank.

Mr CLARKO: More of these students regretably might go that way. When we enact this legislation I do not think there will be any horrific problems. Some of the problems resolve themselves with the effluxion of time. These people pass the age of school leaving and the age where they can obtain an exemption. There is a problem with exemptions because they need the support of parents. If a parent decides his child is a problem and does not want him to leave school, he cannot. When the parent and child are in harmony—sometimes pupils have the ability to twist

parents' arms—the child can leave the education system.

I have taken note of what has been said and I had in mind to look at these matters, and members have refreshed me on those matters.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Clarko (Minister for Education), and transmitted to the Council.

## **BORROWINGS FOR AUTHORITIES AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from 26 October.

**MR I. F. TAYLOR** (Kalgoorlie) [7.48 p.m.]: When moving to establish the borrowings for authorities legislation last year, the then Treasurer suggested that that legislation, and the setting up of the Treasury as the borrowing authority, would be for the co-ordination and consolidation of the borrowings of diverse Government authorities which may be involved in the provision of infrastructure for resource projects.

It now would seem that with the virtual collapse of the infrastructure finance scheme and with developments concerning the Loan Council, it has been necessary for the Government to change tack and come up with this idea of a central borrowing authority to consolidate the loan-raising efforts of all bodies but the State Energy Commission and, as the Treasurer said in his second reading speech, those few smaller authorities which operate bank accounts outside Treasury and have established relationships with those banks.

Mr O'Connor: They can come in, if need be, to top up.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: It would seem that the Government has—as we suggested when the Treasurer was reading his second reading speech—come up with something that was suggested by the Opposition last year, when the then Treasurer brought the legislation before the House. Even though it is perhaps not appropriate to say “we told you so”, if ever there was a case for that to be said, this is it.

If we refer to the second reading debate of last year, we note it was suggested that it would be

much more important and better for the State as a whole if the authority—that is, the borrowing authority—did borrow on behalf of Government departments and instrumentalities. In particular, we referred to the State Energy Commission, Westrail, and the Metropolitan Water Board, as it was then known.

The Opposition suggested that a central borrowing authority could be the answer to the future capital raising financial problems of the Government and that it could apply to any future Government and its instrumentalities. At the time, the then Treasurer poured scorn on that idea and said it was not proper to establish a central borrowing authority.

Mr O'Connor: That is the previous Treasurer?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Yes. The then Treasurer stated—

I am surprised if he does not understand the desire of the Treasury and in fact the insistence of the Treasury that there be a number of properly accredited proven borrowing authorities. To concentrate all our borrowings from the State, whether they be for infrastructure, for the SEC, for the Water Board, for Westrail, or for any other authority that may develop from time to time, would be a disaster.

It would seem we have moved from a situation in which the idea before the House is considered—as it was by the former Treasurer—to be a disaster, to it being allowed and put forward by the Government.

I do not consider for one moment that the SEC should be excluded from this scheme. The SEC above all should be included in the same light as the Treasurer to make sure that it does the right thing by this State. The borrowings of the SEC are quite extraordinary. I am sure in years to come this State will have to question the borrowings of the SEC.

A further matter canvassed last year in the debate related to the Opposition's amendment to section 9 of the current Act. As section 9 stands at present, it allows the Treasurer to meet under certain circumstances a shortfall of funds from the CRF. It was suggested by the Opposition and the member for Victoria Park that that should happen. We moved an amendment to that effect and said the Government should make sure that if at any time the funds ran short, it would be possible to borrow from the CRF at an interest rate equivalent to the amount that would have accrued if the money had been invested under the Public Moneys Investment Act.



The then Treasurer said that it was a good idea. He said—

We cannot achieve the suggested result by a simple amendment. I have requested the Crown Law Department to get busy on the matter, to consider the suggestion, and to see whether it can come up with some simple words which would not lend themselves to any misinterpretation, but which would show the intent clearly.

It is surprising to us that the Government has not made some mention of that suggestion. The then Treasurer did see some merit in the Opposition's amendment, but said that, if there were any drawing on the CRF, the authority concerned should pay an appropriate interest rate and that was the only way to overcome it.

While we support the Bill before the House, we ask the Government to give further consideration to the amendment to which I have referred.

**MR DAVIES** (Victoria Park) [8.01 p.m.]: The member for Kalgoorlie may be modest about saying "I told you so", but I do not have that same modesty. I want the Government to know clearly and unequivocally that it is doing now what at this time last year we said should have been done. Had the Government been reasonable—the leadership has changed, so perhaps we are getting more reason—

Several members interjected.

**Mr DAVIES**: Now I have made enemies in my own camp! If sweet reason had prevailed on that occasion, we would not have had to waste the time of this Parliament now. As far as I can determine, the Bill does exactly as we proposed it should when the matter previously was brought into Parliament. I would be very grateful if the Treasurer were able to indicate whether any difference exists between what we were proposing and what the Government proposes now. I was looking at the Act which was before Parliament last year; a report should have been tabled in the House in relation to what has happened, the borrowings which were made during the year, and the work which was done. According to section 14 of the Act, a provision exists for a report to be made to Parliament at the end of each financial year. Can the Treasurer tell us when or if that report will be made?

**Mr O'Connor**: Offhand, I cannot tell you that.

**Mr DAVIES**: It may be a matter the Treasurer can look at. I have a note of it elsewhere, and I had intended to put a question on the notice paper.

**Mr O'Connor**: Do that, and I will bring the answer back for you. Other members may like to know.

**Mr DAVIES**: I suppose that is reasonable. I could have done that a week ago, but I thought I would take this opportunity to ascertain the reason for the delay. I will do as the Treasurer suggests.

I agree with the remarks made by the member for Kalgoorlie, and thank him for bringing forward the points he raised. Perhaps the Treasurer can tell us why the Government has decided not to go on with the suggestion we made last year about paying interest on money borrowed from the CRF. If the Government is proceeding with that matter, we would be delighted to know. Perhaps next year we will bring in another amending Bill to see if we can include that clause because it seemed to us to have a great deal of value, and it seemed a reasonable thing to do. The Government increasingly is raising charges—one department against another—and it would not have been unreasonable that, where money was borrowed from the CRF which might have raised interest on the short-term money market, the Government could have charged interest to whoever received the advance. I repeat that I am not quite as modest as the member for Kalgoorlie. We told the Government so last year.

**MR O'CONNOR** (Mt. Lawley—Treasurer) [8.04 p.m.]: I thank the two members opposite for their support of the Bill. Members know that during this year some alterations were made at the *Premiers' Conference* in connection with these matters. The SEC was given authority to borrow not only locally, but also overseas. One of the matters which concerned us was the powers of SECs in other States. Unless we set up this authority we would be outbid, and would not be able to borrow as favourably for the State.

I was unaware of the amendment suggested last year by the Opposition, until it was mentioned tonight. If the member for Kalgoorlie gives me the details later on, I will follow up the matter and let members know what has been done about it. I will give them the details they have requested.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

**BILLS (2): RETURNED**

1. Acts Amendment (Mining) Bill.  
Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.
2. Road Traffic Amendment Bill (No. 2).  
Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

**LAW REFORM (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL***Receipt and First Reading*

Bill received from the Council and, on motion by Mr Rushton (Deputy Premier), read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**MR RUSHTON** (Dale—Deputy Premier) [8.08 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to overcome certain problems, which could arise from a High Court decision handed down in April this year in *Fitch v Hyde-Cates*. In order to make clear the import of that decision, it is necessary to recount a little legal history.

At common law when a person died, the right of action against the person who caused his death died with him. This problem was overcome in Western Australia by the Fatal Accidents Act 1959, which confers a new right of action on the dependants of the deceased. Damages recoverable are proportioned to the degree of dependency these persons had on the deceased. This Act was really meant to provide fully for those who had been dependent on the deceased.

Also at common law, any cause of action in tort a person may have had, died with him. This problem was overcome by the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1941. It continued all subsisting causes of action for the benefit of the estate of the deceased. It specifically excluded claims for damages for pain or suffering, bodily or mental harm, or curtailment of expectation of life. The law was not thought to confer any right to damages for the earnings which the deceased would have had during the years of which he had been deprived by the accident that caused his death—"The lost years".

In April of this year the High Court decided, in *Fitch v. Hyde-Cates*, notwithstanding earlier

interpretation to the contrary, that the New South Wales provision which is equivalent to our Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act does confer, on the estate of the deceased person, the right to damages for the earnings which the deceased would have had during the lost years. It is clear that the corresponding provision in this State must now be interpreted in the same way.

One practical consequence of this new rule is that dependants who recover in a claim under the Fatal Accidents Act may, provided they are also entitled to benefit from the estate, receive a further sum in addition to what the court has decided is warranted by their loss of support from the deceased. This additional sum will have to be set off against the entitlement to damages under the Fatal Accidents Act. In some circumstances a dependant will end up with more than he would have obtained under the old rule. In other cases anomalies will be created by the setting off because the beneficiaries may have different entitlements under the fatal accidents judgment and the will or intestacy of the deceased.

The other important consequence of the new rule is that in some cases persons or institutions entitled to benefit from the estate, and not dependent on the deceased in any degree, will receive substantial sums that previously would not have been available. This is because the new right to damages accrues for the benefit of the estate as a whole and any person or body having a right to share in the estate will benefit accordingly.

This development in the law will fall most heavily on Government insurers. It has caused great concern to the insurance industry generally, but particularly to the Western Australian Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust. The concern it has expressed is not simply of increased payouts in respect of future deaths, but also of fresh claims being made in relation to cases previously thought to have been settled.

An actuarial report, by E. S. Knight & Co., commissioned by the State of South Australia has estimated that Australia-wide the decision will add approximately \$100 million annually to the payout by compulsory third party insurers and perhaps as much as \$450 million from additional claims in respect of deaths prior to the decision. In addition, the decision may cost those covering employers' liability insurance about \$37 million per year, as well as increase their outstanding claims by about \$160 million. The South Australian actuarial report has been studied also by the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust's consulting actuary, who agrees with the conclusions reached so far as Western Australia is concerned. He considers that there is no reason to doubt the assess-

ment that the High Court decision will add \$49 million to the trust's outstanding claims provision as at 30 June 1982, and that it will add \$8 million a year to the cost of future claims.

The actuary considers that the effect on premiums paid to the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust would amount to about a nine per cent increase to cover future accidents, to which would need to be added a further increase of between 11 per cent and 18 per cent to raise the \$49 million needed to cover outstanding claims.

He concluded that the total premium increase would need to be in the range of 20 per cent to 27 per cent of present levels depending on whether the money was recovered over the next three to five years.

The alternative would be to increase the premiums sufficiently to recover the \$49 million in one year and to adjust the premium the following year sufficiently to cover future accidents. It is not considered that this alternative would be acceptable to the community generally. Needless to say, there would also have to be increases in premiums payable on other types of policies affected for the same reason.

The matter has caused concern not only to this State, but also to every other State, except Queensland. In Queensland, the law was amended in 1972 and, consequently, the High Court decision had no effect in that State.

New South Wales and South Australia have passed amending legislation this year to counteract the effect of the High Court ruling and Victoria has similar legislation before its Parliament at the present time.

The Bill simply seeks to keep the position as it was prior to the High Court decision to which reference has been made. In effect, it is confirming the position as it was generally understood to be in all States previously, and will not remove any benefits under the Fatal Accidents Act. Thus it is not open to the objection to which retrospective legislation is often subject; namely, that it changes the rules to the detriment of those who very properly have been relying on them. This legislation will do quite the opposite and will prevent a change in the rules which would have very serious financial consequences in this State.

The Bill contains a saving provision so that it will not affect causes of action where courts already may have awarded judgment. In addition, so far as pending claims, if any, are concerned, I understand that the trust, where it might otherwise have been liable, will be agreeable to meeting legal costs for work done to date. A similar arrangement was made in South Australia.

As I have indicated, the situation is of concern not only to this State, but also to others where they either have legislated or are in the process of passing legislation to overcome the problems which have arisen from the High Court decision.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr J. F. Taylor.

## APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

### *In Committee*

Resumed from 2 November. The Chairman of Committees (Mr Blaikie) in the Chair; Mr O'Connor (Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Progress was reported after Division 16 had been agreed to.

### Division 17: Government Printing Office, \$17 298 000—

Mr PARKER: My concern in relation to the Government Printing Office relates to the distribution of copies of the *Government Gazette*. This is not the first time I have raised this matter; but it is the first time I have raised it with the current Treasurer.

When I became a member of Parliament, I was surprised to discover that members were not entitled to receive copies of the *Western Australian Government Gazette* as a matter of right. When one considers the amount of paper work that comes across our desks from all sorts of sources, one realises that many of us would not want any more paper work than we already have.

Mr O'Connor: You can say that again.

Mr PARKER: However, it seems to me that of all the paper that comes across one's desk, the *Government Gazette* is one of the most important. After all, a huge amount of legislation affecting the State of Western Australia is not legislation passed as such by the Parliament, but takes the form of regulations.

Mr Stephens: You could pay for it out of your electorate allowance.

Mr O'Connor: I am not disagreeing with you; but would it be reasonable if three or four copies were sent to each party?

Mr PARKER: I am sure that not every member would want to obtain a copy; and if 87 copies were sent, I am sure 80 of them would be wasted and thrown in the bin or "filed". If one were to do that, one could simply go to the Parliamentary Library and read the copies there.

I suggest that if a member wants to receive a copy of the *Government Gazette*—and very few

members would ask for them—it would be appropriate for the Government to provide them.

The member for Stirling said, "Well, you could pay for it out of your electorate allowance". That is so; one could pay for a lot of things out of one's electorate allowance; but we do not have to pay for our *Hansards*; and we have a huge amount of free bums from various Government departments and instrumentalities coming across our desks. That material is of an informative nature and it relates to the operations of the Government; but it might be said that members have a right to receive the *Government Gazette* because of their position as members.

The Government ought to supply, to the members who specifically request to be placed on the mailing list, a copy of the *Government Gazette*. I understand that the document has now been split up and Public Service appointments no longer are included in it, but are in a separate Public Service list of some sort. I doubt very much whether members would be interested in applying for Public Service positions; but if they required a copy of that document, it would be appropriate for it to be supplied to them.

I would be surprised if more than half a dozen members availed themselves of the service I have proposed. I find it useful because it deals with matters of contracting, tenders, local government authorities' regulations, and regulations made under Acts. Although it is true that one can go to the library to look at copies of the *Government Gazette*, sometimes it is difficult to find time to do so.

If a member asked to be placed on the mailing list, it would be no skin off the nose of the Government Printing Office to provide him with copies.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have no real complaint with the comments of the member for Fremantle. If members require these papers, we have a responsibility to provide them. Like the member, I would not like to see 87 copies supplied and 80 placed into the filing basket. I would prefer to see perhaps three or four copies supplied to the Labor Party, three or four to the Liberal Party, and one to the National Party.

Mr Parker: Don't forget the National Country Party.

Mr Stephens: It is not necessary, really. They are part of the Liberal Party.

Mr O'CONNOR: If we could work out something like that it would be more beneficial and I would be happy to meet that request.

Mr Parker: Even then, you would still have to go to the Leader of the Opposition's office, in our case.

Mr O'CONNOR: Not necessarily. If the party supplied the names of the members interested, I would ensure that the copies were directed to the persons requiring them. The Government Printing Office could be notified of any changes.

A small committee works on matters of this kind. I think the member for Welshpool and the member for Perth are members of it; and I suggest that the interparty committee meets and has a bit of a chat to find out the names of the members requiring this service.

I have no objection to doing something in this regard; but I would not want a lot of documents wasted. If the parties meet and decide what to do, we will see what we can do about meeting the situation.

#### Item 4: Paper and Consumable Materials—

Mr PEARCE: I suppose the Treasurer is showing commendable housekeeping skills in attempting to restrict the number of *Government Gazettes* to four a side; but I suggest—

Mr O'Connor: I did not necessarily say that. I said the two parties should meet and ascertain what is required. In the meantime, I have no objection to looking at the situation. I do not want any wastage.

Mr PEARCE: That is commendable.

Unbelievable numbers of pieces of paper representing a large number of trees come into the hands of members as a result of Government departments. I could easily give up the Productivity Council newsletters, or the material from the Australian Standards Association, if I could receive copies of the *Government Gazette*, which is of direct relevance to members; and it is one document which we ought to receive. I could quite happily surrender many of the documents that I receive in order to have the *Government Gazette* replace them.

Surely it is a matter of priority that the *Government Gazette* should be supplied to members, because it deals with the business of members. It would be unrealistic to believe that only half a dozen members on each side would want to receive copies.

Mr O'Connor: What are you suggesting we do?

Mr PEARCE: I am suggesting the Government provides a copy of each *Government Gazette* to each member.

Mr Parker: What about the member who throws it away?

Mr O'Connor: I suggest that the two parties get together and ascertain the requirements, and we will try to meet them.

Mr PEARCE: Will the Treasurer give me an undertaking that if the joint party committee makes a decision or a recommendation, he will put it into effect?

Mr O'Connor: I do not know what decision it will make. I am trying to be co-operative; and I cannot say more than that.

Mr PEARCE: I take the Treasurer's point. It seems to me that he could go to the level of co-operation of saying that if we see the need for members to have a *Government Gazette*, they should have it.

Mr Laurance: Why don't you enter into the spirit of co-operation with the Treasurer and sit down?

Mrs Craig: You are assured of getting one yourself.

Mr Rushton: You are in front. Why not stay in front?

Mr PEARCE: Members are putting it to me that I should co-operate with the Treasurer and agree that the matter should rest on the basis that the Treasurer will find somebody else to make a recommendation, and then he will decide what to do about the recommendation. The point simply is that the *Government Gazette* is a necessary document for members to have. I am concerned about the amount of paper and consumable materials used in the production of all the documents we receive. I would be happy not to receive those documents if I could receive a copy of the *Government Gazette*.

As a matter of priority and not one of cost-cutting, the Treasurer should consider this matter and give a firmer undertaking than the one he seems to be prepared to give.

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not intend to waste public funds. I have tried to co-operate with members on this aspect. If they require the documents supplied, I will do my best to supply them. The suggestion I made is reasonable. The two party groups should meet and give an indication of what is required; and I will do my best to co-operate. I will not send out 87 copies each week if seven are required.

Mr Pearce: How many *State Reports* are sent out and scrapped?

Mr O'CONNOR: I am just relating the matter as I see it. If members get together on the basis I suggested, I will endeavour to co-operate with them.

**Division 17 put and passed.**

#### **Division 18: Audit, \$3 060 000—**

Mr DAVIES: I take the opportunity to place on record the Opposition's appreciation of the work rendered to the State by Mr Alan Tonks as its Auditor General. Since we last met to consider the Estimates, Mr Tonks has retired and his place has been taken by Mr Bill Rolston.

The Auditor General occupies a peculiar position inasmuch as he is more or less set apart from other civil servants, and has considerable responsibility in the work that he has to do. Not only does he have to meet this responsibility, but also he has to report to the Parliament very quickly after the end of each financial year.

We always look forward with a degree of expectation to the annual report of the Auditor General. The report is presented at about the same time as the Budget is presented to the Parliament.

During the time that I was Leader of the Opposition, and during my 20-odd years in the Parliament, I have received very good service from the office of the Auditor General. However, I pay my tribute to Mr Tonks because I probably needed advice from him more than I did from any other Auditor General.

Mr Tonks always acted strictly in accordance with his required duties under the terms of his appointment. He was able to provide any reasonable information I required, if it came within the ambit of his appointment. I know that Mr Tonks was well respected in the accounting profession; and he was a fine person to meet socially. Both he and his wife were good company at many of the social functions which senior civil servants and politicians are required to attend.

I place on permanent record my appreciation and the appreciation of the Opposition for the services rendered to this State by Mr Alan Tonks. His place has been taken by Mr Bill Rolston, whom I have met only once or twice; I have no reason to doubt he will fill the position as well as did Mr Tonks. I understand that following his retirement Mr Tonks was seconded to special duties and, if my memory serves me correctly, is rewriting the Audit Act, which needs updating very badly because it is many years since it was overhauled completely. I am sure the Government has made a wise choice in asking Mr Tonks to bring the Act up to date.

Mr WATT: Briefly, I endorse the remarks made by the member for Victoria Park in thanking Mr Tonks for the services he has rendered to the State. As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I can indicate to members that the committee had a fair bit to do with Mr

Tonks and I place on record the thanks of all members of the committee—its membership has changed a little in the time I have been associated with it—for the way in which Mr Tonks displayed a willingness to co-operate in any way requested of him. He always acted in a most professional and gentlemanly manner. The committee wishes him well in his retirement.

**Division 18 put and passed.**

**Divisions 19 and 20—Taxation, \$4 630 000; Valuer General's Office, \$4 505 000—put and passed.**

**Division 21: Miscellaneous Services, \$94 228 000—**

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling the member for Victoria Park, I advise all members that on the calling of this division, any member wishing to discuss items for which there is no vote should seek the call then. No debate on these matters will take place once the items have been commenced. If members care to look at the item column they will find some items without a number.

Mr Tonkin: They speak to those items in general debate?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes; because whilst we are going through the items, we will see some without a number. I trust members understand the requirement of the Chair.

Mr DAVIES: Mr Chairman, you pre-empted what I was about to say, as the contribution I want to make at this stage relates to matters for which there is no item number. At times, the Parliament should have an opportunity to express its opinion on Government funds expended, and generally we get an opportunity to do so when there is a vote for a particular charity or organisation. For various reasons it is not possible for all the moneys expended to appear in each Budget, and some of the matters to which I will refer were not in last year's Budget; no vote was given to them, yet money was expended on them during the year, but there is no vote for them this year.

I refer firstly to the Australian Dental Association. One wonders why the Government would give that association \$2 000, although there must be a good reason. Giving away money does not come easily to this Government, but the ADA must have been able to prevail on the good nature of whichever Treasurer was in office at the time the \$2 000 was allocated. I would like to know for what purpose that allocation is to be used.

Similar items are listed, but I do not propose to query all of them as many are self-evident. For instance, the Commonwealth Games Appeal re-

ceived \$10 000, and I suppose we could ask why that was not on last year's Budget as we certainly knew the Commonwealth Games were coming up.

Mr O'Connor: The Australian Dental Association received its allocation because in May 1982 the 23rd National Conference of the Australian Dental Association was held in Perth. Although primarily of a national nature it is of significance. A grant of \$2 000 was made towards the cost of bringing four overseas keynote speakers to Perth.

Mr DAVIES: It was generous of the Government to provide the \$2 000; it would not have paid for all the fares, but it was a contribution. The community always benefits from some rub-off when a national or an international conference is held here. When we consider the charges and taxes imposed by this Government which the community has to pay, we realise that it would not take it long to recoup the \$2 000.

The Care for Youth Appeal was granted \$5 000. I am surprised to find that \$10 000 was given to the Commonwealth Games Appeal, even though no allocation was made in last year's Estimates. I do not know whether that amount was over and above any other contribution the State made or whether it was overlooked previously. With the great success of the games and the success of some of the WA representatives, I certainly do not begrudge the \$10 000; I wish only that Western Australia had been able to get more publicity out of the games than it did.

The item "Isolated Children's Hostel in Kalgoorlie" received \$39 500 last year, which is a fair lump of money. I imagine there is a good reason for its getting that kind of assistance from the Government. As it is a big sum, and as we could reasonably expect to have seen it in the Estimates last year, the Treasurer might explain why it received that amount.

The Lord Mayor's South Atlantic Trust Fund received \$20 000. I do not know that I entirely agree with it, but it was donated and we can do nothing more about it.

Last year the United Nations Association of Australia was voted \$6 000, but this year no allocation is made. As it is an association which strives to maintain its charter to incite people to work for peace in the world, I wonder why it is not to receive an allocation this year.

It is sad to see the Travellers' Aid Society did not spend the \$300 allocated to it last year. The society is an old friend of the Government and the Parliament, and I wonder why it did not spend its allocation. Perhaps it has now closed shop and is no longer operating.

A matter that does concern me is found under the section "Payment to Local Authorities". Last year \$47 722 was paid to the item "Senior Citizens' Centres—Maintenance Grants," but no grant has been made this year. Similarly, the next item "Senior Citizens' Centres—Subsidies for Construction Costs" was allocated \$100 000, but only \$42 810 was spent; again, this year no allocation is made, which concerns me.

I am sure every member of this House is aware that if a senior citizens' centre shows a loss during a year, a sum of \$2 000 is made available to help it with its deficit. Members would be aware also that the Government pays two-thirds of certain furnishings for housing units and other furnishing costs for senior citizens' centres. I am alarmed that the Government apparently is not intending to subsidise construction costs from now on. As I said, the amount spent last year was less than half of the vote, and it would seem that this sort of activity is one the Government should continue to support; it is one accepted and well received within the community. Since the war all Governments have had a history of supporting senior citizens' centres because of the very valuable job they do, and I am certain other members are closely associated with at least one such centre in their electorates and would realise the good work they can do. The Treasurer might explain why there is no vote for those two items this year. It could be there is a different form of funding; it could be that if the Federal Government is opting out of some of its previously accepted responsibilities in this area, the State Government feels obliged to do likewise. That would be wrong, and I would need to be convinced otherwise if the Government does consider it should abandon this assistance. It represents a miniscule amount of money to the Government.

The amount granted to the Karrakatta Cemetery Board was \$360 000, and I imagine that was associated with the alterations to the entrance of the cemetery. If the money was spent on the alterations which are apparent to any member who has recently attended a funeral there, I suppose the money was spent to good effect; at least it provided work for quite a time. However, it is amazing that no provision was made for this work in last year's Estimates, considering it is a huge sum of money. The board must have known it wanted to do the work and must have approached the Government in one way or another. Unless there is a very special reason for this arrangement, I would be a bit cross to learn that that sum of money should appear this year without our having had a chance to consider it when the Esti-

mates were dealt with last year. I would like the Treasurer to explain the expenditure of \$360 000.

Mr PEARCE: I want to express my disappointment at the lack of a grant to the Family Planning Association of Western Australia. The business of a Government grant for this organisation has been a matter of some controversy this year. This position was known in advance of the Budget because I guess someone had to tell the Family Planning Association that it should not be looking forward to receiving any money for this year. This is a fair indication of a decision which was made on grounds other than purely budgetary ones; that is to say, a decision was made wittingly on the grounds that an organisation such as the Travellers Aid Association might become defunct, but the Family Planning Association is operating and it needs the money. It is doing a good job and if it is to continue to do that good job of giving advice on family planning matters to people, the association will have to find the money from elsewhere.

There has been a degree of controversy about the Family Planning Association because in some quarters there has been a degree of controversy about family planning matters generally and a degree of pressure has been brought to bear on some sectors of society which are opposed to advice on family planning matters being given to certain people—for example, to people who are not married—or to the provision of contraceptives and other items to them. This view fails to take account of the needs of our society and the way in which we have adopted society's attitudes. I have taken a particularly strong view on this matter because in my capacity as shadow Minister for women's interests, I have received a number of representations from interested women's groups which believe that the Family Planning Association is doing a very useful job and that the Government ought to recognise the usefulness of that job by continuing to pass money in its direction.

Mr Young: I am just wondering how you would like your eggs. Go on.

Mr PEARCE: The decision to take funding away from the Family Planning Association was political which was made because of pressure from Government supporters. I would be interested to hear any contrary view which the Treasurer may care to advance and if it is the case that the Family Planning Association is still looking for that money, it is an area in which some reconsideration should be given to that association.

Mr JAMIESON: On the general debate, I wish to mention some items which have not received grants this year and I would like the Treasurer to comment on these. The first is the Civilian Maimed and Limbless Association. That has been on the list for many years and it appears that some of these organisations have had to be taken off the list. The freedom from hunger organisation does a very important job and we should always sponsor it in view of the problems that beset people throughout the world. The next item is the homes for the aged.

Mr Davies: It looks as if the Government's opting out of that field.

Mr JAMIESON: Yes, I want to know why.

Last year I raised the item of the New Norcia water supply. A somewhat unusual amount had been allocated for that purpose, but it was explained that it was a once-off sort of thing and that it was to be used for the purpose put forward; that is, to create an efficient water supply for New Norcia. The Estimates seem to have gone astray because \$28 800 was allocated, but only \$5 477 was spent.

The next item is the Perth Emergency House-keeping Service, which last year received \$60 000 and it was recognised as being very important in regard to looking after households requiring emergency housekeeping services. It seems quite unreal that this has gone from a \$60 000 grant to zero.

The Scout Association of Australia (WA Branch) always has been on our list, but for some reason it is no longer there. Youth organisations need assistance. Perhaps that organisation has not applied for assistance, but it would be strange if it had not done so.

I now turn to the United Nations Association of Australia. This organisation has received Government funding for many years.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Its members believe in peace and this Government thinks they are too radical.

Mr JAMIESON: Whatever its members believe, I think everybody believes in some form of United Nations establishment and the Government should be prepared to assist the local organisation. Some very good people are associated with it and these people spend a lot of time involved in the betterment of the world in which we live.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Hear, hear!

Mr JAMIESON: They make sure all nations and people from those nations are considered as equals. We should give our attention and assistance to this matter.

The Cancer Council of WA recently changed its name and no doubt the grant for that council will appear under its new name.

Those are the items that have not been listed. I will raise other matters as we go through the debate if I require information on them.

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: In relation to the items which do not have a listed item number, one in particular concerns me greatly and is one with which I have been involved since being elected to this Parliament; that is, the Isolated Children's Hostel in Kalgoorlie. Last financial year that hostel received a grant of \$39 500, but this year it received no funds whatsoever. In the General Loan Fund it received no funding for any further accommodation or new units to be provided on the hostel site.

The hostel started from very humble beginnings in a small house. The organisers went ahead and proved to the Government that there existed a very real need for accommodation to be provided for children from isolated areas on the goldfields so that they might attend the educational institutions situated in Kalgoorlie. That need has been proved to the extent that over the last couple of years the Isolated Children's Hostel in Kalgoorlie has in fact been required to turn away children rather than allow any more children to attend. Having visited the hostel on many occasions myself, and having also earlier this year taken the Leader of the Opposition to the hostel to inspect the conditions there, I must say that the accommodation is overcrowded. The children are trying to study in conditions that are quite beyond them. The Leader of the Opposition visited the hostel on a very wet Sunday in winter; there were leaks all over the place and buckets were on the floor to catch the drops of rain that were dripping from the ceiling. I understand the Government has had this matter under consideration for some time.

I asked a question in the House a couple of weeks ago and the Minister for Education stated that this matter is receiving consideration at Treasury level. It is surprising that, prior to this Budget, the Government was not able to make up its mind as to whether it would give any further assistance to the Isolated Children's Hostel in Kalgoorlie. The hostel committee owns the block of land alongside the hostel so sufficient room is available for expansion. It is suggested that a new hostel be constructed and the existing hostel could perhaps be used for some study-type facilities for the children who are living and working there.



The Country High Schools Hostels Authority, no doubt under direction from the Government, has not met its obligations in this area. The hostels' authority tries to hide behind the fact it is obliged only to assist those hostels having a certain number of students. The hostel in Kalgoorlie is very small; the student numbers are not sufficient for it to receive assistance from the Country High Schools Hostel Authority and therefore the authority almost wipes its hands of the matter and says, "You just go ahead and run yourself."

In conclusion, I indicate that I believe the committee, the parents of students attending the hostel, and at least all the students from throughout the eastern goldfields area who wish to attend a hostel in the next year or few years are very concerned that insufficient accommodation is being provided in Kalgoorlie for their needs. It is very important the Government looks into this matter as an urgent priority. I would like a new hostel made available to students at the beginning of the next school year.

I assure the Government that if we win the election in 1983 there will be no doubt that the Australian Labor Party will be prepared to provide the funds to construct a new hostel in the eastern goldfields.

Mr PARKER: Also under the general section, I wish to refer to some of the bodies which have not received funds this year. The first to which I refer was mentioned by the member for Welshpool; that is, the Perth Emergency Housekeeping Service. Since being a member of this place I have had occasion to refer constituents to that organisation and I am also aware that the Department for Community Welfare refers people to it. The organisation has provided a valuable service for many people in need. If it is suggested that following the drop from \$60 000 to nothing that organisation will obtain no commensurate funds from elsewhere, I would regard the matter very seriously. Perhaps there has been a limitation in Commonwealth funding which the Treasurer could explain to us.

Mr Carr: I think you will find this has gone to the Health Department.

Mr O'Connor: There is an increase in the amount for it, actually, and I will explain it to you.

Mr Young: It is under public health.

Mr PARKER: I await that explanation.

Mr I. F. Taylor: There should be a footnote on the table itself to tell people that that sort of thing occurred.

Mr O'Connor: I think that is a good idea, yes. It would save a lot of mucking around.

Mr PARKER: Secondly, the United Nations Association of Australia has had its funds reduced from the fairly paltry amount of \$6 000 to nothing. That organisation is a national body and its Western Australian division is part of that national body which in turn is part of a world-wide organisation which is recognised by the United Nations. There is a body called the World Federation of United Nations Associations which has consultative status at the United Nations and has a bureau in all three United Nations Centres; it has one in New York, Geneva, and Vienna. The work of the United Nations Association is tremendously important.

When I was at school—and that was only 15 or 20 years ago depending on the stage I had reached—the United Nations Association and all that the United Nations stood for was promoted to children as being very important and United Nations Day and various other United Nations observations were treated very seriously by the education system. The support given to the United Nations Association seemed to be quite considerable.

Now we have the situation where the United Nations Association is promoting activities which are in harmony with the views of the role of the United Nations itself. To take one example: The United Nations Association in this State promotes the concept of disarmament. I know that members opposite do not like that very much, particularly the member for Mundaring and the Minister for Education.

Mr Davies: They are frightened of the possibility of peace breaking out.

Several members interjected.

Mr Herzfeld: You are distorting things which are not true.

Mr PARKER: I remind members that Admiral Sir Anthony Synnot, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in statements that he made to a Joint House Committee of the Federal Parliament, said there was no immediate threat of any sort to the country and that the only country that might be able to overrun this country—and it would not want to—is the United States of America.

Mr Old: You believe that only because you want to.

Mr PARKER: I am not responsible for the statements of Admiral Sir Anthony Synnot. I would be astonished if he were some undercover agent for the Labor Party, the United Nations, or

peace organisations. He has risen to the highest point in the defence services of this country and it is astonishing that the Minister for Primary Industry has said the things he has.

Mr Pearce: Give us a list of the countries you think could overrun us.

Mr Old: Sixty per cent of the world.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee will come to order!

Mr PARKER: It is rather amazing that a man like the Minister for Primary Industry who would not know a patrol boat from a frigate—

Mr Carr: Or from an aircraft carrier.

Mr PARKER: —or from an aircraft carrier, is prepared to say that 60 per cent of the world could overrun us when Admiral Sir Anthony Synnot is considerably more qualified to pass opinions on this question. When the admiral reported to the Senate committee, which has as a member, Flo Bjelke-Petersen—

Mr Old: He would be as good as you, you puny little man!

Mr PARKER: We know she makes orange pumpkin scones but I do not think she has become pink yet!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest to the member that he relate his remarks to the matter under consideration, which is "Miscellaneous Services—general debate".

Mr PARKER: It might be more appropriate if you, Mr Chairman, suggested to the Minister for Primary Industry that he stop making stupid interjections.

Mr Old: There is no-one as stupid as you; you would not have a clue.

Mr PARKER: I would let other members of the Chamber be the judge of that.

Mr Old: What about we divide on it?

Mr PARKER: The United Nations Association of Australia as one of its activities, has undertaken the promotion of various United Nations decisions and roles. Let me remind members of the Chamber that the United Nations is an organisation that has the strong support of the Australian Government although it is conceivable that some members opposite regard the current Australian Government as somewhat tinged with a pinkish hue. I find that a hard argument to sustain, but with the support of the Australian Government, the support of the United States Government, and the support of Western European Governments, the United Nations

Association has taken the view that the questions of disarmament and its promotion are important.

The United Nations has set up a United Nations disarmament committee and a United Nations research institute of disarmament to consider the military factors associated with military-based industries and other types of industries.

The United Nations Association in Australia and the branch in Western Australia engage in a promotion of those matters determined by the United Nations. It is interesting that only today in the paper we read that the Australian Ambassador to the UN (Mr Richard Woolcott), who has held many positions representing Australia and is now representing us at the UN, made a speech in which he said that the people of Australia were sickened by the fact there had been no progress towards downgrading the arms race and by the fact that there was lack of support for the UN in the area of disarmament. At the same time, we find that one of the bodies promoting the work and views of the UN—and apparently the views of the Prime Minister of this country which views he gave when he spoke to the UN in 1978 about peace issues, and of Richard Woolcott representing the Australian people when he spoke the other day at the UN forum—is Australia, and it is now to be deprived of the funding it received previously from the State Government. That is inappropriate and indeed the work of the UN Association ought to be supported and enhanced and not downgraded.

It is interesting to note the paranoia of members opposite and even more so of the member for Mundaring when he spoke a few weeks ago after the United Nations published what Lord Mountbatten had said. He was a man interested in peace and his credentials could not be beaten by anyone in this Chamber; in fact, they would leave anyone in this Chamber or in Australia for dead. He was of the view that there was no more an important fight to be fought than the fight for peace, and his views were published by the UN Association and reported in the *Western Teacher*.

Mr Stephens: We are all interested in peace, but do you think peace would have been acquired in the Falklands if the British had been able to defend it and stop the Argentinians getting through in the first place?

Mr PARKER: I could spend some considerable time on that question, but I will not.

Several members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the member get back to the United Nations.

Mr Stephens: Can you answer my question?

Mr PARKER: I cannot answer it in a couple of minutes and I do not propose to do so, but let me say that the question of peace and the sorts of issues the member for Stirling is raising are not simple issues that could be determined by way of a short explanation. The UN General Secretary, who has an unpronounceable Spanish name, stated that he was very disturbed that neither party had used the UN to the extent they could have to resolve the problem.

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: One could go on and talk about whether the Russians or the United States use the United Nations to their best advantage. However, it is supported by Australia and continues to be supported by the Australian Government; and whatever the political persuasion of the Government which happens to be in power it should work to promote the views of the UN. However, it has been denied that support by the Western Australian Government.

Mr Clarko: I understand you have been to Russia more than once.

Mr PARKER: I have met with Russian diplomats and I have met with United States diplomats on occasions. I have been to Moscow.

Mr Clarko: Who paid your fare when you went to Moscow?

Several members interjected.

Mr PARKER: I have been to America as well and I do not hear the member for Karrinyup ask who paid my fare on that occasion. I have been to various other countries as well. If the member for Karrinyup wants me to detail who paid my fare on each occasion—

Mr Clarko: I did not ask you that. Just say so—say you do not want to tell me.

Mr PARKER: Let me simply say in response to the highly disorderly comments by the member for Karrinyup that I am prepared to detail any information in relation to the payment of my fares to the countries I have visited.

Mr Clarko: You will not answer my question, will you?

Mr PARKER: I cannot answer the question, I have not had the opportunity. If the member for Karrinyup would shut up for a minute I will answer his question.

Mr Clarko: Raise your eyebrows.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have repeatedly called for order from members of the Chamber to allow the member for Fremantle to continue his remarks. I call the Chamber to order and I call on the member for Fremantle.

Mr Pearce: Chuck the Minister out.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Gosnells will now keep order!

Mr PARKER: The interjection made by the member for Karrinyup is not relevant to the item under discussion and I am surprised that you, Mr Chairman, have allowed the member for Karrinyup to continue to make his point. I am prepared to detail the funds I have received from any source and as we have a motion on the paper that would get all members to do that, I will be prepared to give that information if that motion is passed by the Chamber.

The point I was making is that the United Nations Association of Australia consists of people of many political persuasions and it deserves the support of this Government.

I would like to deal with another matter under the miscellaneous services division which has not been allocated any funds this year. It may well be that the same circumstances arise as previously when a footnote should have been created which outlined that the allocated funds had been transferred to another service. However, the service to which I am referring is the pensioners' motor vehicle licensing concession reimbursements to the Main Roads Department.

The amount of concession in the Act, has been reduced, but it is distressing, nevertheless, that there has been a change in the allocation of \$250 000 compared with the allocation last financial year. It may be that this can be explained in some way.

Mr O'Connor: What item?

Mr PARKER: It is the item between items 108 and 109 on page 58 of the *Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure* for the year ending 30 June 1983. Last year a sum of \$250 000 was expended and no allocation has been made this financial year. Perhaps it has been transferred to some other vote. If that is the case, it is an example of what the member for Kalgoorlie previously said; that is, that we should have a footnote explaining the situation.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will endeavour to answer as many as possible of the queries members have raised. I will deal with them in order of the item numbers rather than refer to them in the order in which they were raised.

The member for Welshpool said that there had been a decrease of \$6 000 in the grant to the Civilian Maimed and Limbless Association. An annual grant has been paid to this association since 1948-49, and it was raised to \$6 000 in 1972-73.

However, as the Civilian Maimed and Limbless Association and the Paraplegic-Quadriplegic Association have similar aims and operate now under a joint executive committee, it has been decided to combine the grants paid to these organisations within the Paraplegic-Quadriplegic Association grant under item No. 53. Members will find the amount has been granted under that particular item.

A comment was made about the Family Planning Association, and this appears just after item No. 33. There has been a decrease of \$22 000 in this grant. The member for Gosnells criticised the Government for not giving more money this year. The grant to the association was increased from \$19 000 to \$22 000 in 1981-82 to offset the liability for payroll tax. From 1982-83 the grant will be paid from the Public Health Department vote, a provision of \$44 000 having been made for this purpose.

Mr Pearce: You say it has been included in the Public Health vote. Naturally I went through the Estimates before I made my speech and it does not appear there.

Mr O'CONNOR: I am telling the member the position. That grant has been provided for in the Public Health vote.

In regard to the Isolated Children's Hostel at Kalgoorlie, there has been a decrease of \$39 500.

The Isolated Childrens Hostel, Kalgoorlie, provides accommodation for children from outlying areas attending schools in Kalgoorlie. A grant of \$39 500 was paid in 1981-82 to help finance the upgrading of existing buildings and playground improvements. Since 1976, the State has provided \$94 500 to assist towards the cost of improvements to the facility. To my knowledge, no other funding is provided during this financial year for this hostel.

I now come to the New Norcia water supply—a decrease of \$5 477.

Mr Jamieson: No, that was the expenditure. There is no grant this year.

Mr O'CONNOR: The increase last year was \$5 477, and this year it is nothing, so it is a decrease to that extent. This item provided for carryover costs associated with the establishment of a new water source at New Norcia.

A critical situation arose in New Norcia at the beginning of 1980 with regard to the town's water supply. The community previously obtained its water by contracting water carters from Moora. The Government initiated action and it was estimated that the commissioning of a new water source at Wilfred's Well and the construction of a

bitumen catchment at the Calingiri Road dam would provide sufficient water to cater for the expected demand at least until 1985.

Although New Norcia is not a gazetted townsite, the Government decided to assist the community with its water supply. In the town there are schools, a Benedictine Community, several commercial establishments, a police station and a small number of residents.

In 1980-81, the State contributed \$156 618 towards the cost of the bitumen catchment area and a further \$5 477 in 1981-82. I hope that following that there will be sufficient to carry the town through for some time.

Some comments were made concerning the Perth Convention Bureau. State grants initiated at a level of \$8 000 in 1972-73 on a dollar-for-dollar basis with private industry contributions to assist towards promotional costs, were progressively increased to a level of \$30 000 which was established in 1978-79. From 1982-83, assistance will be provided by the Department of Tourism under division No. 69.

Members referred to the Perth Emergency Housekeeper Service. Again, this grant has been transferred to another area. I will not go into the details of it; I do not think members want to know them. They want to know generally why no provision has been made this year. The reason is that the grant has been transferred to another vote. If that is not what members want to know, I will give them further details. From 1982-83, this grant will be paid from the Public Health Department vote, a provision of \$70 600 having been made for the purpose. So there has been an increase, and the service will be provided in the coming year.

Members have asked why the grant to the Scout Association has been decreased. In 1981-82, the State provided, on a dollar-for-dollar basis with funds raised by the association, a grant of \$7 000 as a contribution towards the erection of a commemorative monument and picnic facilities at Perry Lakes which was the site of the 4th Asia Pacific Jamboree held during the State's 150th Anniversary celebrations. That project was completed with the Government grant and the association's own funds.

For many years the Travellers' Aid Society has had financial assistance provided to help it carry out its objectives of meeting and helping travellers arriving at transport terminals. Although provision was made for a grant of \$300 in 1981-82, the grant was not claimed. Subsequent inquiries indicated that the society has ceased operations.

Therefore, there was no purpose in proceeding with the grant.

The next item referred to was the regional cultural facilities—contribution to trust fund. The grant for this item was decreased by \$400 000.

In 1978-79, the Government agreed to assist towards the cost incurred by local authorities in developing regional cultural facilities, the State's contribution being based on one-third of the cost to a maximum of \$750 000 for any one project. This assistance is designed to develop facilities for the presentation of the performing arts at major centres. Priority is given to centres with populations in excess of 10 000 people. As sufficient funds are available in the trust fund to meet all existing commitments, no provision is required in 1982-83.

Under the policy, facilities have been developed at Geraldton and Esperance and work has commenced on refurbishing the Albany Town Hall as the first stage of a two-stage development in that town.

In regard to subsidies for construction costs to senior citizens' centres, this grant was decreased by \$42 810. I explained that from 1982-83, the State's contribution will be from the Public Health vote, a provision of \$153 000 having been made for the purpose.

As I go through the items, please let me know if I can give members any additional information.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Just one point: You appear to be taking most of your comments from the notes the Treasury gave you on these items.

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Mr I. F. Taylor: But you are not really addressing many of the points raised by members.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is quite wrong because most members queried the reason for the decreases, and in most cases the explanation is that the grant has been transferred to another vote.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Take the case of the Isolated Children's Hostel in Kalgoorlie.

Mr O'CONNOR: I explained that no money was available for this hostel.

Mr I. F. Taylor: You didn't say why.

Mr O'CONNOR: I said that money was provided for maintenance last year, but the maintenance was not carried out and there is no provision for this year.

Mr Carr: The question is: Why is there no provision?

Mr O'CONNOR: Because it was not considered to be high enough in the priorities to obtain a grant this year.

Mr Young: I might also add, if I can, in respect of the senior citizen situation, that there is a large increase in the Public Health funds for this.

Mr O'CONNOR: In the case of the Karrakatta Cemetery Board, \$360 000 was provided to the board last year to assist in the financing of crematorium facilities.

Due to the critical situation that has arisen in respect of crematorium facilities at Karrakatta Cemetery a grant of \$360 000 was provided in 1981-82 to finance the purchase of new cremators.

The next item referred to related to pensioners' motor vehicle licence concessions—reimbursement to Main Roads Department, and in this case the decrease was \$273 000-odd.

This item provided for reimbursement to Main Roads Department for concessions granted to pensioners on motor vehicle licences. As a consequence of a decision of the Cabinet expenditure review committee the concessions are to continue, but no reimbursement is proposed to the Main Roads Department. That is the reason for the decrease. The conditions applying to the concessions are set out, and I believe members probably are aware of them. The difference is that the Main Roads Department is not being reimbursed for that money. In future, the concessions will be met from the vote of the Main Roads Department.

Mr I. F. Taylor: What is the reason for the MRD not being reimbursed?

Mr O'CONNOR: It is felt that the MRD ought to carry part of this burden. It is reimbursed for other concessions. The MRD receives considerable sums, not only from the Commonwealth, but also by way of licence fees, etc. It was felt the department ought to be able to carry this.

Mr I. F. Taylor: I always thought one of the reasons that the department was being reimbursed was that it had some effect on the grant obtained from the Commonwealth.

Mr O'CONNOR: I think the honourable member would know, as I know, that it takes a great deal of pressure to get money from the Grants Commission today.

Mr I. F. Taylor: I am referring to road funds.

Mr O'CONNOR: The system has changed quite considerably, and I do not think that point would make any difference now.

The other item referred to was the United Nations Association. Between 1976 and 1977, this was a \$6 000 grant. The association has been active in Australia for over 20 years. By creating an awareness of the United Nations organisation and agencies, it supports that body's endeavours to

achieve world peace and a recognition of human rights. It organises regular functions such as United Nations Week and conducts fund-raising activities in support of the international children's emergency fund.

The Government has to make decisions as to priorities. Bear in mind that we lost substantial funding from the Commonwealth Government. In our opinion the Commonwealth—not the State—should pay for many of these items.

**Item 37: Industrial Foundation for Accident Prevention—**

Mr PARKER: Earlier this evening we talked about material that comes to us as members of Parliament, and one of those organisations which is fairly prolific in putting out publications is the industrial foundation for accident prevention. This foundation is a voluble organisation, and it has become much more voluble over the last few years. I cannot remember the precise number of years, but for at least four years it has consisted, not only of employer organisations and of individual employers, but also, after some period of persuasion by the foundation, the trade union movement, in the personage of the Trades and Labor Council is represented. Despite what we hear about industrial disputes, the causes of industrial disputes, and the man hours lost through them, a far greater dislocation to industry, productivity, and the economy is caused by such things as sickness and accidents at work.

Some years ago the ratio of man hours lost through industrial disputes and through sickness and accidents was as high as 5:1 in favour of accidents. That being the case, it seems strange that the grant to the foundation is to be reduced by 25 per cent.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have been advised that the foundation holds substantial reserves and, in view of the fact that we were short of money, it was decided to reduce its allocation from \$20 000 to \$15 000. However, the Department of Labour and Industry meets the costs of the printing of safety manuals and the like, produced by the foundation.

**Item 39: International Congress of Bio-Chemists—**

Mr PEARCE: Briefly, I congratulate the Government for the sum it paid to the international Congress of Bio-Chemists. I presume the \$5 000 to be paid out under this Budget is the last payment to be made of the total figure of \$37 200.

Mr O'Connor: Yes, \$32 200 has been spent and the balance of \$5 000 represents the remaining expenditure undertaken by the Government to the congress.

Mr PEARCE: I am not quibbling about the extent of the expenditure, although it appears relatively heavy for a 10-day affair. It is a matter of some importance to Western Australia that such congresses continue to come here. I note under Item 88 that, in 1983, the World Veterinary Congress will be holding its meeting in Western Australia.

However, the point should be made that the appearance in Western Australia or elsewhere in Australia of such congresses, particularly where scientists are involved, will be heavily threatened if the Commonwealth Government persists with its attitude of barring scientists from the USSR if it has some political disagreement with them. We understand that Malcolm Fraser likes to be the statesman and, at times, seeks to align himself with this bloc or that bloc.

Mr MacKinnon: I thought the Commonwealth Government had changed its policy in respect of scientists going to Russia.

Mr PEARCE: We are talking about Russian scientists coming here.

Mr MacKinnon: It is the same principle; I thought the Government had changed its policy.

Mr PEARCE: I do not think that is the case. What happened is that, of the six Russian scientists coming, the Commonwealth Government persisted with its efforts to ban one or two.

Mr O'Connor: Many more were coming; I think about 17 were due to come, of whom three were banned.

Mr PEARCE: Perhaps, but the point is that none of the others came as a result of the Government's decision. The Commonwealth Government was discriminating against the scientists by attempting to suggest that because the three scientists it sought to ban were particularly high up in the party hierarchy, it followed that they were committed Communists, whereas the others were not so high up in the party and were thus less committed.

I do not know what is the State's attitude to this matter. However, if the Commonwealth Government is to continue to be allowed to vent its paranoia on delegations to scientific congresses, one can hardly be surprised if such delegations will not come to this country. In the many areas of scientific study—and, bio-chemistry would be one of the main areas in which the contribution to the state of knowledge made by scientists from the USSR is very great—the scientists and other scholarly individuals do not impose the same kind of discrimination against each other.

It would be an appalling situation if Governments of other countries were to follow the unfortunate lead set by our Government. Suppose we wanted to send a delegation to next year's congress of bio-chemists held, say, in an eastern bloc country. Let us say the authorities there, on receiving our list of 18 delegates said, "Three of these delegates are top Liberals in Australia; we do not intend to allow them into the country" and ran a blue pencil through those persons' names.

Mr I. F. Taylor: The action of the Commonwealth Government was shortsighted and petty.

Mr PEARCE: That is right. What do members suppose would be the reaction of the remaining 14 delegates on being told that three of their number were unacceptable because of their political affiliations? The danger here is the difficulty such a decision will cause. No-one setting up a world scientific conference would take the risk of holding it in a place where certain delegations, particularly major delegations, could be barred. The net result is that no world congress of scientists will come to Australia until it is clear the policy no longer will be enforced.

Contrary to the view expressed by the Minister for Industrial, Commercial and Regional Development, no statement has been made by the Federal Government to the effect that this policy has been changed. In fact, the Federal Government has been quite lacking in contriteness about the whole business. It has made it clear it would do the same thing again. The Federal Government imperiled that congress for Western Australia and it is my belief the congress proceeded in the way it did only because the organisers had made such an outlay that they could not afford not to go ahead with it simply because at a later hour the Commonwealth Government decided to cancel the visas of three Russian scientists. That is not good enough.

If the State Government has not already made a very firm protest to the Federal Government on the matter requesting that Government in the strongest terms to issue a statement to organisers of subsequent scientific congresses that that sort of thing will not recur in the future, this Government will be doing both the State and Commonwealth a gross disservice.

Mr JAMIESON: I understand the Government purchased from TVW Channel 7 an exhibition tent for use by the congress. The cost of the tent surely would be a lot more than the amount allocated in this Budget. Should not some of that amount be appropriated to the International Congress of Bio-Chemists account to reimburse the Government for its expenditure?

Mr Parker: I thought it was purchased by the Department of Tourism.

Mr JAMIESON: I am not sure, but surely some expenses associated with the purchase of the tent should be appropriated to that function.

Mr O'Connor: I think some of it went into last year's Budget; anyhow I will check the position.

Mr JAMIESON: The decision was arrived at rather rapidly when a suitable hall could not be found.

Mr I. F. Taylor: Channel 7 breathed a sigh of relief when it got that tent off its hands.

Mr JAMIESON: I will bet it did, just as it breathed a sigh of relief when it got rid of the Entertainment Centre.

Mr Parker: I hope it did not cost as much as the Entertainment Centre.

Mr JAMIESON: I seem to remember it was quite expensive.

Mr O'Connor: The Entertainment Centre cost \$7 million.

Mr JAMIESON: I think the tentmakers got at Channel 7, because I recall a very high figure was involved. It will be interesting to hear what the Government intends to do with the tent, and whether it will be left to the moths.

Mr O'CONNOR: The International Congress of Bio-Chemists was a very important congress which attracted some 2 200 people to Perth of whom about 1 500 came from overseas. It is the sort of thing that this Government would like to encourage.

When the Commonwealth Government withheld visas from the three Russian scientists, at the request of the conference committee I approached Federal Minister Tony Street regarding the matter. I was told that one of the reasons for the decision was in protest against the Russian invasion of Afghanistan and that the Federal Government was not prepared to change its mind. Whether or not this was valid, that was the reason I was given.

The point made by the member for Welshpool was correct. We did purchase a tent from TVW Channel 7. The total amount expended on the conference was \$65 000; that amount has all been expended. I understand that the tent is in the process of being sold; someone has expressed an interest in it, although I do not know at what figure. The Government believes there is no need to retain the tent.

However, it was essential that we purchase the tent on behalf of the congress. People representing the congress visited Western Australia to inspect

the facilities to be provided and, were we not able to purchase the tent which was used, in part, for the storage of equipment, the possibility was that the conference would have been lost.

As I said, it was an important congress which brought 2 200 people to Perth; as tourists they left behind a lot of money. In addition, these people would have returned to their homes and told other people about Western Australia. We believe it was money well spent.

**Item 55: Refund of Taxes to Trotting and Racing Clubs for donations to Charitable Organisations—**

Mr PARKER: I simply seek information on this matter. The vote in 1981-82 on this item was \$57 000, of which only \$25 685 was spent. This year, the estimate is \$30 000. The heading indicates the money is used to refund taxes to trotting and racing clubs for donations to charitable organisations. I would like to know on what basis it is determined how much of the taxes paid to the Government by these clubs is refunded. Is it on the basis of a proportion of the taxes paid to the Government, or is it a simple refund of donations to charitable bodies?

In addition, why is it necessary to refund taxes to these clubs as a result of their making charitable donations, rather than either the clubs making donations from the very considerable revenue they receive, particularly from the TAB, or the Government's making such donations, either through this Miscellaneous Services Division, or through the Lotteries Commission?

Mr O'CONNOR: The refund of the money is based on the proportions of bookmakers' betting tax, \$11 000 and Totalisator Agency Board, \$19 000. In the last few days, I have received some queries on this matter. Some of these events are run by only one or two of the eligible organisations. The Western Australian Trotting Association takes advantage of a lot of them, but the racing clubs take advantage of none.

Mr Parker: Of what do they take advantage?

Mr O'CONNOR: It involves charitable organisations which sell tickets to race meetings, because of which they receive a refund of certain taxation. The Western Australian Trotting Association and the Western Australian Turf Club, as well as other clubs, each are permitted to hold a maximum of five such meetings annually. The item is based on the refund of taxation to those people; it is not a very great amount, and the number is limited. One of the clubs which takes the greatest advantage of this situation is the Fremantle Trotting Club (Inc.).

**Item 64: St. John Ambulance Association—**

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: I am sure all members would agree that the work of officers of the St. John Ambulance Association, particularly those officers on the road, has been a lifesaver to many people. I am certain that if we did research on the lives saved, and the number of people saved from more serious injury, we would be quite surprised at the number involved.

My remarks are directed principally to the situation in respect of country areas, where the association is operating ambulances. Under the regulations and procedures adopted by the service, ambulances generally are designed for two-man operation; however, in country areas, including Kalgoorlie, we find ambulances operated by volunteers, frequently on a one-man basis. Thus, we have the situation where one man must take the ambulance on the road and try to cope with an accident.

As far as ambulance officers are concerned, the man driving the ambulance and the man in the back of the ambulance are of equal importance. The driver must drive correctly, quite often through busy traffic and on dangerous roads. It is also important that the person working in the back of the ambulance knows what he is doing, because in many cases he is involved in a life-saving situation. The essential care he provides can range from resuscitation, aspiration of the patient, immobilisation of limbs, and airway control down to good old-fashioned tender loving care and reassurance of a patient in a state of shock.

Another dilemma faced by ambulance drivers who are operating one-man ambulances is that they now have available to them what is called a "life pack five" which is a very important development in the technology of saving lives. One of the great features of this unit is that of a sight and sound monitor. The driver of the ambulance can put the monitor alongside him so that he can see and hear the patient's heartbeat. I understand from medical people that the heart rate is very important in understanding whether a patient is in any danger.

The problem is that, under the rules as they stand at the moment, even if an officer is trained in the use of a "life pack five" he is unable to use it while he is in a one-man ambulance situation. In other words, in a situation where it may be essential to use the life pack in order to know what is going on in the ambulance, a trained officer who, may have an inexperienced person in the ambulance trying to look after the patient, is unable to tell, by using the monitor of the "life pack five" whether his services are needed or exactly what is required for that patient.



Another problem with one-man ambulances is that the officer himself is subjected to additional physical and mental stress. I refer to physical stress from the point of view that occasionally an officer is required to lift and carry patients, because no-one else is available to assist. If someone is available, that person may be totally inexperienced in the use of stretchers or in lifting patients; so the patient puts an additional strain on the ambulance officer.

We must consider also the mental stress involved. If an officer is involved in a very bad accident situation, he may need to find someone who is prepared to assist, then jump into the ambulance and drive it to the hospital or, in the case of a heart attack, he may have to knock on the door of a house in order to get someone to give him a hand to drive the ambulance to the hospital. That has happened in Kalgoorlie on a number of occasions and it occurs in many larger country towns throughout the State.

Mr O'Connor: How many ambulances do they have in Kalgoorlie?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: They have two ambulances; one of them is nearing the end of its life and they are in the process of raising funds—

Mr O'Connor: How are they operated?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: They are operated by single individuals, unless the ambulance driver himself is able to call on the help of a volunteer. Volunteers are sometimes available to drive the ambulances or, in some cases, work in the back with the patient. However, on many occasions the ambulance officers are forced to operate the ambulances by themselves. That is the situation which is causing some concern to the officers.

One-man ambulances also result in delays in transportation of patients from outback areas. For example, if an accident occurs on a gravel road in the outback, an officer has to drive out by himself, try to cope with the situation, and get the patient back to hospital. If a crisis develops during the transportation of the patient, it is necessary for the officer to stop the ambulance, treat the patient, and then drive the ambulance to the hospital.

One-man ambulances involve unnecessary injury risks for officers who must carry and move patients by themselves. As a whole, the equipment is designed for use in two-man ambulances. Therefore, it is important that we consider making funds available for two men to operate ambulance services in major country towns, such as Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and also, I understand, Geraldton.

I understand Bunbury has two-man ambulances and nearly every circumstance in the metropolitan area is dealt with by two-man ambulances.

Might I say that Kalgoorlie deals with an average of 166 calls a month compared with 184 calls received by most metropolitan depots. That number of 166 calls per month exceeds the number of calls attended by one-third of the metropolitan ambulance depots.

I have obtained from the St. John Ambulance Association the very latest information on callouts from its Kalgoorlie depot over the past three months. In August, September, and October the depot received a total of 521 calls and treated a total of 512 patients; so it can be seen it is not an insignificant service to a community the size of Kalgoorlie. Over the past two years, the number of callouts has increased by approximately 40 per cent and it is the busiest depot outside the metropolitan area.

Mr Watt: Have you taken it up with the St. John Ambulance Association in Perth?

Mr I. F. TAYLOR: Yes, I have. The union has taken a very active role to try to get something done in Kalgoorlie. However, Kalgoorlie is in very unusual circumstances in that, for many years, the service was operated purely through the charity of the local people and the goldfields medical fund, and the mining companies all provided some financial assistance.

Only in the last couple of years have the St. John Ambulance Association people in Kalgoorlie gone to the association in Perth and asked for financial assistance to meet the operating costs and to pay the wages and salaries of the officers. They have received some assistance, but certainly not sufficient to be able to employ two men to operate ambulances when they are called out to accidents or casualty situations.

I urge the Government to give some consideration to providing funds so that centres such as Kalgoorlie, Boulder, and other major towns can operate two-man ambulances to provide medical services.

Mr O'CONNOR: I understand the point made by the member for Kalgoorlie. My understanding is that priorities as to where funds should go are set by the St. John Ambulance Association. We have done a good deal in this area this year. We have increased the funds available by in excess of 20 per cent, but most of this money is required for additional capital works at headquarters. However, I note the points made by the member. It appears Kalgoorlie is one of the last of the major towns that does not have this facility and I shall inquire into the matter. I cannot make any commitments, but I shall follow up the matter for the member.

**Item 85: Western Australian Shippers' Advisory Committee—**

Mr PARKER: This item refers to the WA Shippers' Advisory Committee which is to receive a grant of \$2 500. I am not aware of this committee and I ask the Treasurer to provide me with details of its composition, basis, aims, objectives, and whatever other information he has about it. I should also like to know the reason that body will receive \$2 500 this year.

Mr O'CONNOR: This item provides for the first two annual grants for the WA Shippers' Advisory Committee. Grants totalling \$30 000 for the triennium commencing 1977-78 were made to the committee to fund its establishment as an associate member of the Australian Shipping Council. To ensure its continuing associateship with the Australian Shipping Council, while financial independence is gained, the Government has made a grant of \$2 500 for financial membership for the year 1982-83.

**Item 89: Child Health Centres—**

Mr DAVIES: This item deals with payments to local authority child health centres. The vote last year was \$56 900 and the actual payment was just in excess of \$16 000. The vote this year is \$55 000, which I assume is the usual sum allocated to this area. What is the reason for the rather severe reduction in the payment that was actually made to child health centres last year?

Mr O'CONNOR: This represents an increase of \$38 000.

Mr Davies: Why was it decreased last year?

Mr O'CONNOR: I do not have the details for last year, but the provision this year is based on the effective claims from child health centres now being planned and under construction in towns throughout the State. I assume there was a drop in the number of claims last year.

The Government provides a subsidy equal to one-third of the total cost of the construction of new child health centres which conform to the standards approved by the Public Health Department.

In the case of combined child health and pre-school centres, the contribution towards the child health centre is \$6 000 a year north of the 26th parallel and \$4 000 elsewhere. I do not have the figures with me, so I can only assume there was a reduction in the requirements last year.

**Item 90: City of Perth—Burswood Island and Foreshore Development—**

Mr DAVIES: The development of Burswood Island and the foreshore has probably been proceeding for as long as we have been a State. I

know it has caused a certain amount of heartburn over the years and in approximately the early 1970s a plan was prepared for the development of the foreshore and Burswood Island for passive and active recreation in its various forms. That plan was shunted off to a committee in order that a decision might be arrived at. The committee then shunted it off to local government.

Apart from the development of Burswood Island, the only other real development has been that which was provided for the 150th Anniversary along the section between Great Eastern Highway and the river and Burswood Road.

Mr Rushton: They are still doing some filling and planting there.

Mr DAVIES: That was a very good development and I am pleased to note that, in some areas, it is being used increasingly by people walking their dogs—

Mr O'Connor: It is certainly a tremendous improvement on what it was three, four, or five years ago.

Mr DAVIES: —and young fellows walking with their girlfriends. I congratulate the Perth City Council on its contribution to this area, but it has not been developed in any way for active recreation. The initial plans provided that certain areas would be set aside for that kind of activity. Last year, in accordance with the vote, \$20 000 went to the City of Perth. This year I am delighted to see the sum has been increased to \$50 000.

As the Deputy Premier said, some filling is still being done at the top end of the area. However, it is being argued whether rubbish will be dumped there to lift the level. Certainly the \$50 000 which we are being asked to vote on here is not for the development of rubbish depots.

Mr O'Connor: It is for assistance to the west bank Swan River landscaping.

Mr DAVIES: I protest about that; I want it for the east bank. It is the wrong bank of the river. It is probably intended to be used along the foreshore and down around Christian Brothers' College. I suppose I have to be reasonable and say they must have a chance to develop that area, although I believe a greater development of the region below the Swan Portland Cement Ltd. works and between Great Eastern Highway and the river would provide a very valuable area for active as well as passive recreation.

I merely register a formal protest that the Government has made a mistake and has selected the wrong side of the river.

**Item 93: Local Authorities Assistance Fund—Contribution—**

Mr PARKER: I simply request the Treasurer to advise the reason for the virtual halving of the amount being paid to the Local Authorities Assistance Fund.

Mr O'CONNOR: As members would know, a substantial increase in funds from the Commonwealth has occurred in this field in recent times. In view of the increased share of Commonwealth revenue now paid to local authorities, the Government has decided to phase out its contribution by reducing the allocation from a level of \$1.15 million provided in 1981-82 by one-third to \$767 000 in 1982-83 and by a further reduction of one-third to \$383 000 in 1983-84. Thereafter an amount of \$50 000 will be provided for contingencies. In addition, provision for pensioner rate concessions by local authorities previously provided under this item will be accounted for separately in 1982-83 under item 109.

**Item 100: Metropolitan Region Planning Authority—**

Mr DAVIES: The expenditure last year of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority was \$1 million in excess of the vote for that year—a good round figure. Earlier in the session, just after the Budget papers were presented, I asked a question on this very matter. I was told that the Cabinet decided \$1 million would be provided to acquire properties in Servetus Street. The Government had an exceedingly large amount of cheek to go ahead with the purchase of properties in that street before the decision had been made finally on whether the western suburbs road would or would not go along Servetus Street.

Mr Hassell: You know that was done to relieve selected cases of genuine hardship.

Mr DAVIES: I will come to that point shortly. The Government was quite wrong in pre-empting the decision of the inquiry and, in effect, it thumbed its nose at the people of that area.

The first we knew of the purchase of some houses in that street was when we read an article in *The Western Mail* indicating that a house in Servetus Street had been purchased by the MRPA for something like \$90 000. I hope I remember the figure correctly; I should not be hanged for quoting a wrong figure. The chairman of the MRPA said that the house was bought as a result of extreme hardship experienced by the vendor, but he was quoted by the newspaper as saying that he had not pleaded hardship. Appar-

ently the authority purchased the house for an amount considerably in excess of that which the vendor normally would have obtained for it.

I am not aware of the circumstances surrounding the purchase of another seven houses in that street at a cost of approximately \$813 000. I remember reading about that somewhere in the Press. I did not need to inquire because the Government's plan became patently obvious. The Government decided to purchase as many houses as it could, at prices which may have been a little in excess of the market price, so that it would remove some opposition to its actions. The provision of \$1 million is the proof of that plan.

The Minister for Police and Prisons, the member for Cottesloe, said that cases of extreme hardship existed. I would be pleased for him to provide details of those cases. I cannot imagine that in the eight cases circumstances existed which made it necessary for the houses to be purchased immediately. For example, the vendor of the house to which reference was made in *The Western Mail* said he had been under no hardship and had made no special plea. The Government used a ploy to remove opposition to its actions.

Mr Hassell: That's nonsense.

Mr DAVIES: It was a disgusting ploy.

Mr Hassell: You would have been the first to complain if the Government had not responded to the needs of the people. You would have been the first to say the Government was unfair.

Mr DAVIES: If the Minister wants to provide proof of the hardship experienced by the vendors of these houses, I will place a question on the notice paper.

Mr Nanovich: What would you have done about the problems?

Mr DAVIES: The man who sold his house for a splendid price said that he had suffered no hardship—I did not say he suffered any hardship.

Mr Nanovich: As the Minister, what would you do to relieve the problems?

Mr DAVIES: The vendors of those houses had not pleaded problems. The Government decided it would remove some opposition to its actions and thereby thumb its nose at the people living in that area. The Government knew the result of the inquiry would affect people in that street, so it decided to spend \$1 million without announcement to remove opposition. It made this money available to those people who might have been in the know that the right price would be paid for their houses.

I hope the Minister will provide complete details of the sellers of these houses, including de-

tails of where they might be living now. We will then determine the nature of their hardships. Worry and concern over the Government's actions would be the only hardship they could plead.

Mrs Craig: What about if people were transferred in their jobs?

Mr DAVIES: That is not a hardship.

Mrs Craig: What if they were transferred to England?

Mr DAVIES: That sort of transfer occurs every day. People being transferred to England or from England to Australia must leave their houses until they can be sold, or whatever. I would be pleased to read the details of these hardship cases.

The Government used a disgusting ploy to remove opposition. It overvalued the houses so that the residents might leave the area and no longer be a nuisance to the Government. In addition, the Government thumbed its nose at the rest of the community. This trick was disgusting. No announcement was made that \$1 million was available for the purchase of homes of which the owners could convince the Government that they could not any longer remain in their houses. The whole strategy was sad and shabby.

#### **Item 101: Murdoch University—Debt Charges (Government Guarantee)—**

Mr PEARCE: My question refers to this item as well as items 106 and 107. The Treasurer would be well aware that these institutions are funded by the Commonwealth. I was not aware the State was responsible for any of the costs associated with those institutions. Can he explain what the debt charges represent?

Mr O'CONNOR: This is an increase of \$347. The provision is made to meet known debt charges on Government guaranteed loans raised by the university. The total State contribution towards the 1973-75 triennium capital works programme at the university was \$1 556 833 of which \$356 833 was met from the General Loan Fund in 1972-73. The balance of \$1.2 million was financed from private loans raised by the university as follows: \$400 000 in August 1973; \$400 000 in January 1974; and \$400 000 in July 1974. This item provides for the actual debt charges on these loans.

Mr Pearce: Does that mean the State Government has built some of the buildings at Murdoch?

Mr O'CONNOR: The State has not built them, it has merely guaranteed some of the funding.

Mr Pearce: Are we now paying some of the interest?

Mr O'CONNOR: My understanding is that we did not actually build any of the buildings, but we made a contribution towards the funding of their construction.

Mr Pearce: I take it Murdoch has borrowed the money to build some of its own buildings?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Mr Pearce: So the State Government is now paying for the loan?

Mr O'CONNOR: That is correct.

Mr Pearce: Objectively, the Government is paying for the construction of some of these buildings.

Mr O'CONNOR: That is so. I thought the member asked whether we were actually building the buildings.

Mr Pearce: Effectively, the State is.

#### **Item 103: Pinnaroo Cemetery Board—**

Mr PARKER: Why is there a massive increase in the funding under this item?

Mr O'CONNOR: This item provides for a grant of \$107 500 for capital purposes, of which \$90 000 is for the first stage of a headstone area, and a further \$39 500 to assist towards operating costs in 1982-83.

#### **Item 105: State Energy Commission—Board Services and Registration Fees—**

Mr PARKER: This seems to be a reimbursement of \$35 000 to the SEC. If this amount relates to Government organisations which should pay registration fees to the SEC, surely those amounts should be chargeable against those organisations. If that is not what the vote represents, I ask what is meant precisely by the term "Board Services and Registration Fees".

Mr O'CONNOR: This vote is a decrease of \$41 on the previous year—not very much. The estimate has been based on the fees expected to be collected in 1982-83 under the State Energy Commission Act regulations. Fees collected under the regulations are paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund in accordance with section 64 of the Constitution Act 1899-1963.

I do not have all the details of that, and obviously the member would not have them or require them. An examination of fees is carried out by the SEC and a reimbursement is made to the commission.

Mr Parker: Don't you think that is an anomaly? Wouldn't you think it is best to transfer the whole box and dice to the SEC?

Mr O'CONNOR: The member may be correct. Apparently this course has been adopted for a long period. That does not mean it should con-

tinue, and certainly I am quite prepared to look into the matter.

**Item 106: University of Western Australia—Debt Charges; University of Western Australia—Literary Grant—**

Mr PEARCE: Again I ask the question I asked in regard to Item 101. What is this amount for?

Mr O'CONNOR: Provision is made to meet the known debt charges due in 1982-83 on loans raised by the university for capital works.

The debt charges relate to loans raised by the university to meet the State's contribution to the capital works programme under the arrangements which existed prior to 1 January 1974. Consequently the cost of servicing these loans is a charge against State funds. Prior to 1968-69 only interest payments were met from this item and instalments for repayment of loans were met from the General Loan Fund. In 1980-81 approval was granted for the university to raise further loans totalling \$993 000 to finance the States' agreed contribution towards the cost of the Animal Resources Centre at Murdoch University. That is probably the point the member wanted.

The cost of servicing these loans is a charge against State funds.

Mr Pearce: Do your notes indicate when these debts will be paid off?

Mr O'CONNOR: I ask the member to jot down the detail he requires and give me that note. I assure him I will obtain the information for him. I imagine the debts would be paid off every three or four years. I cannot provide an accurate answer offhand.

**Item 107: Western Australian Institute of Technology—Debt Charges—**

Mr PEARCE: I request the detail in regard to this item.

Mr O'CONNOR: The debt charges relate to loans raised by the institute to meet the State's contribution to the capital works programme under the arrangements which existed prior to 1 January 1974. Consequently the cost of servicing the loans is a charge against State funds. I do not have the detail of the actual issue, which obviously the member wants. If he jots down what he wants I will obtain the information for him.

**Item 125: Ex Gratia Payments—**

Mr DAVIES: The vote for 1981-82 was \$43 000 and expenditure was \$113 427. Perhaps the Treasurer can tell us what was involved in that sum.

Mr O'CONNOR: The *ex gratia* payments were as follows.

From 1 July 1975 the Government approved an annual *ex gratia* payment of \$1 500 to the Hon. F. J. S. Wise to supplement his existing pension payable under the parliamentary superannuation scheme. Mr Wise was paid an amount of \$702 at the time of his retirement from Parliament in May 1971 representing the "higher office" component of his pension. This has been subsequently updated to \$1 279 on 19 September 1975, and \$1 451 from 27 December 1975.

Each member's entitlement depended on the length of contributory service and the ratio of total salary to basic salary during that service. As Mr Wise's contributions to the fund commenced on 1 July 1944 only service from that date counts for superannuation purposes and the earlier service in higher office was excluded from the calculation of pension benefits.

Other payments were to Sir John Virtue, \$3 101.50; and a payment to myself of \$287.

Mr Davies: You got it? Congratulations. How do we get on the list?

Mr O'CONNOR: It was in respect of a writ given to me and the costs involved.

Mr Parker: An office of profit?

Mr O'CONNOR: No, it was not; there was no profit in it for me at all. Other payments were to B. W. Dyker, \$7 500 and G. & R. Chidlow, \$2 000.

Mr Davies: Perhaps you could send a list.

Mr O'CONNOR: I will be happy to have a list provided for the member.

**Item 128: Heritage Committee—**

Mr EVANS: The estimate for the Heritage Committee of \$46 000 is something like one-quarter of the fund for 1981-82. It is a tremendous decrease and I am wondering whether some change has occurred in the circumstances of the committee or some curtailment of its operations. If so, what is it and how will it affect the future operations of the committee?

Mr O'CONNOR: The reduction this year reflects the non-recording of an amount of \$122 000 provided for the restoration of the Evandale complex.

Mr DAVIES: I wonder whether we could get some action from the Heritage Committee on State heritage legislation which has been promised for something like 10 years and which has been abnormally slow in coming forward. I know some problems exist with it but that does not mean we should ignore it altogether. Other States and the national capital have been able to evolve this type of legislation.

During the last session of Parliament I asked what was the position in regard to the legislation and was given to understand it was under active consideration. On 28 October 1982 I asked the following question—

- (1) Is the final draft of the State Heritage legislation completed?
- (2) If not—
  - (a) what is the reason for the delay;
  - (b) when will the draft be completed?
- (3) When will it be introduced into Parliament?

The Minister replied—

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) and (b) It is still under consideration.
- (3) When consideration is complete.

We have come to expect that sort of answer from this Government which cannot appreciate that such answers waste the time of the department because we then have to write another question asking for specific detail.

Today I referred to question 1863 of 28 October 1982 and asked when was it expected consideration of this legislation would be completed. I asked the names of the persons who had the matter under consideration because it was easy to accept, from the answer given earlier, that it was a matter the Government had under positive and active consideration.

We were led to imagine it would be a committee of high-powered experts. However, the answer was that we could expect some finality, but no time limit had been set. This legislation has been under consideration for some 10 years or more and no time limit has been set as to when it might be finalised.

The answer to the part of my question relating to the names of the persons involved got to the nub of why there is no action. The person looking at the matter is the Minister for Cultural Affairs who is so busy having his photo taken—the Honourable R. G. (Bob) Pike. From the information provided, it seems it will be another 10 years. If by some mishap the Government were returned next year action would be taken on the heritage legislation because the Government does not embrace this kind of thing, just as it does not like the United Nations, the Tree Society, or anyone who might have a few hard words to say about the Government.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to draw to the attention of members the inactivity of this Government on the matter. The matter has been in the hands of the Minister for Cultural Affairs

for at least 12 months. There will be some action after the next election.

#### Item 138: Perth Entertainment Centre—

Mr DAVIES: This matter has involved some research in respect of who controls the Perth Entertainment Centre. It seems it has been controlled from the Premier's office through the Treasury. TVW Channel 7 had a five-year lease on the centre which expired in June 1981. Since then there has been dithering around with the rewriting of another lease. TVW Channel 7 now has the centre on a month-to-month basis.

On 20 October last in question 1753, I asked in part—

- (4) For what purpose will the \$175 000 voted in the current CRF Estimates be used?

The Premier replied in part—

- (4) For maintenance of the building which is the responsibility of the owner.

It is a lease which has been drawn up by the Government to help those responsible for maintaining the building. Generally if any organisation or person leases a building under a business arrangement, that person becomes responsible for rates, maintenance, and the like; but under the curious agreement which has yet to be finalised and which certainly has not been made public, the Government is allowing TVW Channel 7 to continue to lease the building and we have not been told what the Government is receiving for it or the terms of the contract. I asked a supplementary question on the same day as follows—

- (1) Would I be right in presuming the lease was arranged between the Premier's office, and TVW Enterprises Ltd. direct?
- (2) If so, why was it arranged in that way and not handled by the Perth Theatre Trust, for which type of work that body was especially established?

The Premier replied—

- (1) and (2) I am unable to provide the details without checking into the matter. However, my understanding is that the lease was arranged direct between the Treasury and TVW Enterprises Ltd.

Mr Davies: Why?

Mr O'CONNOR: The arrangements were made before my time as Premier. In order that I might clarify my answer, I undertake to provide the member with the details he requires.

The Premier did not know what were those considerations and I am pursuing that matter also. We are wasting the talents we have brought under an Act of Parliament when setting up a statutory authority—the Perth Theatre Trust—to look after the Concert Hall, His Majesty's Theatre and of theatres and entertainment places in the State with a Government or local government connection. The Entertainment Centre is certainly one facility over which the Government has some control.

The Entertainment Centre was built when I was Minister for Town Planning and it was financed by TVW Enterprises. The Government took it over because of some financial difficulty. I can understand on that occasion it was not unreasonable for TVW Enterprises to have a lease of the centre because it was responsible for it initially, but other organisations in Perth might be able to do a better deal with the Government if the matter were put out to tender.

However, as soon as the lease expired, and ever since then—about 12 months ago—TVW has had the centre on a month-to-month basis and the Government has been attempting to negotiate another lease. The Perth Theatre Trust should be looking after the centre and it should be linked with the statutory body which was established to do that job.

The three large entertainment centres should be taken under the one fold, and it is a mystery that special consideration should be given to TVW Channel 7. I repeat it was fully entitled to a reasonable lease when the matter was initiated, but that lease having expired, the Government should live up to its philosophy of free enterprise and ascertain whether it is getting the best possible deal instead of negotiating the matter through Treasury. This matter is being dealt with to the exclusion of any other organisation which may wish to be considered in respect of the lease of that centre.

I am certain they would get some very good offers from among the entrepreneurs in Perth.

Another matter which concerns me, apart from the fact that this year we are lightly going to spend \$175 000 on the Perth Entertainment Centre, is that I cannot find in the Budget papers any record of the income we receive from the centre. If we have it out on lease some rental must be coming in; however, I cannot find a record in the Budget papers of the amount of money received in the past 12 months from the lessees of the Perth Entertainment Centre.

All I am asking is that the matter be thrown open to public tender. I do not deny that Channel

7 was instrumental in getting it there, and that it has done a good job during the time it has had the lease. The Government should live up to what it purports to be—a free enterprise Government—and make certain that the authority we set up to look after these matters is allowed to handle the work for which it was intended.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member has asked some questions and has given details of the replies he received. I do not have the detail of the income for the year from the Entertainment Centre. I know the amount involved in this Budget is \$175 000, which is for refurbishing the thrust stage and box office, \$52 000; tavern equipment, \$25 000.

Mr Davies: Tavern?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Mr Davies: That is bit rough—the Government furnishing a tavern.

Mr O'CONNOR: It goes on: Upgrade electrical installations, \$32 000, and minor works, \$66 000, making a total of \$175 000. There is no information about the income for the year from the centre.

Mr Davies: And no reason that the trust should not handle it?

Mr O'CONNOR: It was done before I became Treasurer. I do not know the reason.

**Division 21 put and passed.**

**Division 22: Deputy Premier's Office, \$2 089 000—put and passed.**

**Division 23: Governor's Establishment, \$690 000—**

Mr DAVIES: I wish to make a brief comment. Under our system of government we have a Governor; naturally, he must be paid for, at an increasingly high cost to the State. While the vote last year for the allowance to the Governor was \$159 000, the payment was actually \$177 000, and the estimate this year is \$199 000. I do not want to appear miserly, but it seems to be a considerable increase—something like \$40 000 over two years. I do not know whether that increase is in accordance with the cost of living, or whether some special reason exists for the fairly large increase.

Mr RUSHTON: The actual numbers are the same.

Mr Davies: We still have only one Governor.

Mr RUSHTON: The increase in salaries is \$37 000, as a result of award increases and normal incremental changes.

Mr DAVIES: The vote was \$159 000, and the expenditure was \$177 000. That is \$18 000 in ex-

cess of the vote, and the estimate for this year is up another \$22 000. That is an increase in allowances to the Governor of \$40 000 over two years. Can the Minister explain it?

Mr RUSHTON: The notes I have in relation to allowances to the Governor say it is the normal increase to take account of inflation.

**Division 23 put and passed.**

**Division 24: Marine and Harbours, \$8 141 000—put and passed.**

**Division 25: Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust, \$50 749 000—**

Mr PEARCE: I would like to take up with the Minister for Transport the question of rail crossings on the metropolitan line. I am not able to speak with authority of any of the crossings apart from those which are situated between the Gosnells and Armadale stations. In that area the position of the crossings can be described only as poorly designed. In the past, I suppose for geographical reasons, it may have been reasonable before automatic crossings were installed that the major rail crossings between Gosnells and Armadale came onto the railway line adjacent to the stations. For example, two crossings are within 300 metres of the Gosnells station, one is not far from Seaforth; Kelmscott crossing is right near the station, and Armadale crossing is near Armadale station.

Each of the crossing gates is activated by an automatic system. These systems are worked on the basis of through-trains. A train which may be travelling non-stop from Bunbury to Perth will activate each of the crossings as it comes to them in time for the lights to start flashing and for the boom gates to come down with a margin of safety before the train goes through. That is fine for through-trains; there is a delay for road vehicles which want to use the crossings and have to sit there for a minute while the gates come down and the train goes through. No-one could argue with that because there must be a right-of-way, and trains have it.

However, the system which operates for through-trains also operates for trains which are stopped, so the situation arises where people can be sitting in a car at a crossing looking down the track at a train stopped at Armadale station. They can sit there for several minutes until the train gradually starts to move away and goes through the crossing. Obviously a train picking up speed travels more slowly than the Australind. The delays are not only longer, but also frustrating for motorists, and occasionally, potentially dangerous for the emergency services.

The Armadale townsite and most of the population is on one side of the line, and the volunteer fire brigade is on the other. A fire engine would not be able to get onto the road to attend a fire if traffic were built up at a crossing waiting for a train which was leaving the station. It could get across the crossing only illegally, as it does, by going across the road on the wrong side and zig-zagging through the closed crossing. That is a very dangerous procedure, but one which is followed. The ambulance station on the next crossing down occasionally is forced to do the same thing. Westrail officers have confirmed to me that they have seen the ambulance and fire engine do this on occasions.

The Minister for Transport and I have been fighting a battle in the local papers over this. It has been one of the old style battles where the initial thrust is launched a month before the Minister replies; or possibly the delivery to the Minister's house is slow, or maybe he is very busy. A month after I made a suggestion as to how this system could be improved, and I thought the issue had died away, a reply from the Minister came through. Hallelujah! It put the proposition that I was being irresponsible in suggesting a lowering of safety standards. The Minister should have realised in the month between the time he read the article and replied, that two levels of safety requirements exist.

A through-train may require half a mile from the point at which it activates the crossing until it reaches the crossing so that the lights can start, the boom can come down, and vehicles can stop in plenty of time to allow the train through. But a train which is stopped at the station and is picking up speed does not require the same margin of safety in terms of distance. It may require the same margin of safety in terms of time, although accelerating from a standstill, the margin for time is narrower than it is for through-trains. The problem which arises, and which is prevalent throughout the metropolitan area, is that the system works only for through-trains.

If a train has stopped at a station and is then picking up speed, it activates crossings and holds up drivers for unnecessary minutes, and occasionally, creates dangerous situations. A system is required which discriminates between through-trains and those stopped at stations. Once, when men operated these systems, they could see what was going on and could make that discrimination themselves. Now, for reasons of economy, they have been replaced by machines, and it seems they cannot do the jobs men used to do. Even that is not correct because machines exist which can do this job, but the Deputy Premier told me in the



local rag that these machines were unsafe and cannot do the job people can do. He said that although they could discriminate between stopped trains and through-trains, they could not do it safely.

I had hoped to be in a position to present some independent expert advice to the House which I am obtaining. However, it is not yet available. If I have the information, I will seek time during the third reading of the Budget to present it. The Minister should not demonstrate the normal knee-jerk reaction of saying, "The whole business is too hard—what does it matter if people have to wait a few minutes?" With the increased frequency of rail services in the area and the tremendous growth in housing developments on the west side of the line, many more people than previously are using rail crossings. More trains are going through, and are holding up motorists for longer.

These frustrations may appear to be minor in some ways, but unfortunately they encourage motorists into gambling with safety; when they are stopped for minutes, they may be seen to attempt to go across the crossing. There have been instances when people have found the boom gates coming down almost on their cars as they have attempted to scoot through. That situation is not particularly desirable, any way one looks at it, and something needs to be done.

It fell to me, at the prompting of my constituents and, I might say, at the prompting of some of the constituents of the Minister for Transport, to raise this matter. The Government ought to have been aware of the situation and done something about it, but it seems that because I raised the matter, the standard knee-jerk reaction has taken place—"It is too hard"; "It cannot be done"; "The machine cannot be found"; "If it can be found, it is too costly". This is not helping the Minister for Transport. During the last election he had people asking him questions about the rail service in his electorate. He has the double misfortune now, I might say, that his electorate has been moved further south from the Armadale station. Where previously he could hold the line by saying that the services were benefiting Armadale, he now has no passenger rail service in his new electorate.

I know that many people are pressing the Minister on matters such as providing a train service further than it presently runs, to south Armadale, Byford, and points further south. Many people around the place are asking what is to be done about the mix of road and rail services, and the main problem is the one to which I have referred. It will not be enough for the Minister to say, "It is too hard. The Opposition are doing their normal

glib job" —another quote—"with regard to this matter." What is required is for the Government to do something about the matter.

What we need are discriminating crossing operating devices which are used successfully in other parts of Australia and in other parts of the world. There is no suggestion that they cause accidents. With a little forethought and the application of modern technology, this problem could be overcome easily.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** I will make some remarks on Division 25. Unlike the member for Gosnells, my remarks will not be related to the question of railway crossings, or matters of that nature, but to the proposed expenditure of \$50 749 000 by the Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust. This includes the expenditure on the metropolitan bus system and the metropolitan rail system.

Members of the Committee should give careful consideration to the total expenditure that the Government of Western Australia is making on the metropolitan transport system. That expenditure is being met by the taxpayers of this State.

**Mr Pearce:** Most of them live in the metropolitan area.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** Although most of them live in the metropolitan area, I assure the member for Gosnells that some people live in the country areas, and they expect their members of Parliament to ensure that the expenditure of taxpayers' funds is made wisely.

I am not questioning whether the funds are spent wisely on the metropolitan services. I am asking the Minister to clarify the expenditure of \$50 million.

**Mr Pearce:** You weight that against the rail expenditure for the rest of the State, which is \$222 million, and the rebate from the metropolitan passenger services of \$7 500 000.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** If the member for Gosnells is so sensitive, I will prolong my remarks on this matter by 25 minutes. I was intending to speak on this matter for only two or three minutes.

**Mr Pearce:** That is all right.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** If the member wishes me to speak for my total time and then obtain an extension, I will be delighted to accommodate him.

**Mr Carr:** You will not get an extension tonight.

**Mr BLAIKIE:** Last year \$42 million was voted, and a similar amount was expended. This year, the Government proposes that the expenditure be increased by \$8 million.

When one looks at the financial situation of the metropolitan bus system, one sees a total gross es-

timated expenditure of \$62 million, with a total net expenditure of \$35 million. The difference between those two figures is the operating loss.

Mr McIver: Do you think we should increase the fares?

Mr BLAIKIE: I am asking the Minister to give an explanation to the Committee—

Mr McIver: I am asking you. You are criticising. How do you eliminate it?

Mr BLAIKIE: —of the expenditure of this amount of money which, at the moment, the Parliament is about to approve.

Mr Pearce: What about country school buses? How much do kids pay to travel on a country school bus?

Mr BLAIKIE: We are looking at a net loss situation for the metropolitan bus system. When one looks at the metropolitan rail system, one sees a total gross expenditure of \$18 million, and a total net expenditure of \$15 million. That means that, in relation to the two services, an amount of \$50 million must be met by the taxpayers to ensure that the services continue for the year.

When one considers the size of the operation of the MTT, one realises that it needs fairly hefty injections of money. Has the Government given consideration to determining whether there could be a greater use of private operators in this system, to determine whether some runs could be taken on by private operators, thereby lessening the burden to the Government—to the taxpayers of Western Australia?

Mr Pearce: They would take on only the profitable runs, for heaven's sake, and that takes away all the rebates that come back from the profitable runs.

Mr BLAIKIE: I am not suggesting a curtailment of services; but has the Government given any consideration to that suggestion?

Mr Pearce: Ranting ideology.

Mr BLAIKIE: The amount of \$50 million is an extremely large sum. I seek an explanation from the Government for its expenditure.

Mr WILLIAMS: I might need a ruling from you, Mr Deputy Chairman (Mr Crane). I missed the general debate about the metropolitan bus system; I want to deal with traffic lights, an item which appears before bus services.

Mr Pearce: That is all right. Go ahead.

Mr WILLIAMS: I would like the Minister to give consideration to our traffic lights. Members know quite well that traffic is always very slow in taking off from traffic lights, and that includes buses. The lights change from red directly to

green. In other parts of Australia, and in most countries overseas, the traffic lights change from red to amber, and then to green. Will the Minister give due consideration to having that system adopted?

The change from red to amber gives the motorist a warning that the lights are about to turn green. He can organise himself and be ready to move off the mark. If we want our traffic to flow in a proper manner, we should alert motorists and have them ready.

The system I have suggested works effectively. It could help a great deal in speeding up the traffic flows, particularly in the city block. The Minister should give consideration to that. Many frustrated motorists would welcome the change.

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Gosnells gave me fair warning of his matter, because he has raised it from time to time in the local newspaper. I was concerned that he would not be present for the debate tonight, to carry out his promise; but the member for Avon made sure he was here on time.

I am not unsympathetic to the point raised by the member for Gosnells. I had it investigated prior to his getting into the act. The general tenor of the discussion in the local paper is that the member for Gosnells implies that the Minister for Transport is not doing his job; so the Minister for Transport reacts when he sees that in the local paper.

I have been involved in this matter for a long time, but greater emphasis is now placed on the problem because of the greater frequency of trains. As the member said, we have introduced more frequent train services in an endeavour to attract more traffic to rail, so we have a credit in that situation.

I suffer the same problem as the member in going from east to west and vice versa, because some of our activities take us to the opposite side of the line from where we live. I raised the issue with Westrail because it is understandable that motorists prefer to spend the least time waiting at the boom gates, and the frustration caused could lead to accidents. A positive result would flow if we could achieve a solution to the problem.

There is no resistance to the proposition; but it is a matter of doing it in a safe way. My information to date—it is not a dead issue, but is still continuing—is that the standards adopted in Australia do not achieve what the member and I would like to achieve; more selective equipment to determine a through train or a stopping train is far from satisfactory.

Apart from the fact that it is costly, I understand that some of the equipment overseas is of an unsatisfactory nature, and accidents have been caused. Naturally, Westrail and I cannot take risks with people's lives. I understand that overseas a manual operation is combined with the machinery, and that is a pretty costly exercise. We have to see whether we can find ways of improving the situation.

If in his research the member finds something that he thinks could be effective, I am willing to have it investigated and tested in our conditions. There will be no obstruction. I was involved in trying to find such a solution; and it is becoming more necessary with the improved frequency of the trains.

If we are successful in our introduction of light rail, it will be a more important matter because we will have a greater frequency of trains. Therefore, we could experience greater holdups at the crossings. If the member finds anything of use, I will be happy to receive it. If the Parliament has risen when he finds it, he can convey the information to me, and I will have it tested.

The member for Vasse raised the question of the MTT debt of \$50 million, which is a combination of figures relating to all public transport services. I have spent considerable time addressing myself to ways of holding down the spiralling deficit. I indicated recently to the Parliament and to the public that if we are not able to modify the present trends, in 10 years we could have a deficit in public transport of \$150 million.

Already we have been somewhat effective in retarding that growth, but if things had gone on as they were, that is what would have happened.

We are presently testing a marketing programme in an attempt to achieve a better utilisation of resources during off-peak times. Most members would be aware that we do not need any more patrons during peak times because this only adds to our costs; what we need is a better utilisation of our resources during other times, and this relates to the remarks I made to the member for Gosnells about more frequent trains and improved bus services. We are trying to get more paying bottoms on seats in order to obtain a better return for our services and therefore retard growth in the transport deficit.

Mr Blaikie: Can you assess what overall increase in the debt would have occurred had the Perth-Fremantle passenger service continued?

Mr RUSHTON: It would not have helped the deficit; that has been demonstrated. Even the two lines I mentioned earlier are very much less cost effective than our bus services; but we are ad-

ressing that problem by considering the purchase of light rail vehicles which could prove to be most cost effective.

I hope the MTT will be able to achieve a dissection of its costs, because there is a big social service component in the MTT's deficit. Concessions for children and elderly people mean that, although we get a refund from Treasury, this amounts to only 50 per cent of the running costs of the services provided. A very large amount is involved with these concessions in providing bus services for children to educational centres and services to people who are unable to drive their own vehicles for whatever reason. These services involve credits as well as debits, and most people would accept that the services are necessary.

Mr Blaikie: On the subject of concessions, I know \$6.25 million is paid out of Treasury funds. Does that show up in the receipts in the MTT for buses or railways?

Mr RUSHTON: It appears as a recoup to the MTT.

What is reasonably satisfactory to me is that the Grants Commission in assessing our position in comparison to other States has commented favourably upon our performance. The comments of the Treasurer and the Under Treasurer show that the public transport system of this State is effective and more efficient than the systems in the other States. Nevertheless, we still must hold the costs as best we can.

The member for Vasse mentioned private operations; consideration is being given at this time to a private operation at Mandurah which would provide for the MTT to service the mainline haul to Mandurah, with the internal service to be handled by a private operator. Our present thrust is to hold costs and to obtain a better utilisation of resources, and this service will be tested.

Mr McIver: Has consideration been given to a private operator in Kalamunda?

Mr RUSHTON: Consideration will be given to all cases. I understand an operator south of Armadale has put forward the proposition that he can run a service as good as the MTT is running but at less cost.

Mr McIver: What would be the criteria for the fare structure?

Mr RUSHTON: That would be a matter for the MTT.

Mr McIver: Would it be a subsidised service?

Mr RUSHTON: Not necessarily.

We need to reflect back to the time when this whole concept was put together by a Labor

Government when Herb Graham was involved. If we had this knowledge then we might have had a co-ordinating body and not forced all the small services into one conglomerate. We probably would have given them subsidies and so saved many millions of dollars.

The member for Clontarf raised the subject of traffic lights, and I would appreciate it if he would confirm his suggestion formally by giving me a note on his proposition so that I can have it tested. It is always worth while to hear suggestions from members who see advantage in other ideas working in other places.

One encouraging innovation is to be the synchronisation of lights, something I announced last weekend. This will occur at the lights on Albany Highway near the Carousel shopping complex. The object is to get motorists through the lights in a constant flow.

I think I have answered all queries raised by members.

Mr NANOVIK: I endorse the remarks made by the member for Clontarf on the subject of traffic lights. Traffic lights provide a very fair and good service to motorists in their journeys to various destinations. The problem is that some motorists are inclined to ignore the lights; some try to beat the amber or red lights. If such drivers were less ignorant, far fewer accidents would occur at traffic lights, whether they be controlling crossings or T-junctions. It does seem that some motorists ignore the reason the lights are installed.

I know problems occur on dual carriageways, where there is such a large area where motorists can creep in between the two carriageways and try to beat the amber light; these motorists cause the greatest problems. Motorists should realise that traffic lights are the best and fairest way of keeping the traffic moving.

I must confront 18 sets of traffic lights when travelling to Parliament House. I cannot say that it will take me 25 or 30 minutes to arrive here of a morning.

The Main Roads Department can make adjustments to the lights, particularly on major roads where a minor road crosses them. In built-up areas the department takes into account the problems encountered with dual carriageways; it also can make adjustments so that all lights are red at one time.

But the whole idea of traffic lights is to give motorists a fair go and to keep traffic moving rather than to have a bank-up of traffic a kilometre or two down the road. They also assist people on minor roads to cross major carriageways.

Although it is costly, we should concentrate on installing traffic lights wherever possible, because people in this State are genuinely inclined to want to drive their own vehicles. This means an even greater number of vehicles will be using our roads in the future. I trust the Minister acknowledges the great importance of traffic lights to motorists.

Mr McIVER: For many years now I have been advocating that the Government should take the step to have controlled traffic lights in Perth, similar to the system in Sydney. For the benefit of those members who have not visited Sydney, the Brisbane Street headquarters is a place to be visited to see the closed circuit television system which helps in the operation of the controlled traffic lights. These are used to control traffic approaching the Sydney Harbour Bridge and every built-up area in the city business district of Sydney. Members will be able to see at a glance what is accomplished at this centre.

I know that to have a similar system here would be a costly exercise, but nothing we tackle in the field of transport is cheap. I am fully conscious that the population of Sydney and the volume of traffic there is far greater than the volume in Perth; however, as our city expands we must realise that the traffic flow through the city will not become any less.

I ask the Minister to instruct the various committees established to consider the traffic problems in Western Australia to give consideration to controlled traffic lights. Not only is this system terrific for the flow of traffic, but also the closed circuit television will mean that the whole city is under surveillance, and this can assist to apprehend motorists who infringe against the traffic code. In fact, some people who have held up business offices have been able to be apprehended immediately because they have come under surveillance from the control centre.

A State as big as Western Australia needs to budget in the future to commence the concept I have outlined and I think that will dovetail what the member for Clontarf and the member for Whitford have put forward. This would be more advantageous than installing more traffic lights in the metropolitan area. Once an approach is made to the Federal Government and a decision is made and the work commenced it can always be added to, and I strongly emphasise that point.

Mr RUSHTON: Briefly in reply to the members for Whitford and Avon, I take on board the comments they have made. Traffic lights come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Main Roads. Constant attention is paid to the changing type of traffic lights; it is all part of traffic man-

agement. Once again, I demonstrate to them through what we have announced in the last few days, the progressive stance we are taking in this regard. Obviously as the need or the necessity arises the points raised by both members will be addressed.

**Item 1: Amount required for Services for the year—**

Mr McIVER: I also want to comment on Item 1 in relation to fuel, where the increase is from \$5 463 420 to \$6 295 000. Has the Government made allowance for the diesel fuel levy that will apply to all Government instrumentalities from 1 January? I know that in Westrail in regard to locomotives alone the fuel bill will increase by about \$4 million.

Mr Rushton: It is \$3.7 million in a full year.

Mr McIVER: I was wondering about that in regard to the cost to the MTT. Has allowance been made for this provision? If no allowance has been made for it, this figure would not be accurate.

Mr RUSHTON: Of course provision has been made for this. We cannot expect that we will beat the problem, but we are endeavouring to do so; however, it is getting very close to being implemented. The rise is in relation to fuel price, not extra miles, and it relates to the levy applying to people who were not exempted before. Those people copped another cent per litre. I take the opportunity to make sure the Committee is aware of the fight that the State Government has put up in regard to this matter. Off-road vehicles certainly have been exempt, and they will continue to be exempt under the State component of the franchise. I assure the member that it has been provided for. We have objected to the Commonwealth not so much in relation to on-road, but for off-road vehicles.

Mr McIVER: Is that only a 1c per litre increase?

Mr RUSHTON: For the buses it is 1c per litre because they were not exempt before. The trains are a different issue because they will cop the 5.155c per litre increase which does not apply to road. It goes into the Commonwealth coffers.

Mr McIVER: So it is a 5.155c increase for rail?

Mr RUSHTON: It is 5.155c which is the exemption Westrail received before, plus the 1c for roads which will total \$3.4 million for the rest of this year and \$3.7 million for a full year. As far as buses are concerned, it will amount to only 1c per litre.

Mr McIVER: It has been budgeted for?

**Division 25 put and passed.**

**Division 26: Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission, \$13 950 000—put and passed.**

**Division 27: Western Australian Government Railways Commission, \$222 731 000—**

Mr TUBBY: The first matter I raise is only a minor one, and concerns the heading "Western Australian Government Railways Commission". I wonder why it is not now "Westrail".

I bring to the Minister's attention a problem which was brought to my notice by the Telecom maintenance and engineering section in Geraldton in regard to Westrail telephone lines which are leased to Telecom subject to Westrail's requirements. Problems are created in farming areas because of the height of Westrail phone lines. It is a very difficult situation. The trend is for modern machinery to be wider and far higher than before and a lot of modern cultivator bars come up to a height of 14 or 16 feet in transport position.

Mr Rushton: You mean when they are being transported by rail?

Mr TUBBY: When they are being transported by farmers.

Mr Rushton: What, on the railway tracks?

Mr TUBBY: Over the railway crossings. Last season in one shire these lines were drawn down on seven occasions during the transportation of this type of machinery. It seems apparent the height of lines has not been increased since the lines were originally constructed, during which time a great change has occurred in the trend and type of farm machinery which occasionally crosses under these lines. The farmers are concerned as they do not want their communication system disrupted. The lines are used as feeder lines to the various Telecom exchanges.

The problem with Telecom leasing the lines from Westrail is that when these lines are brought down, and because Westrail lines normally require only minimal maintenance, Westrail has only a very small maintenance staff and this leads to disputes between Westrail and Telecom as to who will repair the lines. It is usually Telecom which repairs the lines because it is more geared up to handle the situation and this leads to a dispute as to who will reimburse Telecom for the costs involved.

Apart from the problem with Telecom, the height of Westrail lines at these crossings should be increased and the crossings also should be increased in width so that farmers will be able to cross railway lines without putting their machines into the transport position and creating problems with the lines. I presume this problem does not apply only to my area but that it would be common to most farming areas. Farmers would be willing to co-operate with Westrail to perhaps increase the height of the lines and the widths of the

crossings with their modern plant. This would not represent a great cost to Westrail but would be of great benefit to the community and the valuable lines of communication would not be disrupted.

Mr McIVER: I refer to the Total West concept. I may be beating the gun here because this matter may be in the annual report; however, I do not think it has been brought to Parliament.

Mr Rushton: It will be shortly.

Mr McIVER: As I understand it, the leasing arrangements of Total West and Westrail have not yet been finalised; in other words the financial aspects of the joint venture have not really been determined and the lease agreement in accordance with the legislation that we passed in Parliament has not been signed.

It seems very strange to me that up to now a Government instrumentality has been allowed to use the facilities of Westrail with no financial return. Not only has it had the benefit of the facilities, but also it has had the benefit and expertise of those people who have been seconded by Westrail to assist in the initial stage of the changeover and to guide Westrail in relation to the handling of smalls and LCL traffic; yet the lease agreement has not been signed. I would like the Minister when replying to me, to elaborate on that aspect because it is a very important one.

I cannot remember a situation where the Government of the day has entered into such an agreement and has allowed its facilities and expertise to be utilised with no monetary return. To be quite honest, I think it is a scandalous situation and it should be rectified.

In relation to lease arrangements, I draw the Minister's attention to the situation where Westrail enters into a lease arrangement with primary producers where a railway line is not operational. To be more specific, I refer to the line from Northam to Wundowie. That line has not been operative because ore no longer is being transported from Koolyanobbing to Wundowie. Westrail has leased a lot of the farming property adjacent to that line. However, this year I understand the financial arrangement for those agreements have been increased dramatically, so much so that many of the farmers in the locality that have taken advantage of these leasing arrangements will cancel their lease agreements. I think it would be far better—

Mr Rushton: What were they leasing?

Mr McIVER: They were leasing the railway reserve adjacent to the Northam-Wundowie section of the railway line so they could extend their crops to assist in feeding operations for their stock.

Mr Rushton: Right by the track?

Mr McIVER: Yes, and on the other side.

Mr Rushton: Do they pay a reasonable return? Do we have a crop-sharing arrangement with them?

Mr McIVER: As the Minister would know, under the Government Railways Act it is a leasing arrangement with X-amount of dollars being paid per annum. I believe that Westrail has become too greedy and wants too much for this land. It would be far better to keep the leasing arrangement that has applied in the past in order to maintain the same amicable arrangements between the farmers and Westrail. It is far better to receive some return than nothing at all. As the member for Warren has rightly pointed out, this land is not cultivated or cleared, and will be a fire hazard to other areas in the region if it is allowed to grow in its wild state.

Mr Evans: Will Westrail be required to remove the fire hazard?

Mr McIVER: Westrail has entered into a new concept and the shires are now responsible. At one time the shires and the local farmers of the respective communities worked with Westrail for a day burning off this land. However, this does not continue for reasons that I do not go along with.

Mr Rushton: They still do that.

Mr McIVER: If the Minister can understand, it is a different concept now to that which applied previously. However, the shires have been burdened with extra expense, and the Minister would have received many submissions in that regard.

Mr Rushton: It has been modified.

Mr McIVER: Yes, but not modified enough to assist the shires.

Mr Rushton: They join in.

Mr McIVER: They used to.

Mr Rushton: They still do.

Mr McIVER: The responsibility resting with the shires is greater than that which rests with Westrail.

Mr Rushton: Westrail cannot be responsible for the district.

Mr McIVER: The old system worked year-in-year-out and suddenly Westrail had to change it.

Mr Rushton: They are trying to save some money.

Mr McIVER: If that is the case, it is false economy. Members are losing track of the main point that I am raising. What Westrail is doing now is making the farmers in this area pay more

for the land that they have leased, and in turn Westrail will cop it in the future because the farmers will say, "We will not lease it". That is money that Westrail will not receive.

Mr Rushton: Have you any idea of the amount of money being lost?

Mr McIVER: I do not have any idea, but keep in mind that besides the lease agreement and the fees the farmer must pay, he also must pay shire and water rates. This runs into a considerable sum. I do not say that the farmer should be given the land for nothing, but it is far better to look at a level system and have some return than to increase the lease fees and receive nothing. That is the point I am making.

Mr Rushton: We will have to put in a crop ourselves by the look of it.

Mr McIVER: Yes, the Government should have done it this year, because I have never seen the farming area look so prosperous.

I refer to another aspect which disappoints me greatly, particularly when Western Australia will have a record harvest this year because it will require the transfer of many Westrail personnel to country regions on a seasonal basis in order to shift the grain. These people will have to go to places like Wongan Hills, Wyalkatchem, Lake Grace, and so on where the barrack facilities for the employees are very substandard. The barracks have been there for years, going back into the steam days.

Mr Rushton: Which ones do you think should be replaced? I have been to some very good ones in recent times.

Mr McIVER: It would be most unfair to say that there are no good facilities throughout the State, but not enough money has been allocated to maintain the phasing out of the old sleeper-type barracks in which railway sleepers were stacked on top of one another to make rooms.

Mr Rushton: Is there one like that at Wongan Hills?

Mr McIVER: They are just ordinary board and asbestos. In the last few years, fans have been placed in the rooms. This is 1982; I know it would be impossible to have a large-scale building programme for the construction of barracks all over Western Australia, but the Government should have a set building programme so that the oldest barracks could be phased out.

Let us consider what has happened in Quairading. The barracks in Quairading have not been there for long because they were brought from another railway centre. It was only a matter of putty and paint. They have refrigeration and

gas stoves, but that does not alter the fact that what is essential in the country areas when it is extremely hot is rest. We are approaching a season when the men will be working long hours. Whether we like it or not, the grain must be shifted, but rest for the men is important. One cannot sleep in temperatures in excess of 100 degrees Fahrenheit in a small 12' x 12' room with a fan that is circulating only the air in the room.

This is 1982, and the employees deserve better. It is not that requests have not been made to the commission, because there has been a constant cry. Unfortunately, some people do not really appreciate the facilities; however, they are in the minority.

Mr Rushton: I have been to many of them, and the impression I have gained was that they were in pretty good nick—certainly from the old days. Maybe you could name the odd ones and I could follow them up.

Mr McIVER: I mentioned Wongan Hills, and I mentioned Wyalkatchem. Improvements have been made from time to time in these two centres, but it would have been far better to use the money on building a new complex altogether.

If the Commissioner for Railways were sitting next to the Minister, he would say, "What about the finance? You give me the money, and I will build it."

Mr Rushton: We are putting a fair bit of money into the amenities at Midland Workshops this year. Maybe that is the wrong priority.

Mr McIVER: No. These things have to be looked at in perspective. I am referring to the running crews now. The Minister is referring to people at the Midland Workshops who go home to their families every night.

The running crews could be away from their families for three or four months, apart from a couple of weekends. It must be remembered that railway men spend at least 60 per cent of their working life away from home.

I recall the words of Mr Duplessis, the Royal Commissioner—

Mr Davies: Who remembers him? That was a fair while ago—back in the 1940s.

Mr McIVER:—following the ASG strike. One of the main factors he named as a cause of disruption and discontent was substandard amenities; he described the railway barracks of Western Australia as "hovels". He was appalled at what he witnessed.

I give full marks to the former Premier (the Hon. Sir Charles Court), who was the Minister for Railways of the day. He made an allocation of

funds, and we saw great advances in the facilities for railway men, particularly those residing in the barracks. Narrogin is one centre that comes to mind. Amenities rooms were provided because it could be seen that the recommendations of the Royal Commission were valid, and that when the men left their homes where they had good facilities, they were entitled to good facilities in the barracks or rest houses, as I think they call them now, where they spent up to 24 or 25 hours at a time.

I will not dwell on that point, because no money has been allocated to that area this year. However, I make a plea on behalf of the men who will work long hours this year in shifting the grain harvest. They have a big job ahead of them and I know they will give their full co-operation, as they have done in the past. We have modern locomotives to shift the grain, and I am sure we will have no trouble whatsoever. However, we should have a reciprocal arrangement, with recognition of the services of the men. The facilities in the country areas, particularly in the really hot regions, must be improved.

I wish to make a brief comment on Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. freights. We have the situation at Midland with the great storage sheds where the grain from the Miling-Toodyay line used to be stored and was then taken to Kwinana to meet the requirements of CBH. What happens now is that most of the grain goes directly to Kwinana, one of the reasons being that under the old system CBH was expected to meet two freight charges. It was expected to pay the freight from the wheat centre to the Midland receipt point, and then to pay further freight from Midland to Kwinana.

We rely heavily on revenue from CBH, and it would be far better to include overall, the Miling freight rate and not charge a further rate on the transport from Midland to Kwinana. The Government is having two bites at the cherry.

Mr Rushton: If it could be done without storage, it would certainly cut out some costs.

Mr McIVER: If the Government charged initially from the loading point to Kwinana and did not charge double, it would be a more equitable situation.

Reference was made earlier to the fuel tax imposed by the Federal Government. It is scandalous that Government instrumentalities in Western Australia must meet that cost.

Mr P. V. Jones: I agree with you.

Mr McIVER: When members opposite criticise transport expenditure, they do not understand the full implications. It could also be said that the

motorist in the metropolitan area subsidises metropolitan transport. However, the Federal Government expects the States to pay this tax. It must be pointed out that, although the tax may amount to only a 1c a litre now, bearing in mind the formula adopted, in eight years' time we will be paying 8c a litre tax. You, Sir, can imagine the additional costs involved.

The Minister referred to a figure of \$3.7 million—

Mr Rushton: The figure was \$3.7 million for railways.

Mr McIVER: That is just for locomotives and allowance must be made for on-road vehicles.

Mr Rushton: I am told the figure of \$3.7 million is for the total railways area.

Mr McIVER: Members should look at the SEC situation.

Mr P. V. Jones: What about it?

Mr McIVER: I am referring to the effect of the tax on diesel fuel.

Mr P. V. Jones: Yes, it is unreasonable.

Mr McIVER: If the figure for Westrail is \$3.7 million, I would not hazard a guess at the likely figure for the SEC.

Mr Evans: You are weak and ineffectual.

Mr P. V. Jones: I hope you don't think we agree with it.

Mr McIVER: We appreciate representations have been made to the Federal Government.

Mr P. V. Jones: And still are being made.

Mr McIVER: Hardly a day went by during the term of office of the Whitlam Government when members opposite did not say what a dreadful Government it was. Now the boot is on the other foot and we hardly hear a bleat out of them. We simply see a little column in the newspaper to the effect that the State Government objects to the fuel tax.

Mr Evans: The mouse that squeaks.

Mr McIVER: Members opposite should be in Canberra banging the table and doing everything possible to point out the direct and indirect effects of tax on the transport industry in Western Australia. The action taken by this Government so far has been pitiful. It has been all huff and puff, but nothing has been done. The Government's action in this regard has been similar to its lack of action on the air fare situation. On a mileage basis, the air fare from Perth to Kununurra is greater than the return fare to Melbourne, yet nothing is done. This Government reeks of hypocrisy and it has much to answer for in the transport field.



Westrail has been eroded and that erosion is continuing.

Mr Rushton: What do you mean by "eroded"?

Mr McIVER: I do not want to enter into debate on the matter, because the hour is late, and I shall have the opportunity to emphasise this matter later. Since this Government came into office the present Minister has not been the only one to handle the transport portfolio, but year by year further aspects of Westrail have been eroded. I hope the deregulation of timber will not be approved by the Minister. If it is allowed, in accordance with stage three of the land freight transport policy, it will be disastrous.

Mr Laurance: Steady on! The timber industry is in a bad way too.

Mr McIVER: I am talking about transport, not the general economics of the timber industry. I hope members opposite will take heed of the senior officers of Westrail who are strongly opposed to this move.

I hope the remarks I have made tonight, as the Opposition spokesman on transport matters, will be considered and followed up, particularly in relation to the leasing arrangements, because I would prefer to see the money coming into the system rather than being lost to it.

Mr RUSHTON: The member for Greenough referred to the name of "Commissioner of Railways". I point out that he is the railways commissioner and that Westrail is the trade name, therefore, it is more appropriate that he should remain as the Commissioner of Railways.

The member for Greenough referred also to the fact that some telephone lines were too low and I shall consider that matter. If the member has some specific recommendations on it, he should bring them forward.

I regretted the member for Avon could not be with us when we reviewed the progress Westrail was making, because I know he would have found it informative on Sunday when we had a good crowd on the Hotham Valley steam train. Approximately 1 000 people travelled on two trains to Dwellingup.

The leasing arrangements of Total West are being organised, bearing in mind space requirements. As the member would agree, when Westrail dealt with the matter, resources were under-utilised in that area. Indeed, a good deal of space is available for leasing to other authorities, which indicates the effectiveness of the policy. Under-utilisation has occurred at Kewdale and the trolley system, which cost a great deal to maintain and was not as fast as private people de-

sired, operates no longer. If they have not been made already, payments will be made in the future and it should be borne in mind that is a continuing matter. When the company can identify the exact area it will use, it will be necessary to finalise the lease arrangements.

Mr Davies: When will it be decided?

Mr RUSHTON: It will have to be done rather quickly. Not long ago I spoke to the commissioner about this, but it is Westrail's responsibility to conclude the matter.

Mr McIVER: Will reference be made to this in the annual report?

Mr RUSHTON: The department produces the report and I am obliged to table it. I do not write the annual report, so I do not know whether this matter will be referred to in it. The report will be tabled soon and we will be able to take up the matter from there.

The member referred to the leasing of land to primary producers between Northam and Wundowie. Obviously Westrail is endeavouring to obtain a commercial rate wherever possible, because it wants to operate as efficiently as it can. However, if too high a rate is charged, the land will not be leased and no income will be received. Therefore, a fine balance must be achieved and it is subject to negotiations.

The member also raised the subject of barracks, and I remember during the time I lived in the country visiting some very fine barracks. He mentioned those at Quairading, Wongan Hills, and Wyalkatchem.

Mr McIVER: I mentioned the concept of not building new ones but of transferring old ones.

Mr RUSHTON: Most probably he could find some very fine barracks along the standard gauge line, as also could be found in other places. Obviously Westrail is trying to obtain the best use of its resources and funds. Probably if the barracks were fully equipped with fans and so on, although they would not be a palace they would be very comfortable. The people working in them need consideration because they do shift work, necessitating that they sleep at all times of the day or night. The next time I visit these areas I will see to it that I inspect the barracks. Great advances have been made in recent times.

Mr McIVER: Advances were made, but they have stopped since; room exists for improvement.

Mr RUSHTON: The member mentioned that the grain season we have experienced will mean that Westrail will face a challenge in moving the grain. I think it will meet the challenge successfully; I am confident it will handle all the grain

the growers can produce. All members will be delighted that growers in Western Australia have had such a good season, because this will be of benefit not only to the farmers but also to all the people of this State.

Westrail is geared up to meet the challenge, and strong co-operation is to be found between it and CBH. The new DB locomotives coming on stream will be a great asset, as will the new wagons. I am happy to say we are in a good position to meet whatever tonnages must be shifted.

The member mentioned also the Midland storage; I believe what has happened there, fundamentally, represents a more efficient way of handling the grain in that it now is carried straight through to Kwinana. Consideration will be given to his comments about through freight, although for the time being that is not an issue because no grain is going through to Midland storage.

The Opposition and the Government share common ground on the subject of fuel tax. I have had the Federal Minister and other Federal members visit me and I have pointed out this Government's view on this matter; the Premier has communicated with the Prime Minister objecting to Commonwealth action.

Mr McIver: It looks like the only answer is a change of Government.

Mr RUSHTON: I do not think so.

The member said that Westrail's operation had been eroded, but had he been at the meeting held during the week he would know that the opposite is the case. Westrail is making investments and preparing itself for a bigger and better future. It is meeting its role very effectively and it will move to greater efficiency. This should be recorded more so in its annual report.

I acknowledge that the timber industry is facing difficult times, and I have no wish for Westrail to lose the cash flow it derives from that industry. On 1 July next year we will examine this situation thoroughly. We understand that the industry is facing difficult times, which could cause a number of lines to be in jeopardy if the timber freight is lost.

I thank members who have contributed to the debate and assure them that transport services in this State are in good hands.

**Division 27 put and passed.**

### *Progress*

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr Nanovich.

### **BILLS (2): RETURNED**

1. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Amendment Bill.
2. Borrowings for Authorities Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

*House adjourned at 12.02 a.m. (Thursday)*

### **QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

#### **ARGENTINE ANTS**

##### *Yanchep National Park*

1824. Dr DADOUR, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

- (1) With reference to question 31 of 23 March 1982, will he table the biological monitoring programme undertaken at Yanchep National Park prior to and subsequent to spraying with oftanol and heptachlor on 17 and 18 March 1982?
- (2) Have organochlorines and/or organophosphates been used in any other lands which fall within his various portfolios?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), would he please state for each of the lands—
  - (a) the vesting, classification and purpose of the land;
  - (b) the precise areas treated;
  - (c) the chemicals used;
  - (d) the strength of the chemicals used;
  - (e) the reasons for treatment;
  - (f) the dates on which the treatment was carried out;
  - (g) the precautions taken to prevent contamination of people;
  - (h) the precautions taken to prevent contamination of wildlife;
  - (i) the authority responsible for monitoring the area before and after treatment?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) No, the report on the monitoring programme is still being prepared.
- (2) These chemicals have been used by two departments within my portfolio.
- (3) (i) Zoological Gardens, South Perth—
  - (a) "A"-class reserve for "Zoological Gardens Purposes";
  - (b) animal enclosure, plant nursery;

- (c) "Ianskil" (Fenchlorphos), "roundup" (Glycophosphate), "heptachlor";
  - (d) in accord with the instructions;
  - (e) housefly and stablefly control, weed killing, Argentine ant control;
  - (g) protective clothing, boots and respirators are worn by the worker. Park is sprayed in early morning when no public present;
  - (h) common sense and spraying done only in the early morning and only when windless thus preventing any drift;
  - (i) in the case of Argentine ants, the Department of Agriculture.
- (ii) Forests Department—
- (a) State Forest and land vested in Conservator of Forests;
  - (b) precise areas not available;
  - (c) aldrin, fenthion, DDT, dieldrin, trichlorfon, parathion-methyl, azinphos-methyl, clordane, demeton-s-methyl, malathion, heptachlor, dimentoate;
  - (d) strictly as prescribed on the various labels.
  - (e) Mainly control of termites in departmental buildings and control of insect attack in tree nurseries. About 10 hectares each year of tuart regeneration at Ludlow receive a foliar spray of dimethoate for control of defoliating insects. This is applied directly to individual plants only;
  - (f) ongoing as required. Impossible to document precisely;
  - (g) strict application of precautions set out in the departmental chemical users manual;
  - (h) not considered necessary;
  - (i) no monitoring as none considered necessary.

## SMALL BUSINESSES

### *Provisional Tax*

1871. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

Referring to his party's promise prior to the last State election which said the Government would seek discussions with the Federal Government on—

- (a) abolition of the requirement for private companies to pay out dividends half their annual nett earnings;
- (b) removal of the requirement for small businesses to pay provisional tax; and
- (c) reform of tax allowances for depreciation of assets:
  - (i) when have these matters been raised with the Federal Government;
  - (ii) what was the nature of the suggestions;
  - (iii) will he table documents and correspondence in connection with each such response?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) to (c) These matters were taken up with the Commonwealth Government in discussions between my predecessor and the Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer on more than one occasion. Although not conceding all of the concessions sought, the Commonwealth accepted the need for a progressive freeing of restrictions on the retention and reinvestment of private company profits and the strength of the case for more realistic depreciation provisions. In fact real progress has been made as manifested in recent decisions by the Commonwealth to—

increase to 80 per cent the retention allowance in respect of the trading profits of private companies, for distributions from taxable incomes of 1981-82 and subsequent years;

provide that new and second-hand plant ordered after 19 July 1982 will be eligible generally for accelerated depreciation over either three or five years with the three year depreciation applying where the previous prime cost depreciation rate was greater than 20 per cent and the five year depreciation applying when the previous rate was less than 20 per cent. New primary production plant ordered after that date will thus generally be depreciated over three years;

depreciation allowances have been introduced in respect of new non-residential income producing buildings.

## ADVISORY COMMITTEES

*Membership*

1877. Mr BRYCE, to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, and Emergency Services.

When may I expect to receive the answer to question 1450 of Thursday 23 September 1982 respecting regulatory bodies?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

The member should receive the details required in the near future.

## BOATS

*Licensing and Supervision*

1888. Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many patrol vessels has the Marine and Harbours Department available for supervising and policing small craft?
- (2) What has been the income from the licensing of small craft in each of the last five financial years?
- (3) How many additional inspection personnel have been employed by the department?
- (4) Where, outside the proximity of the Fremantle Harbour and Swan River, are inspectors with suitable craft stationed?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) 11.
  - (2)
 

1977-78	\$198 383
1978-79	\$271 378
1979-80	\$434 884
1980-81	\$512 096
1981-82	\$645 749
  - (3) Five additional inspection personnel have been employed by the department in the last five years.
  - (4) Mandurah,  
Albany,  
Geraldton,  
Karratha\*
- \*Suitable craft will be supplied this year.

## TOURISM

*Expenditure*

1894. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Tourism:

Can he provide a breakdown of expenditure for 1981-82 and estimate for 1982-

83 for each of the States for tourism under the following categories:

- (a) total expenditure;
- (b) promotional expenses;
- (c) administration expenses;
- (d) salaries;
- (e) expenditure as a portion of the Consolidated Revenue Fund?

Mr MacKINNON replied:

Following is a breakdown of expenditure for the Western Australian Department of Tourism for 1981-82 and 1982-83—

	1981-82	1982-83 (estimates)
	\$	\$
(a) Total expenditure	4 590 347	5 443 000
(b) promotional expenses	780 000	850 000
(c) administration expenses	917 000	1 174 000
(d) salaries	2 197 956	2 527 000
(e) expenditure as a proportion of total CRF expenditure	0.22%	0.23%

Expenditure details relating to other State Departments of Tourism are not available, however they may be obtained from the respective published annual estimates.

## HEALTH: MENTAL

*Institutions: Number*

1895. Mr GORDON HILL, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) What are the names and locations of Government institutions for the intellectually handicapped?
- (2) How many social trainers are employed in each?
- (3) How many social trainers are currently undergoing training for employment in Government institutions for the intellectually handicapped?
- (4) How many social trainers were employed by the Government in each of the following years—
  - (a) 1977;
  - (b) 1978;
  - (c) 1979;
  - (d) 1980;
  - (e) 1981?
- (5) How many new Government institutions for the intellectually handicapped have been established in each of the last five years?
- (6) Are new institutions to be established in the next year?
- (7) If "Yes" to (6), how many, and where are they located?

- (8) What is the current rate of pay of social trainers employed in their first year?
- (9) Is it a fact that social trainers have been requested not to take public holidays?
- (10) If "Yes" to (9), why?
- (11) What is the rate of pay of social trainers working on public holidays?
- (12) How many social trainers have accumulated public holidays?
- (13) What is the maximum number, and average number, of public holidays accumulated?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) to (13) As the information requested by the member is not readily available, an answer will be given in writing as soon as possible.

### ROAD

#### *Marmion Road*

1896. Mr GORDON HILL, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has the Main Roads Department completed an evaluation of the feasibility of establishing a medium refuge island in Marmion Road, near Weld Road, Swan View?
- (2) (a) If "Yes", what type of pedestrian facility is to be established; and  
(b) when will it be established?
- (3) If "No" to (1), when will the study be completed, bearing in mind that it was advised in May of the study being undertaken?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) to (3) It is assumed that the question relates to Morrison Road near Weld Road and not Marmion Road. If that is the case I can advise that it is proposed to construct a pedestrian median refuge island. The work will be undertaken by the Mundaring Shire Council and is expected to be completed during the first quarter of 1983.

### COURT

#### *Cannington-Queens Park*

1897. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is the Attorney General aware of the legal and social problems occurring daily in the Cannington-Gosnells area which require court proceedings?

- (2) If "Yes", is he also aware of the intense interest the legal profession has shown by establishing legal practices generally throughout this area?
- (3) As the Local Courts and Courts of Petty Sessions are located in Armadale, Fremantle, Midland and the City of Perth, will the Attorney General give immediate attention to having a courthouse established in the Cannington-Queens Park area to cope with this ever increasing problem and overcrowding of the existing courts?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) I am unaware of legal and social problems in the Cannington/Gosnells area being markedly above the general level elsewhere in the metropolitan area.
- (2) I am aware of practices in the Cannington/Gosnells area, the majority of which having been established for some time.
- (3) and (4) There is no overcrowding in existing courts. The transfer of Magistrates' Courts to the Central Law Courts has provided superior and adequate accommodation for the public. In addition, the centralising of magistrates has resulted in better use of their time reflecting in reduced court delays.

Work has commenced on a new court at Armadale which will provide convenient access to practitioners and residents of the Gosnells area.

The likely court work generated in the area, having regard to the new Armadale court, does not at this time justify court facilities at Cannington/Queens Park.

### CONSUMER AFFAIRS: DOOR-TO-DOOR SALES

#### *Ethics*

1898. Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

- (1) Is he aware there are door-to-door salesmen who use unethical and untruthful methods when selling goods in the metropolitan area?
- (2) Is he also aware such salesmen have been operating in the Queens Park area, selling scissors?

- (3) If "Yes" to (1) and (2), is it known to him that these salesmen offer a recommended price of \$15 for a pair of scissors which can be bought at Boans Waverley for \$5.95 a pair?
- (4) In view of this method of selling by door-to-door sales will he take action to prevent such an abuse of sales ethics?
- (5) If "Yes" to (4), will he introduce legislation to prevent this abuse?
- (6) If not, why not?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) No.
- (4) to (6) No further legislation action is considered to be warranted to combat this practice. Consumers should adopt prudent and discerning attitudes before committing themselves to any purchases. This includes being satisfied that the goods being purchased represent value for money and are price competitive.

At present the provisions of the Door to Door (Sales) Act do not apply to goods and services costing less than \$20. I see no good reason to amend this legislation.

1899. *This question was postponed.*

## CULTURAL AFFAIRS

### *Heritage Legislation*

1900. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Cultural Affairs:

- (1) Referring to question 1863 of 1982 relating to State heritage legislation, when is it expected consideration of this legislation will be complete?
- (2) What are the names of the person(s) who have the matter under consideration?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) No time limit has been set.
- (2) The Minister for Cultural Affairs.

## STRATA TITLES ACT

### *Amendment*

1901. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Attorney General:

- (1) Is it expected legislation will be introduced during the current session of Parliament to amend the strata title legislation as a result of the review by the Law Reform Commission?
- (2) If not, what is the present position?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The Law Reform Commission has not yet completed work on this project. It is, however, anticipated that it will be finalised in the near future.

## EDUCATION

### *Millen Special School*

1902. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Referring to question 1864 of 1982 respecting the Millen special school, can he detail—
  - (a) the extent of classroom additions;
  - (b) the extent of the manual arts extensions;
  - (c) the extent of the additional administration and storage areas?
- (2) Will the work cost in excess of the \$20 000 shown in the General Loan Fund estimates?
- (3) If so, what is the estimated cost?

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (1) (a) One classroom will be added;
- (b) the existing manual arts shed to be demolished and replaced. An additional shed to be supplied for storage of equipment currently stored in the manual arts shed;
- (c) the administration area will be increased in size to include a new staffroom and sick bay. The existing area will be subject to conversion and improvement.
- (2) and (3) The total allocation for the job is \$260 000. The \$20 000 mentioned in General Loan Fund estimates represents the expenditure to be incurred in 1982-83, the balance of funding to come from 1983-84.

## TRANSPORT: BUSES

### *Sale*

1903. Mr CARR, to the Premier:

- (1) With reference to Government buses which are being replaced, are these always sold by tender through the State Tender Board or can provision be made for a worthy community-based organisation to purchase a bus directly without it being submitted to tender?

- (2) If the latter is the case, will he please inform me of details as to who should be approached with representations on behalf of such a community organisation?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Consideration would be given to a request from any worthy community-based organisation which wished to purchase a surplus Government bus.
- (2) Application can be made to the Secretary for Railways at Westrail or the Managing Director of the MTT

## BOATS

### *Licensing*

1904. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) With reference to licensing requirements to use a boat for tourist purposes, is there any regulation which prevents a petrol-powered jet boat being licensed?
- (2) Will he please provide me with details of any such restrictions?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) The Western Australian Marine Act survey and equipment regulations allow motor boats exceeding 20 feet in length but less than 15 tonnes gross tonnage to be powered by petrol engines.
- (2) For reasons of safety it is the policy of the Department of Marine and Harbours where vessels in this category are to carry passengers, not to allow in-built petrol engines.

The Uniform Shipping Laws Code which is being adopted by all marine authorities throughout Australia will require passenger vessels fitted with in-board engines to operate on fuel having a flash point of not less than 60° Centigrade.

## TRAFFIC: LAWS

### *Interpretation*

1905. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

With regard to interpretation of traffic laws, such as parking an unlit vehicle on a roadway at night, is there a common interpretation—issued by a senior officer for the guidance of patrolmen, or is interpretation of the laws left to individual patrolmen?

Mr HASSELL replied:

Patrolmen are given general guidelines to assist in law interpretation. This is an integral part of their training.

## COURT AND POLICE STATION

### *Beverley*

1906. Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Police and Prisons:

- (1) What plans do the Police and Crown Law Departments have for the police station courthouse, also the police residences, at Beverley, when the new police complex at Beverley becomes operative?
- (2) Would he consider a proposal from the Beverley arts and crafts committee to lease or rent their buildings to enable the Arts and crafts committee to expand their operations?
- (3) If "No" to (2), would he state his reasons?

Mr HASSELL replied:

- (1) (a) On completion of the new police complex at Beverley, the Police Department intends to relinquish the existing station and one set of quarters to the Under Secretary for Works, and retain one set of quarters as a residence for the second police officer, his wife and family.
- (b) The Beverley courthouse is to be retained by the Crown Law Department for court proceedings presided over by the circuit magistrate during his visits to the town.
- (2) Any proposal for the Beverley arts and crafts committee to use the vacated premises should be referred to the Minister for Works.
- (3) Answered by (2).

## HOSPITALS: COMPUTING SERVICES

### *Cyber Equipment*

1907. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is he aware of approximately what proportion of large hospital administration and information retrieval systems are based on cyber equipment?
- (2) Is he aware of what equipment types are most commonly used and in what proportions in health systems in Australia and other comparable nations?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) This information is not readily available. Control Data Corporation has a major worldwide commitment to medical and hospital computing. The company markets one of the most widely used hospital pathology computer systems in the United States and Canada. The particular product PATHLAB is a recognised market leader. As well, the company has developed the most advanced computer assisted education system in the world. This system (PLATO) is used extensively in support of medical and paramedical education in the USA and Canada and is recognised as a leader in its field.

In Europe, the Geneva hospitals have implemented their hospital administration systems on a large Control Data computer configuration.

- (2) In terms of numbers of computer installations, the most common make of computers in use by hospitals in Australia is Digital Equipment Corporation equipment. In Australia, as throughout the world, there is really no dominant supplier of computing equipment to the hospital sector.

In Australia, a very wide range of computing equipment is in use, with each State having a different mix of computer equipment—

NSW—Digital Equipment Hewlett Packard, NCR and others

Victoria—Burroughs, Prime, Hewlett Packard, Digital Equipment, Tandom

SA—Burroughs, IBM, Digital Equipment, Microdata

Queensland—Univac and others

Tasmania—Digital Equipment and others

Commonwealth—IBM

WA—Control Data, Digital Equipment.

## HOSPITALS: COMPUTING SERVICES

### *Cost*

1908. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

In respect of the hospital computing services—

- (a) which are the major areas where computerisation can be justified but have not yet been effected;

- (b) what is the estimated cost of completing all justifiable computerisation?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (a) No computer systems are developed for use by WA public hospitals without cost justification. The individual hospitals are responsible for identifying areas of hospital administration which can justify the use of a computer system. At this point in time, the department is not in possession of any new hospital computer system proposals for which there is cost justified support.
- (b) Until specific new computer systems proposals are received from individual hospitals, it is not possible to estimate the total cost of completing new computing systems which may be at this point in time, cost justifiable. However, it is the policy of the department that hospital computing should pay its way and no system will go ahead unless it can be demonstrated that the system will result in improved efficiency.

## HOSPITALS: COMPUTING SERVICES

### *Annual Growth*

1909. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

In respect of the hospital computing services—

- (a) what is the projected annual growth in main frame processing load for the next five years;
- (b) which major projects will be completed during this period and which major projects will be outstanding at the end of the period;
- (c) what is the planned hardware upgrade path for the next five years?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (a) The cumulative annual growth in mainframe processing load over the previous six years has been 18%. Growth over the next five years should be of a similar order, though the way this processing power will be delivered will depend on computer hardware developments over this period;
- (b) The department will continue to support the development of cost justifiable computing. Each system proposal will be considered on its merits.



- (c) The most important consideration in regard to any computerisation programme is the availability of computer software which is applicable to user needs. The hardware used is a secondary consideration.

## HOSPITALS: COMPUTING SERVICES

### *Requirements*

#### 1910. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

Why is the hospital computing service using a mainframe computer which primarily provides mathematical computing facilities when its computing requirements are administrative data management?

Mr YOUNG replied:

It is well known that Control Data Corporation is the third largest supplier of computer hardware, software, and services in the world. The company has a large and diverse user-base taking in large commercial and governmental organisations.

Two large scale users of Cybers for general non-scientific computing in Australia are the Australian Taxation Office and the State Government Insurance Office in Queensland. The Australian Taxation Office recently announced an \$8 million upgrade to its Control Data Cyber computer installation.

Elsewhere, Control Data equipment is used in large banking, retailing, insurance and governmental situations.

It is not true that Cyber equipment is primarily suitable for mathematical applications.

## HEALTH: COMPUTING SERVICES

### *Delays*

#### 1911. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

How many times per day do users of the health computing services system experience a delay of more than 10 seconds in getting a response from an action at the terminal?

Mr YOUNG replied:

The most recent measurements of computer terminal response times indicate a worse case situation of 8 to 10 per cent of all terminal responses being greater

than 10 seconds. The most common response delay is one second.

## HEALTH: COMPUTING SERVICES

### *Technology*

#### 1912. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

Did Coopers and Lybrand, Barry Feranti and Computer Science of Australia when consulting to health computer services, suggest a change of hardware to take advantage of more advanced software technology which offers reduced application development costs?

Mr YOUNG replied:

All suppliers of computer hardware and software, including Control Data, are giving much greater emphasis to providing application software development aids and specific computer application system packages.

An important criterion in the selection of new hardware would be the availability of such software.

However, this would be only one factor in any determination of a new health computing hardware and software strategy. The actual cost of the hardware, its expansibility, reliability, and the cost of converting computer systems which are already running satisfactorily, would need to be taken into account. Given the high measure of success which has been achieved in the provision of hospital computing in this State in comparison to elsewhere in Australia, any change in computer hardware will need to be very carefully assessed to ensure that the benefits of change outweigh the disadvantages.

## HOSPITALS: COMPUTING SERVICES

### *Investment*

#### 1913. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

What is the total investment to date in hospital computing services in the following categories:

- (a) computing hardware;
- (b) software (application development tools);
- (c) software (applications)?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (a) Health Computing Services mainframe computer equipment is on lease from Control Data Australia and from the University of Western Australia. The budgeted lease cost of existing Cyber equipment in 1982-83 is \$938 000;
- (b) Health Computing Services staff have access to applications development tools as part of the software which is licensed to run on the Cybers.  
As well, along with other WA Government departments, Health Computing Services makes use of SDM/70, a systems development methodology acquired by the State Government;
- (c) between \$1.5 and \$2 million.

#### HEALTH: COMPUTING SERVICES

##### *Manpower*

1914. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

What proportion of the health computing services manpower is engaged in working on—

- (a) existing computer systems;
- (b) new computer systems?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (a) and (b) Approximately 40 per cent of Health Computing Services staff are engaged in the maintenance and support of existing computer systems and hospital users of those systems. The remaining staff are engaged in the development of new systems and the provision of new system features to existing computer applications.

#### CONSUMER AFFAIRS: MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS ACT

##### *Licences: Objections*

1915. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

With reference to page 16 of the 1981-82 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, of the 13 occasions upon which the Commissioner objected to a licence being renewed or obtained, what was the Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board's determination in those cases, and which cases were in respect of dealers, yard managers and salesman's licences respectively?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (a) Dealers—  
in 3 cases objection not sustained by board;  
in 2 cases objection sustained by board.
- (b) Yard managers—  
in 2 cases objection not sustained by board;  
in 1 case objection sustained by board.
- (c) Salesmen—  
in 2 cases objection not sustained by board;  
in 2 cases objection sustained by board;  
in 1 case objection partially sustained by board.

#### CONSUMER AFFAIRS: MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERS ACT

##### *Licences: Disqualifications*

1916. Mr TONKIN, to the Minister for Consumer Affairs:

With reference to page 167 of the 1981-82 Annual Report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, of the four applications made by the Commissioner for a disqualification of a person from holding a licence, how many were in the category of dealers, yard managers or salesman's licence respectively, and what was the determination of the Motor Vehicle Dealers Licensing Board in each case?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

Three dealers and one yard manager comprised the four applications.  
The result was two disqualifications by board and two warnings by board.

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

##### *North-West Shelf: SEC Purchases*

1917. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Will North West Shelf gas purchased by the State Energy Commission after the commencement of the export phase of the project contain liquefied petroleum gas?
- (2) (a) Is it intended to build a liquefied petroleum gas extraction plant at Kwinana, as mentioned in the "Dampier-Perth Environmental Review and Management Programme";  
(b) if so, when is it hoped that such a plant would be brought into operation;  
(c) if not, why not?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) (a) to (c) No. LPG will be extracted at the Withnell Bay treatment site, in conjunction with the LNG plant operation.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT: SIGNS

##### *Approvals*

1918. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Referring to question 1780 of 1982 respecting advertising signs has the meeting referred to yet taken place?
- (2) If so, with what result?

Mrs CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) I indicated that I would give consideration to the formation of a committee, including industry and local government representation, to examine the problem.

#### WOOD CHIPPING

##### *Environmental Review and Management Programme*

1919. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Has the WA Chip and Pulp Company Pty. Ltd. submitted the environmental review and management programme, due in early 1981, for the production and export of an additional volume of 150 000 tonnes of woodchips (already approved) and a further 200 000 tonnes to be approved after the acceptance of the environmental review and management programme?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) The proposed expansion in the woodchip industry for which the environmental review and management programme was required, has not eventuated.

1920. *This question was postponed.*

#### STATE FORESTS: JARRAH, KARRI, AND PINE

##### *Donnybrook Sunklands*

1921. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What is the estimated cost per hectare of the pine planting programme in the Donnybrook sunklands?

- (2) How much is currently being spent per hectare on jarrah forest silviculture?
- (3) How much is currently being spent per hectare on karri forest silviculture?
- (4) In the financial year 1981-82, in the Donnybrook sunklands—
  - (a) how many hectares were clearfelled for the planting of pines;
  - (b) how many hectares were planted with pines;
  - (c) how many hectares were planted with pines and pasture for agroforestry?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) \$505 per hectare approximately—direct field costs.
- (2) 43c per hectare approximately—direct field costs over the Jarrah forest as a whole.
- (3) \$4.88 per hectare approximately—direct field costs over the Karri forest as a whole.
- (4) (a) 2853 hectares;
- (b) 1342 hectares;
- (c) clover pasture was established on the whole area planted in 1981-82.

#### STATE FORESTS: PINE

##### *Dieback*

1922. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Is it a fact that dieback is affecting pines in State forests?
- (2) Have any pines been killed by dieback?
- (3) If so, what area or approximate number of pines has been—
  - (a) affected; or
  - (b) killed by dieback?
- (4) In what specific locations have pines been—
  - (a) affected; or
  - (b) killed by dieback?
- (5) For each location, on what date was it first recorded that pines were—
  - (a) affected; or
  - (b) killed by dieback?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) Effects of dieback on pines in State forest have been reported in departmental annual reports of 1980 and 1981 and in answer to parliamentary question 753 of 10 September 1980.
- (2) Sporadic deaths have occurred.
- (3) (a) and (b) Because of the sporadic nature of deaths the disease is not seen as a management problem and area or numbers of deaths have only been recorded in specific studies.
- (4) (a) and (b) In areas where pine replaced dieback affected jarrah stands scattered throughout the south west.
- (5) (a) and (b) Answered by (3) above.

### TIMBER

#### Royalties

1923. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Forests:

- (1) What is the royalty currently being paid on—
  - (a) jarrah sawlogs;
  - (b) karri sawlogs;
  - (c) marri sawlogs;
  - (d) pine sawlogs;
  - (e) hardwood chip logs;
  - (f) softwood chip logs, from State forest?
- (2) When did the last increase in royalties on—
  - (a) hardwood sawlogs;
  - (b) softwood sawlogs;
  - (c) hardwood chip logs;
  - (d) softwood chip logs, take effect?
- (3) Has there been any decrease in royalties on—
  - (a) hardwood sawlogs;
  - (b) softwood sawlogs;
  - (c) hardwood chip logs;
  - (d) softwood chip logs?
- (4) If so, when did the decrease take effect and how much was the amount of the decrease in each of the categories listed in question (1)?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) (a) (b) and (e) Answered in question 1016 of 11 August 1982;
- (c) \$7.14 per cubic metre;
- (d) representative rates are—\$6.46 per cubic metre for case logs and \$20.09 per cubic metre—\$21.52 per cubic metre for mill logs;

(f) \$4.13 per cubic metre—\$4.96 per cubic metre.

- (2) (a) 1 July 1982;
- (b) 1 July 1982;
- (c) 1 January 1981;
- (d) 1 January 1981.
- (3) (a) to (d) No.
- (4) Not applicable.

### STATE FORESTS: QUARANTINE AREAS

#### Logging Trials

1924. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Lands and Forests:

- (1) Have the logging trials in quarantine areas carried out by the Forests Department been completed?
- (2) If the Forests Department enforces all its proposed regulations for logging in quarantine areas, what is the estimated costs per hectare and/or per cubic metre of timber to the logging companies?
- (3) Does the Forests Department intend to enforce all its proposed regulations for optimal protection of the forest during logging in quarantine areas?
- (4) Will he table the regulations that the Forests Department proposes to enforce for the protection of the forest during logging in quarantine areas?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) to (4) Consideration of the need for any variation of existing forest disease regulations is not possible pending detailed photography monitoring of the results of the logging trials. It is, therefore, not possible to determine any contingent cost factors at this stage.

### HOSPITAL

#### Port Hedland

1925. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it a fact that the radiologist at the Port Hedland Hospital lives in a house owned by the State Government?
- (2) If "Yes", what rent is paid on the house?
- (3) Is it a fact that a considerable sum has been spent by the Government on renovating and upgrading the house occupied by the radiologist?
- (4) If "Yes" to (3), please provide details of what work has been done and what the total cost was for the improvements?

- (5) Is it a fact that another house was originally provided for the radiologist at South Hedland?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), what did it cost to construct the house at South Hedland and why was it not occupied by the radiologist?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) Yes. The radiologist elected to move from a superior quality house in South Hedland to one close to the hospital in order to provide an improved emergency service.
- (2) \$147.50 per week.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) A general repairs and renovation programme involving painting, replacement windows, floor coverings, and other improvements was carried out at an approximate cost of \$8 500.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) The residence was built at a cost of approximately \$86 000. The radiologist occupied the house from 26 August 1980 to 8 December 1981. This house was purchased to enable the north-west to enjoy its first resident service instead of a visiting service from the metropolitan area.

## HEALTH: ALCOHOL AND DRUGS

### *Budget Allocations*

1926. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

- (1) How much will be allocated from the 1982-83 Budget for voluntary agencies dealing with alcohol and drug related problems?
- (2) How much will be available in the 1982-83 Budget for Serenity Lodge?
- (3) Does the Government consider that the allocation for voluntary agencies is commensurate with their contribution to the fight against alcohol and drug related problems in the community?
- (4) Does he accept the findings and conclusions of the recent Alcohol and Drug Authority sponsored study on Serenity Lodge?
- (5) What action does the Government plan to take as a result of the findings of the recent Serenity Lodge study?
- (6) (a) Is it likely that as a result of the study mentioned above there will be any significant alteration in the Alcohol and Drug Authority approach to handling alcoholics;

(b) is consideration being given to placing less emphasis on hospitalisation of alcoholics?

Mr YOUNG replied:

- (1) \$501 000.
- (2) The amounts allocated for distribution to individual voluntary agencies will be made public when each agency has been advised.
- (3) This year's allocation to voluntary agencies represents a significant increase in the amount of funds made available in previous years. The Government believes it should continue to assist voluntary agencies to achieve and maintain professional standards, but it also believes in encouraging community support for these widespread problems.
- (4) Yes, but they must be interpreted with care and with the realisation that the Serenity Lodge programme is not suitable for many with problems of alcohol abuse.
- (5) The result of the study does not call for specific Government action.
- (6) (a) No; the authority maintains close contact with the Alcoholic Anonymous fellowship and uses its skills wherever considered appropriate;  
(b) the authority plans to place increasing emphasis on the non-residential management of individuals with alcohol and drug problems, but some degree of hospitalization is unavoidable.

## GOVERNMENT CONTRACT

### *Carpet*

1927. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Who tendered for carpet contract ADQ 3427?
- (2) What were the tender prices in each case?
- (3) Did all of the tenderers take advantage of the 10 per cent local preference rule?
- (4) If not, which tenderer used Eastern States manufactured carpet?
- (5) Who won the tender?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- |                        |               |
|------------------------|---------------|
| (1) and (2)            | \$            |
| Carpet Call            | (a) 16 590.00 |
|                        | (b) 13 496.00 |
| Carpet Fair            | 13 650.00     |
| Barrett Carpet Company | 14 060.20     |

Malco Floorcoverings	15 089.00
Integrity Carpets	15 253.00
Custom Floors	15 900.00
S.P. Mulcaster	16 100.00.

- (3) No.
- (4) Carpet Call 13 496.00  
Carpet Fair 13 650.00  
Barrett Carpet Company 14 060.20.
- (5) Malco Floorcoverings.

1928. *This question was postponed.*

**HOUSING: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES'  
HOUSING AUTHORITY**  
*Lease-back Arrangements*

1929. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

With reference to his answer to question 1860 of 1982, what is the value on a year-by-year basis of Government Employees' Housing Authority homes leased back to the Superannuation Board since the commencement of this method of financing housing construction?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

The value of sales of houses by the Government Employees' Housing Authority to the Superannuation Board under leased back arrangements on a year by year basis from inception are—

	\$
1968-69	1 102 703
1969-70	1 128 187
1970-71	1 253 854
1971-72	1 601 925
1972-73	1 499 965
1973-74	1 500 083
1974-75	2 100 769
1975-76	1 999 879
1976-77	3 027 115
1977-78	3 492 118
1978-79	4 001 902
1979-80	4 008 248
1980-81	4 029 634
1981-82	3 997 491.

**SEWERAGE**

*Morley*

1930. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Water Resources:

- (1) What consideration has been given by the Metropolitan Water Authority to

complaints from the resident of 25 Cooper Road, Morley, about the all night operations of a water pump as part of sewerage construction works immediately adjacent to his property?

- (2) In view of the serious interruption to the sleep of residents in the vicinity due to the noise and vibrations from the pump, will he ensure that its operation is restricted to daylight hours?
- (3) If "No" to (2), why not, and what other amelioratory measures is the authority prepared to take with regard to the noise nuisance associated with the pump's operation?
- (4) How much longer is the pump likely to be operated in this vicinity?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (1) A diesel driven pump was used until such time as sufficient power could be provided to the site by the SEC. The pump is now driven by a much quieter electric motor.
- (2) It is not practicable to restrict pumping to daylight hours.
- (3) The water table would rise and the banks of the open trench would collapse. No further measures to reduce noise are possible.
- (4) As planned, the pump unit will be shifted to a location about 30 metres further away from No. 25 Cooper Street today, and it will be there for about one week.

**EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL**

*Children: Statistics*

1931. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Community Welfare:

- (1) Referring to a report in *The Sunday Times* of 31 October 1982, of a seminar on children's services in Australia at which comment was made to the effect that Western Australia has 33 per cent more pre-school age children than any other State, that 30 per cent of working mothers in this State have pre-school children but that less than 3 per cent of those children have access to any formal child care, can he confirm the accuracy of these statistics?

- (2) What specific steps is the State Government taking to extend the availability of formal child care to families needing such support?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) When comparing the number of pre-school age children in each State it is necessary to determine the actual upper age limit being used as school entry ages vary from State to State.

#### 1981 CENSUS FIGURES FOR ALL STATES—

	0-4 years	5 years	6 years	Total Popu- lation
New South Wales	394 450	80 892	83 652	5 237 068
Victoria	292 393	60 789	63 141	3 948 555
Queensland	185 846	38 284	40 147	2 345 335
South Australia	92 862	19 367	19 871	1 319 327
Western Australia	104 405	21 423	21 690	1 299 090
Tasmania	33 986	6 914	7 122	427 308
Northern Territory	13 427	2 849	2 748	122 844
ACT	21 114	4 339	4 490	227 255
TOTAL	1 138 483	234 857	242 861	14 926 782

The total number of children attending child day care facilities was 6 155 as at September 1981.

In the census conducted by Department for Community Welfare for child day care facilities in 1981 4.9 per cent of the children aged 0 to 6 years were using day care facilities in Western Australia.

In relation to the latter part of the member's first question, I am not aware of the source of the figures quoted and I am not in a position to confirm the accuracy of these statistics.

- (2) The early childhood services unit of the Department for Community Welfare works closely with the office of child care together with local government and community groups to identify and clarify child care needs. The office of child care is the funding authority and the department assists in the establishment of priorities for funding. The department also works with the private sector in the development of day care and family day care services.

#### EDUCATION: PRE-SCHOOL

##### *Four-year-olds: Policy*

1932. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) Further to question 1637 of 1982, does his assurance of no change in 1983 from

1982 policy mean that children with social needs and children in sparsely populated areas are to continue as two categories of special need as prescribed by the former Premier in a Press conference reported in *The West Australian* on 17 November 1981?

- (2) If "Yes", is it not a fact that three-plus age children (four year olds) residing in Mt. Magnet constitute children in either of the above categories?
- (3) If "Yes" to (2), will he instruct his department to admit three-plus age children to the Mt. Magnet pre-primary school in 1983, and if not, why not?

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (1) to (3) In 1982 no special provision was made for 3+ aged children to attend the Mount Magnet pre-primary centre. As indicated in my response to question 1637, no change in policy is proposed for 1983 and, consequently, no changes are contemplated to the 1982 arrangements for the Mount Magnet pre-primary.

#### EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

##### *Agricultural Courses*

1933. Mr BLAICKIE, to the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the enrolment in each year for agricultural courses conducted at the
- Cunderdin;
  - Denmark;
  - Harvey;
  - Morawa;
  - Narrogin;
  - Gnowangerup,
- high schools?

- (2) Further to question 1893 (1)(c) of Tuesday 2 November, what is the area, if any, of the "school farm" as related to schools providing agricultural courses in whole or part?

Mr CLARKO replied:

- (1) (a) to (f) Enrolment in each year for agricultural courses—

School	Student Numbers	Approx. Student Intake /Year
Cunderdin	96	48
Denmark	40	20
Harvey	48	24

Morawa	34	17
Narrogin	108	54
Gnowangerup	24	12

The schools endeavour to maintain equal student numbers in each year of the two year course but as this is not always possible these figures vary slightly from year to year.

- (2) The area of the "school farm" as related to schools providing agricultural courses in whole or part—

Full-time 2 Year Agric. Course	ha.
Cunderdin Agric. District High School	742
Denmark Agric. District High School	300
Harvey Agric. Senior High School	270
Morawa District High School	388
Narrogin Agric. College	1 909
Gnowangerup Agricultural School	76
Schools offering agricultural subjects—TAE studies agricultural options, alternative upper school, school-to-work transition projects	ha.
Boyup Brook District High School	12
Carnarvon District High School	—
Central Midland Senior High School	—
Darkan District High	—
Dalwallinu District High School	2
Esperance Senior High School	750
Governor Stirling Senior High School	2
Goomalling District High School	—
John Willcock Senior High School	—
Kelmscott Senior High School	5
Kojonup District High School	180
Lockridge Senior High School	—
Manjimup Senior High School	35
Margaret River High School	28
Merredin Senior High School	2
Mt Barker Senior High School	238
Narembeen District High School	8
Pinjarra Senior High School	—
Wanneroo Senior High School	—
Wongan Hills District High School	—
Wyalkatchem District High School	101
Yalgoo Primary	—
York District High School	—
Some schools make local arrangements to lease land.	

## CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT: LESCHENAULT INLET

*Laporte Australia Ltd.: Studies*

1934. Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Conservation and the Environment:

Regarding the disposal of effluent from Laporte and the suggested discharge into Geographe Bay, can he ensure that an environmental review and management programme will be undertaken to ensure adequate engineering, marine

and environmental studies are carried out and also to provide for community participation?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

Yes.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

*Premiers' Conference*

733. Mr BRIAN BURKE, to the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that the Premier of New South Wales is seeking a special Premiers' Conference to discuss the problem of employment in this nation?
- (2) Will he support that pressure to the Prime Minister so that a Premiers' Conference might be held to address this important issue?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) I am aware that the Premier of New South Wales is seeking this conference as I saw this in the Press. I hope that if the Premier of New South Wales wants to pursue this matter, he will contact the other Premiers, and inform us of the problems in NSW and the complete list of reasons for the conference so we can see whether or not to join with him. In the meantime, I intend to work as hard as I can in WA to ensure that we do not get into the very poor state which New South Wales is in financially.

## HOUSING: PURCHASE AND RENTAL

*Budget Allocation*

734. Mr WATT, to the Premier:

Referring to the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition in this House earlier today, that the State Housing Commission's allocation of funds was not sufficient to mount its announced rental and purchase programme of 800 units this year, would the Premier provide details of the commission's funding for 1982-83 for this purpose, together with details of its 1982-83 rental and purchase housing programme?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Yes, as usual the comments of the Leader of the Opposition are inaccurate and misleading.



The funds of the State Housing Commission will be utilised as follows in 1982-83 for its rental and purchase programme—

\$18 million will be used to commence 553 rental and 250 purchase or a total of 803 units during 1982-83. It is anticipated that there will be a carry-over of this programme to works in progress at 30 June 1983 of \$4.4 million for 142 of these units, comprising 102 rental and 40 purchase units.

The number of units to be completed in 1982-83, therefore, will be 698 rental plus 244 purchase—a total of 942 units—with, as I have already said, another 142 under construction and to be funded from the 1983-84 Estimates.

I might add that that does not include the GEHA houses either which would put the total over 1 000.

#### PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATIONS

##### *Inhibitions*

735. Mr TONKIN, to the Premier:

I wish to ask the Premier a question about Government policy. I notice that the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administrative Investigations has stated that he is encountering difficulties because of the inhibitions placed upon him in regard to Press publicity and also because of his inability to enter premises. Does the Government have any policy to give the Ombudsman greater freedom in these areas?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I have not yet had the opportunity to pursue this report with the responsible Minister.

Mr Tonkin: Who is the responsible Minister?

Mr O'CONNOR: The responsibility has been transferred from the Minister for Labour and Industry to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. When I receive a report from the Minister for Consumer Affairs, it will be considered. Certainly no legislation will be introduced in this session of Parliament.

#### RAILWAYS: MILING-TOODYAY

##### *Firebreaks*

736. Mr CRANE to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that Westrail has not yet provided fire-breaks on the northern section of the Toodyay-Miling railway line?
- (2) In view of this and the urgency of the need for local farmers to carry out their annual burn of the railway reserve and station yards at Miling, Bindi Bindi, Gabalong, and other sidings on the line, will the Minister have the matter expedited?

Mr RUSHTON replied:

- (1) and (2) I am not aware of the details of the Westrail programme at this time. I am very conscious of the fact that Westrail co-operates closely with local authorities in these areas for the most effective fire-break programme possible. I give the member an undertaking that I will follow this through and report to him as quickly as possible.

#### HOUSING: INTEREST RATES

##### *Consumer Price Index*

737. Mr CARR, to the Minister for Housing:

What is the likely impact on housing interest rates of the escalation of the Consumer Price Index to an annual rate of 12.3 per cent?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

The member for Geraldton is asking me to look into a crystal ball. It was published quite some time ago that the building societies in this State have forecast that they may be in a position to reduce their housing interest rates early in the New Year. However, obviously that is something that will be reviewed and I would not be able to forecast the long-term rate.

#### STATE FINANCE: BUDGET

##### *Capital Works Programme*

738. Mr NANOVIK, to the Premier:

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition made a statement that the Government's work programme this year would be 24 per cent less than the estimate last year if the SEC's programme were omitted. Is that statement correct?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

From the information I have obtained from the Treasury, that is not correct. The statement is another illustration of the Opposition's adding, omitting, and deleting parts of our statements. The information provided by the Treasury is as follows—

Compared with last year our Total Works Programme is up by \$460.5 million or 82 per cent although most of the increase is due to projects being undertaken by the State Energy Commission, particularly the Dampier to Perth gas pipeline. But even if the State Energy Commission is removed the increase is \$64.2 million or almost 18 per cent as the following table shows.

	1981/82	1982/83
	\$M	\$M
Total Programme	561.3	1 021.8
Less State Energy Commission	201.6	597.9
	<u>359.6</u>	<u>423.9</u>

It would appear that to arrive at a figure of a decrease of 24 per cent you would have to forget to take away State Energy Commission expenditure in 1981/82.

Could anyone imagine taking away the figure for one year and not for another? It continues—

That is a decrease of 24 per cent results if you compare the total works programme in 1981/82 including the State Energy Commission (\$561.3 million) with the total works programme in 1982/83 excluding the State Energy Commission (\$423.8 million).

I hope that if that is what Opposition members did, it was done in error.

## HOUSING: INTEREST RATES

### *Australian Savings Bonds*

739. Mr I. F. TAYLOR, to the Minister for Housing:

What impact is the new tender system for the sale of Commonwealth bonds having on housing interest rates?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

I am unable to answer that question. The member would be far better to address it to the Premier.

Several members interjected.

Mr Davies: I doubt it!

Mr Tonkin: Look at the Premier! He said, "Why dob me in?"

## ALUMINA REFINERIES: WORSLEY

### *Environmental Safeguards*

740. Mr BARNETT, to the Minister for Mines:

With respect to the Alumina Refinery (Worsley) Agreement Amendment Bill currently before the House, I note that the Bill provides for the Government authority to grant a lease which the Government is already obligated to grant under the original agreement. I ask—

- (1) Does the proposed lease area cover any area of State forest which is currently under quarantine?
- (2) What restrictions on mining and movement in such quarantine areas will be required by the Government before granting the lease?
- (3) Will the Minister provide me with a map showing those areas of quarantined forest which will be within the lease area?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (3) I can provide the member with a simple answer to the question, but if he requires a detailed answer I suggest that he put the question on notice.

I cannot say exactly the requirements the Conservator of Forests will apply. The requirements are not applied by me, as Minister for Mines; they are applied by the Conservator of Forests and we abide by the conditions he establishes and the requirements he makes before a tenement can be granted, as we are doing at the present time, or before the lease will apply, as in this case.

In order to define the exact area or delineation of the quarantined area as it exists at the present time and where it overlaps with the area of the lease, I ask the member puts the question on notice, and I shall provide him with a map of the relevant area.

## HOUSING

*Statutory Reserve Deposits*

741. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the Government's attitude to the proposal for the Reserve Bank to release funds from the statutory reserve deposit for housing?
- (2) What steps has he taken to ensure that the bank is aware of the Government's view before making its decision?
- (3) If funds are released from the statutory reserve deposit for housing, what proportion of them does he expect to come to Western Australia and by what means does he anticipate they will be distributed?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) to (3) Obviously that information is not available to me at the moment. I shall provide the member with an answer at a later date.

## GRAIN: WHEAT

*Confiscation*

742. Mr EVANS, to the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Is it a fact that the wheat crop grown this year by two Pindar farmers is to be confiscated?
- (2) Had the land upon which this crop was grown been part of the cropping programme of the property for 20 years, and was it Crown land or reserve?
- (3) If so, why was action delayed until 1981?
- (4) How did this action come about?

Mr LAURANCE replied:

- (1) Yes. In fact the Lands and Surveys Department has now called tenders for the harvesting of that crop which is on Crown land. In addition, a Supreme Court injunction has been taken out to restrain those who planted the crop from harvesting it themselves. The information I have today is to the effect that the two persons concerned have ignored both the injunction and the announcement that tenders were being called to harvest the crop, so action is being taken to ensure the Supreme Court injunction is served.

(2) to (4) I am aware that this land has been cropped illegally previously. Some time ago requests were made for that cropping to be discontinued. In 1981 legal action was taken to prevent this from occurring, although advice was given to the Lands and Surveys Department that appropriate action to ensure that the offence did not continue to occur may not be able to be taken under the Land Act. In August of this year the two men were fined a small amount in the Geraldton court. The maximum fine for this offence under the Land Act is \$1 000. Obviously last year the crop was worth considerably more than that, so I am sure the member would agree that the penalty was quite inappropriate. When the crop was planted illegally again this year, it was felt more positive action should be taken to indicate that the Crown will not allow land to be cropped illegally. Therefore, the activities I outlined in answer to part (1) of the question were entered into; that is, tenders were let for the crop to be harvested so that the return on the crop would go to the Crown and an injunction was taken out in the Supreme Court to prevent those who planted the crop from dealing with it.

Mr Jamieson: You are socialising the farmers now!

Mr Laurance: We are upholding the law!

## HOUSING: INTEREST RATES

*Mortgage Relief: Commonwealth-State Scheme*

743. Mr WILSON, to the Minister for Housing:

I refer to the Government's recent Press advertisements which included a reference to the mortgage and rental crisis relief scheme, details of which, according to the advertisements, were being completed with the Commonwealth, and ask—

- (1) Have the details been completed?
- (2) If so, when will the scheme come into operation?
- (3) How will it operate?

Mr SHALDERS replied:

- (1) to (3) Cabinet has given approval to the details of the scheme as the Government would wish it to operate in this State. However, the scheme requires the acquiescence of the Commonwealth in relation to the funds it makes available. Therefore, the Federal Minister has been requested to consider the State's proposals and advise us whether they are acceptable.

I have not yet received a reply from the Federal Minister and until such time as it is received, obviously the scheme does not have the necessary agreement of both parties and I cannot make the information available.

Mr Wilson: When did it go to the Commonwealth?

#### FUEL AND ENERGY: GAS

##### *North-West Shelf: Equity Sale*

744. Mr GRILL, to the Minister for Resources Development:

- (1) What wild flight of fancy has led the Minister to assert that an ALP Government would purchase a 10 per cent equity in the North-West Shelf LNG project when no member of the ALP and no policy of the ALP has ever suggested that a Government of any complexion should purchase any interest in the project—

Mr P. V. Jones: In this project?

Mr GRILL: In this project.

Mr P. V. Jones: Or any project?

Mr GRILL: In this project. To continue—

—or that public funds would ever be used to purchase any interest in the project?

- (2) Where can he point to any words supporting this horrendous leap of the imagination?

Several members interjected.

Mr GRILL: To continue—

- (3) Was this misleading and incorrect statement simply made to draw the public's and the media's attention away from the Government's humiliation at the expense of foreign interests and its dismal performance in protecting Western Australia's equity in its own resource projects?

- (4) Will the Minister apologise for his error?

Mr P. V. JONES replied:

- (1) to (4) The answer to the last part is, "No". The situation is very clear, and I hope the member for Yilgarn-Dundas is implying that the policy of the Labor Party, as confirmed at its last State conference, for taking equity in projects in Western Australia, is wrong.

Mr Grill: We said we would take equity in one project. I challenge you to point to the words which indicated we ever intended that we would take any interest in the North-West Shelf LNG project, or use public funds.

Mr Tonkin: Apologise or resign.

[Laughter.]

Mr Brian Burke: Or both.

Mr P. V. JONES: At the last ALP State conference its delegates confirmed the original intention of having a corporation which would take equity in projects in Western Australia and use public funds to do so.

Mr Grill: It would not use public funds.

Mr P. V. JONES: The publicity following that conference—

Mr Grill: It was never suggested.

Mr P. V. JONES: —referred to that intention and also—

Mr Grill: You raise funds from the public, not use public funds.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Yilgarn-Dundas will remain silent and allow the Minister to reply to the question asked by the member.

Mr P. V. JONES: The publicity inferred quite clearly that the Government would be involved in taking equity. If the member thinks about the publicity—and I can only assume he said it, when the reference in the Press was for Government involvement—does that mean public funds or not?

Mr Grill: No.

Mr P. V. JONES: In relation to this particular project, I have no reason to believe—like the Leader of the Opposition said earlier today, "How could he know something if no-one told him?"—that the member and his colleagues have classified this project as different and

one that will not attract Government involvement in the way that he implied—

Mr Tonkin: You cannot make up things on that basis.

Mr P. V. JONES: —when other projects will be the recipients of some form of Government involvement and participation through the member's development corporation.

Mr Brian Burke: I cannot believe it.

Mr P. V. JONES: Of course the Leader of the Opposition cannot believe it.

Mr Brian Burke: From where did you get the 10 per cent?

Mr P. V. JONES: The Leader of the Opposition's colleague suggested that, on the basis of Australian equity, we should abandon the North-West Shelf project and support the Woodada project.

Mr Grill: Don't be silly.

Mr P. V. JONES: Just so that members understand what was being proposed, I indicate that not only does the Woodada

prospect have unproved reserves that are in no way defined—

Mr Grill: We listened to this diatribe yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister is not given the opportunity to answer the question, I will have to do something about it.

Mr P. V. JONES: Not only does the Woodada reserve—which the member suggests we were not utilising properly—not have proven reserves, although estimates have been made to indicate it could last for two years, but it also has less Australian equity than the North-West Shelf onshore development. That is what the member for Yilgarn-Dundas said yesterday, and he spoke about the North-West Shelf project and the foreign equity in it.

The inference to be taken from the publicity following the ALP's State conference—members opposite can look this up; they should not ask me to do it—was that 10 per cent would be taken.

